

# WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY.

PROGRESS! FREE THOUGHT! UNTRAMMELED LIVES!

BREAKING THE WAY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

Vol. VI.—No. 11.—Whole No. 141.

NEW YORK, AUG. 16, 1873.

PRICE TEN CENTS.

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

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

This Bank negotiates LOANS, makes COLLECTIONS, advances on SECURITIES and receives DEPOSITS.

Accounts of Bankers, Manufacturers and Merchants will receive special attention.

FIVE PER CENT. INTEREST paid on CURRENT BALANCES and liberal facilities offered to our CUSTOMERS.

DORR RUSSELL, President.  
A. F. WILMARTH, Vice-President.

**JOHN J. CISCO & SON,**  
Bankers,

No. 59 Wall St., New York.

Gold and Currency received on deposit subject to check at sight.

Interest allowed on Currency Accounts at the rate of Four per Cent. per annum, credited at the end of each month.

ALL CHECKS DRAWN ON US PASS THROUGH THE CLEARING-HOUSE, AND ARE RECEIVED ON DEPOSIT BY ALL THE CITY BANKS.

Certificates of Deposit issued, payable on demand, bearing Four per Cent interest.

Loans negotiated.  
Orders promptly executed for the Purchase and Sale of Governments, Gold, Stocks and Bonds on commission.

Collections made on all parts of the United States and Canada.

HARVEY FISK. A. S. HATCH  
OFFICE OF  
**FISK & HATCH,**  
BANKERS AND DEALERS IN  
GOVERNMENT SECURITIES,  
No. 5 Nassau st., N. Y.,  
Opposite U. S. Sub-Treasury.

We receive the accounts of Banks, Bankers, Corporations and others, subject to check at sight, and allow interest on balances.

We make special arrangements for interest on deposits of specific sums for fixed periods.

We make collections on all points in the United States and Canada, and issue Certificates of Deposit available in all parts of the Union.

We buy and sell at current rates, all classes of Government Securities, and the Bonds of the Central Pacific Railroad Company; also, Gold and Silver Coin and Gold Coupons.

We buy and sell, at the Stock Exchange, miscellaneous Stocks and Bonds, on commission, for cash.

Communications and inquiries by mail or telegraph, will receive careful attention.

FISK & HATCH.

## TO INVESTORS.

To those who wish to REINVEST COUPONS OR

DIVIDENDS, and those who wish to INCREASE

THEIR INCOME from means already invested in less

profitable securities, we recommend the Seven-Thirty

Gold Bonds of the Northern Pacific Railroad Com-

pany as well secured and unusually productive.

The bonds are always convertible at Ten per cent,

premium (1.10) into the Company's Lands, at Market

Prices. The rate of interest (seven and three-tenths

per cent. gold) is equal now to about 3 1-4 currency

—yielding an income more than one-third greater than

U. S. 5-20s. Gold Checks for the semi-annual in-

terest on the Registered Bonds are mailed to the post-

office address of the owner. All marketable stocks

and bonds are received in exchange for Northern

Pacifics ON MOST FAVORABLE TERMS.

**JAY COOKE & CO.**

A FIRST-CLASS  
**New York Security**  
AT A LOW PRICE.

The undersigned offer for sale the First Mortgage Seven Per Cent. Gold Bonds of the Syracuse and Chenango Valley Railroad, at 95 and accrued interest.

This road runs from the City of Syracuse to Smith's Valley, where it unites with the New York Midland Railroad, thus connecting that city by a direct line of road with the metropolis.

Its length is 42 miles, its cost about \$42,000 per mile, and it is mortgaged for less than \$12,000 per mile; the balance of the funds required for its construction having been raised by subscription to the capital stock.

The road approaches completion. It traverses a populous and fertile district of the State, which insures it a paying business, and it is under the control of gentlemen of high character and ability. Its bonds possess all the requisites of an inviting investment. They are amply secured by a mortgage for less than one-third the value of the property. They pay seven per cent. gold interest, and are offered five per cent. below par. The undersigned confidently recommend them to all class of investors.

GEORGE OPDYKE & CO.,  
No. 25 Nassau Street.

BANKING HOUSE OF  
**HENRY CLEWS & CO.,**  
32 Wall Street, N. Y.

Circular Notes and Letters of Credit for travelers; also Commercial Credits issued available throughout the world.

Bills of Exchange on the Imperial Bank of London, National Bank of Scotland, Provincial Bank of Ireland and all their branches.

Telegraphic Transfers of money on Europe, San Francisco and the West Indies.

Deposit accounts received in either Currency or Coin, subject to Check at sight, which pass through the Clearing House as if drawn upon any city bank; interest allowed on all daily balances; Certificates of Deposit issued bearing interest at current rate; Notes and Drafts collected.

State, City and Railroad Loans negotiated.

CLEWS, HABICHT & CO.,  
11 Old Broad St., London.

**BANKING & FINANCIAL.**

THE ST. JOSEPH AND DENVER CITY RAILROAD COMPANY'S

**FIRST MORTGAGE BONDS**

Are being absorbed by an increasing demand for them. Secured as they are by a first mortgage on the Road, Land Grant, Franchise and Equipments, combined in one mortgage, they command at once a ready market.

A Liberal Sinking Fund provided in the Mortgage Deed must advance the price upon the closing of the loan. Principal and interest payable in GOLD. Interest at eight (8) per cent. per annum. Payable semi-annually, free of tax. Principal in thirty years. Denominations, \$1,000, \$500 and \$100 Coupons, or Registered.

Price 97½ an accrued interest, in currency, from February 15, 1873.

Maps, Circulars, Documents and information furnished.

Trustees, Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of New York.

Can now be had through the principal Banks and Bankers throughout the country, and from the undersigned who unhesitatingly recommend them.

TANNER & CO., Bankers,  
No. 11 Wall Street, New York.

**AUGUST BELMONT & CO.,**  
Bankers,

91 and 21 NASSAU STREET,

Issue Letters of Credit to Travelers, available in all parts of the world through the

MESSRS. DE ROTHSCHILD AND THEIR CORRESPONDENTS.

Also, make telegraphic transfers of one on California, Europe and Havana.

**RAILROAD IRON,**  
FOR SALE

BY S. W. HOPKINS & CO.,

71 BROADWAY

**TOLEDO, PEORIA**

AND

**WARSAW RAILWAY,**

**SECOND MORTGAGE CON-**

**VERTIBLE 7 PER**

**CENT. CURRENCY BONDS.**

INTEREST WARRANTS PAYABLE

OCTOBER AND APRIL,

PRINCIPAL 1886.

We offer for sale \$100,000 of the above bonds in block. By act of reorganization of the Company these bonds are convertible into the First Preferred Shares of the Company, which amounts to only 17,000 shares, and into the Consolidated Bonds (recently negotiated at Amsterdam) of six millions of dollars, which cover the entire line of 230 miles of completed road, together with all the rolling stock and real property, to the value of more than ten millions of dollars. The road crosses the entire State of Illinois and connect with the mammoth iron bridges spanning the Mississippi at Keokuk and Burlington. The income of the road for the year will net sufficient to pay interest on all the bonded indebtedness and dividend on the preferred shares.

For terms apply to

**CLARK, DODGE & CO.,**

Corner Wall and William Streets.

*Mr. Lawrence*



The following speech was first delivered in Steinway Hall, New York City, November 20, 1871, to thirty-five hundred people, and was the first distinct announcement of the doctrines upon which the new social order will be founded—perfect individual sexual freedom, to be regulated by education instead of law:

## The Principles of Social Freedom.

It has been said by a very wise person that there is a *trinity* in all things, the perfect *unity* of the trinity or a tri-unity being necessary to make a complete objective realization. Thus we have the theological Trinity: The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; or Cause, Effect and the Process of Evolution. Also the *political* Trinity: Freedom, Equality, Justice or *Individuality, Unity, Adjustment*; the first term of which is also resolvable into these parts, thus: Religious freedom, political freedom and social freedom, while Religion, Politics and Socialism are the Tri-unity of Humanity. There are also the beginning, the end and the intermediate space, time and motion, to all experiences of space, time and motion, and the diameter, circumference and area, or length, breadth and depth to all form.

Attention has been called to these scientific facts, for the purpose of showing that for any tri-unity to lack one of its terms is for it to be incomplete; and that in the order of natural evolution, if two terms exist, the third must also exist.

Religious freedom does, in a measure, exist in this country, but not yet perfectly; that is to say, a person is not entirely independent of public opinion regarding matters of conscience. Though since Political freedom has existed in theory, every person has the *right* to entertain any religious theory he or she may conceive to be true, and government can take no cognizance thereof—he is *only* amenable to *society*-despotism. The necessary corollary to Religious and Political freedom is Social freedom, which is the third term of the trinity; that is to say, if Religious and Political freedom exist, *perfected*, Social freedom is at that very moment guaranteed, since Social freedom is the fruit of that condition.

We find the principle of Individual freedom was quite dormant until it began to speak against the right of religious despots, to determine what views should be advocated regarding the relations of the creature to the Creator. Persons began to find ideas creeping into their souls at variance with the teachings of the clergy; which ideas became so *strongly* fixed that they were compelled to protest against Religious Despotism. Thus, in the sixteenth century, was begun the battle for Individual freedom. The claim that rulers had *no right* to control the consciences of the people was boldly made, and right nobly did the fight continue until the *absolute* right to individual opinion was wrung from the despots, and even the *common* people found themselves entitled to not only entertain but also to promulgate *any* belief or theory of which they could conceive.

With yielding the control over the *consciencies* of individuals, the despots had no thought of giving up any right to their *persons*. But Religious freedom naturally led the people to question the right of this control, and in the eighteenth century a new protest found expression in the French Revolution, and it was baptized by a deluge of blood yielded by thousands of lives. But not until an enlightened people freed themselves from English tyranny was the right to self-government acknowledged in theory, and *not yet* even is it fully accorded in practice, as a legitimate result of that theory.

It may seem to be a *strange* proposition to make, that there is no such thing yet existent in the world as self-government, in its political aspects. But such is the fact. If self-government be the rule, every self must be its subject. If a person govern, not only *himself* but others, that is despotic government, and it matters not if that control be over one or over a thousand individuals, or over a nation; in *each* case it would be the *same* principle of power exerted outside of self and over others, and *this* is despotism, whether it is exercised by *one* person over his subjects, or by *twenty* persons over a nation, or by *one-half* the people of a nation over the other half thereof. There is no escaping the fact that the principle by which the *male* citizens of these United States assume to rule the *female* citizens is *not* that of self-government, but that of despotism; and so the fact is that poets have sung songs of freedom, and anthems of liberty have resounded for an empty shadow.

King George III. and his Parliament denied our forefathers the right to make their own laws; they rebelled, and being successful, inaugurated this government. But men do not seem to comprehend that they are now pursuing toward *women* the *same* despotic course that King George pursued toward the American colonies.

But what is freedom? The press and our male governors are *very much* exercised about this question, since a certain set of resolutions were launched upon the public by Paulina Wright Davis at Apollo Hall, May 12, 1871. They are as follows:

*Resolved*, That the basis of order is freedom from bondage; not, indeed, of such "order" as reigned in Warsaw, which grew out of the bondage; but of such order as reigns in Heaven, which grows out of that developed manhood and womanhood in which each becomes "a law unto himself."

*Resolved*, That freedom is a principle, and that as such it may be trusted to ultimate in harmonious social results, as in America, it has resulted in harmonious and beneficent political results; that it has not hitherto been adequately trusted in the social domain, and that the woman's movement means no less than the complete social as well as the political enfranchisement of mankind.

*Resolved*, That the evils, sufferings and disabilities of women, as well as of men, are social still more than they are political, and that a statement of woman's rights which ignores the right of self-ownership as the first of all rights is insufficient to meet the demand, and is ceasing to enlist the enthusiasm and even the common interest of the most intelligent portion of the community.

*Resolved*, That the principle of freedom is one principle, and not a collection of many different and unrelated principles; that there is not at bottom one principle of freedom of conscience as in Protestantism, and another principle of freedom from slavery as in Abolitionism, another of freedom of locomotion as in our dispensing in America with the passport system of Europe, another of the freedom of the press as in Great Britain and America, and still another of social freedom at large; but that freedom is one and indivisible; and that slavery is so also; that freedom and bondage or restriction is the alternative and the issue, alike, in every case; and that if freedom is good in one case it is good in all; that we in America have builded on freedom, politically, and that we cannot consistently recoil from that expansion of freedom which shall make it the basis of all our institutions; and finally, that so far as we have trusted it, it has proved, in the main, safe and profitable.

Now, is there anything so terrible in the language of these resolutions as to threaten the foundations of society? They assert that every individual has a *better* right to herself or himself than any other person *can have*. No living soul, who does not desire to have control over, or ownership in, another person, can have any *valid* objection to *anything* expressed in these resolutions. Those who are not willing to give up control over others; who desire to *own* somebody beside themselves; who are constitutionally predisposed against self-government and the giving of the same freedom to others that they demand for themselves, will of course object to them, and such are the people with whom we shall have to contend in this new struggle for a greater liberty.

Now, the individual *is* either self-owned and self-possessed or *is not* so self-possessed. If he be self-owned, he is so because he has an *inherent* right to self, which right cannot be delegated to any second person; a right—as the American Declaration of Independence has it—which is "inalienable." The individual must be responsible to self and God for his acts. If he be owned and possessed by some second person, then there is *no such thing* as individuality: and that for which the world has been striving these thousands of years is the merest myth.

But against this irrational, illogical, inconsequent and irreverent theory I boldly oppose the spirit of the age—that spirit which will *not* admit all civilization to be a failure, and all past experience to count for nothing; against that demagogism, I oppose the plain principle of freedom in its *fullest, purest, broadest, deepest* application and significance—the freedom which we see exemplified in the starry firmament, where whirl innumerable worlds, and never one of which is made to lose its individuality, but each performs its part in the grand economy of the universe, giving and receiving its natural repulsions and attractions; we also see it exemplified in every department of nature about us: in the sunbeam and the dewdrop; in the storm-cloud and the spring shower; in the driving snow and the congealing rain—all of which speak more eloquently than can human tongue of the heavenly *beauty, symmetry* and *purity* of the spirit of freedom which in them reigns untrammelled.

Our government is based upon the proposition that: All men and women are born free and equal and entitled to certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the *pursuit* of happiness. Now that we, who demand social freedom, ask, is simply that the government of this country shall be administered in accordance with the spirit of this proposition. *Nothing* more, *nothing* less. If that proposition mean *anything*, it means *just what* it says, without qualification, limitation or



equivocation. It means that *every* person who comes into the world of outward existence is of *equal* right as an individual, and is free as an individual, and that he or she is entitled to pursue *happiness* in whatever direction he or she may choose. Now this is absolutely true of all men and all women. But just here the wise-aces stop and tell us that *everybody* must *not* pursue happiness in his or her own way; since to do so absolutely, would be to have no protection against the action of individuals. These good and well-meaning people only see *one-half* of what is involved in the proposition. They look at a single individual and for the time lose sight of all others. They do not take into their consideration that every other individual beside the one whom they contemplate is *equally* with him entitled to the *same* freedom; and that each is free within the area of his or her individual sphere; and *not* free within the sphere of any other individual whatever. They do not seem to recognize the fact that the moment one person gets out of *his* sphere into the sphere of *another*, that other must protect him or herself against such invasion of rights. They do not seem to be able to comprehend that the moment one person encroaches upon another person's rights he or she ceases to be a *free* man or woman and becomes a *despot*. To all such persons we assert: that it is *freedom* and *not* despotism which we advocate and demand; and we will as rigorously demand that individuals be restricted to *their* freedom as any person dare to demand; and as rigorously demand that people who are predisposed to be *tyrants* instead of free men or women shall, by the government, be so restrained as to make the exercise of their proclivities impossible.

If life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are *inalienable* rights in the individual, and government is based upon that inalienability, then it *must follow* as a *legitimate* sequence that the *functions* of that government are to *guard* and *protect* the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, to the end that *every* person may have the most *perfect* exercise of them. And the most perfect exercise of such rights is *only* attained when every individual is not only fully *protected* in his rights, but also *strictly restrained* to the exercise of them within his *own* sphere, and *positively* prevented from proceeding beyond its limits, so as to encroach upon the sphere of another: unless that other first *agree* thereto.

From these generalizations certain specializations are deducible, by which all questions of rights must be determined:

1. Every living person has certain rights of which no law can rightfully deprive him.
2. Aggregates of persons form communities, who erect governments to secure regularity and order.
3. Order and harmony can alone be secured in a community where every individual of whom it is composed is fully protected in the exercise of all individual rights.
4. Any government which enacts laws to deprive individuals of the free exercise of their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is despotic, and such laws are not binding upon the people who protest against them, whether they be a majority or a minority.
5. When every individual is secure in the possession and exercise of all his rights, then every one is also secure from the interference of all other parties.
6. All inharmony and disorder arise from the attempts of individuals to interfere with the rights of other individuals, or from the protests of individuals against governments for depriving them of their inalienable rights.

These propositions are all self-evident, and must be accepted by every person who subscribes to our theory of government, based upon the sovereignty of the individual; consequently any law in force which conflicts with any of them is not in accord with that theory and is therefore unconstitutional.

A fatal error into which most people fall, is, that rights are conceded to governments, while they are only possessed of the right to perform duties, as a further analysis will show:

In the absence of any arrangement by the members of a community to secure order, *each* individual is a law unto himself, so far as he is capable of maintaining it against all other individuals; but at the mercy of all such who are bent on conquest. Such a condition is anarchy.

But if in individual freedom the *whole* number of individuals unite to secure *equality* and protection to themselves, they thereby surrender *no* individual rights to the community, but they simply *invest* the community with the power to perform certain specified *duties*, which are set

forth in the law of their combination. Hence a government erected by the people is invested, *not* with the *rights* of the people, but with the *duty* of *protecting* and maintaining their rights *intact*; and any government is a *failure* or a *success* just so far as it fails or succeeds in this duty; and these are the legitimate functions of government.

I have before said that every person has the right to, and can, determine for himself what he will do, even to taking the life of another. But it is *equally* true that the attacked person has the right to defend his life against such assault. If the person succeed in taking the life, he thereby demonstrates that he is a *tyrant* who is at all times liable to invade the right to life, and that every individual of the community is put in jeopardy by the freedom of this person. Hence it is the *duty* of the government to so restrict the freedom of this person as to make it *impossible* for him to ever again practice such tyranny. Here the duty of the community ceases. It has *no* right to take the life of the individual. That is his own, *inalienably* vested in him, both by *God* and the *Constitution*.

A person may also appropriate the property of another if he so choose, and there is no way to prevent it; but once having thus invaded the rights of another, the whole community is in danger from the propensity of this person. It is therefore the duty of government to so restrain the liberty of the person as to prevent him from invading the spheres of other persons in a manner against which he himself demands, and is entitled to, protection.

The same rule applies to that class of persons who have a propensity to steal or to destroy the character of others. This class of encroachers upon others' rights, in some senses, are *more* reprehensible than any other, save only those who invade the rights of life; since for persons to be made to appear what they are not may, perhaps, be to place them in such relations with third persons as to destroy their means of pursuing happiness. Those who thus invade the pursuit of happiness by others, should be held to be the *worst* enemies of society; proportionably worse than the common burglar or thief, as what they destroy is more valuable than is that which the burglar or thief can appropriate. For robbery there may be *some* excuse, since what is stolen may be required to contribute to actual needs; but that which the assassin of character appropriates does *neither* good to himself nor to *any one else*, and makes the loser poor indeed. Such persons are the worst enemies of society.

I have been thus explicit in the analysis of the principles of freedom in their application to the common affairs of life, because I desired, before approaching the main subject, to have it *well settled* as to what may justly be considered the rights of individuals; or in other words what individual sovereignty implies.

It would be considered a very unjust and arbitrary, as well as an unwise thing, if the government of the United States were to pass a law compelling persons to adhere during life to everything they should to-day accept as their religion, their politics and their vocations. It would *manifestly* be a departure from the true functions of government. The apology for what I claim to be an invasion of the rights of the individual is found in the law to enforce contracts. While the enforcement of contracts in which *pecuniary* considerations are involved is a matter distinct and different from that of the enforcement of contracts involving the happiness of individuals, *even in them* the government has *no* legitimate right to interfere. The logical deduction of the right of two people to *make* a contract without consulting the government, or any third party, is the right of *either* or *both* of the parties to *withdraw* without consulting any third party, either in reference to its enforcement or as to damages.

As has been stated, such an arrangement is the result of the exercise of the right of two or more individuals to unite their rights, perfectly independent of every outside party. There is neither right nor duty beyond the uniting—the contracting—individuals. So neither can there be an appeal to a third party to settle any difference which may arise between such parties. All such contracts have their legitimate basis and security in the honor and purposes of the contracting parties. It seems to me that, admitting our theory of government, no proposition can be plainer than is this, notwithstanding the practice is entirely different. But I am now discussing the abstract principles of the rights of freedom, which no practice that may be in vogue must be permitted to deter us from following to legitimate conclusions.

In all general contracts, people have the protection of government



in contracting for an hour, a *day*, a *week*, a *year*, a *decade*, or a *life*, and *neither* the government nor *any other third party or person*, or *aggregates* of persons ever *think* of making a scale of respectability, graduated by the length of time for which the contracts are made and maintained. *Least of all* does the government require that any of these contracts shall be entered into for life. Why should the social relations of the sexes be made subject to a different theory? All enacted laws that are for the purpose of perpetuating conditions which are themselves the results of evolution are so many obstructions in the path of progress; since if an effect attained to-day is made the ultimate, progress stops. "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther," is *not* the adage of a progressive age like the present. Besides, there can be no general law made to determine what individual cases demand, since a variety of conditions cannot be subject to one and the same rule of operation. Here we arrive at the most important of all facts relating to human needs and experiences: That while every human being has a distinct individuality, and is entitled to all the rights of a sovereign over it, it is not taken into the consideration that *no two* of these individualities are made up of the self-same powers and experiences, and therefore cannot be governed by the *same* law to the *same* purposes.

I would recall the attention of all objecting egotists, Pharisees and would-be regulators of society to the true functions of government—to protect the complete exercise of individual rights, and what they are no living soul except the individual has any business to determine or to meddle with, in *any* way whatever, unless his own rights are first infringed.

If a person believe that a certain theory is a truth, and consequently the right thing to advocate and practice, but from its being unpopular or against established public opinion does not have the moral courage to advocate or practice it, *that* person is a *moral coward* and a *traitor* to his own conscience, which God gave for a guide and guard.

What I believe to be the truth I endeavor to practice, and, in advocating it, permit me to say I shall *speak* so *plainly* that *none* may complain that I did not make myself understood.

The world has come up to the present time through the outworking of religious, political, philosophical and scientific principles, and to-day we stand upon the *threshold* of *greater* discoveries in more *important* things than have ever interested the intellect of man. We have arrived where the very *foundation* of all that *has* been must be analyzed and understood—and this foundation is the relation of the sexes. These are the bases of society—the very last to secure attention, because the most comprehensive of subjects.

All other departments of inquiry which have their fountain in society have been formulated into *special* sciences, and made legitimate and popular subjects for investigation; but the science of *society itself* has been, and still is, held to be too sacred a thing for science to lay its rude hands upon. But of the relations of science to society we may say the same that has been said of the relations of science to religion: "That religion has always wanted to do good, and now science is going to tell it how to do it."

Over the sexual relations, marriages have endeavored to preserve sway and to hold the people in subjection to what has been considered a standard of moral purity. Whether this has been successful or not may be determined from the fact that there are *scores of thousands* of *women* who are denominated prostitutes, and who are supported by *hundreds of thousands* of *men* who should, for like reasons, also be denominated prostitutes, since what will change a woman into a prostitute must also necessarily change a man into the same.

This condition, called prostitution, seems to be the *great evil* at which religion and public morality hurl their *special* weapons of condemnation, as the sum total of all diabolism; since for a woman to be a prostitute is to deny her not only all Christian, but also all humanitarian rights.

But let us inquire into this matter, to see just what it is; not in the vulgar or popular, or even legal sense, but in a purely *scientific* and *truly moral* sense.

It must be remembered that we are seeking after truth for the *sake* of the truth, and in utter disregard of *everything* except the truth; that is to say, we are seeking for the truth, "let it be what it may and lead where it may." To illustrate, I would say the extremest thing possible. If blank materialism were true, it would be best for the world to know it.

If there be any who are not in harmony with this desire, then such have nothing to do with what I have to say, for it will be said regardless of antiquated forms or fossilized dogmas, but in the *simplest* and *least* offending language that I can choose.

If there is *anything* in the whole universe that should enlist the *earnest* attention of *everybody*, and their support and advocacy to secure it, it is that upon which the true welfare and happiness of everybody depends. Now to what more than to anything else do humanity owe their welfare and happiness? Most clearly to being born into earthly existence with a sound and perfect physical, mental and moral beginning of life, with no taint or disease attaching to them, either mentally, morally or physically. To *be so* born involves the harmony of conditions which will produce such results. To *have* such conditions involves the existence of such relations of the sexes as will in themselves produce them.

Now I will put the question direct. Are not these *eminently* proper subjects for inquiry and discussion, not in that manner of maudlin sentimentality in which it *has been* the habit, but in a *dignified, open, honest* and *fearless* way, in which subjects of so great importance should be inquired into and discussed?

An *exhaustive* treatment of these subjects would involve the inquiry what should be the *chief* end to be gained by entering into sexual relations. This I must simply answer by saying, "Good children, who will not need to be regenerated," and pass to the consideration of the relations themselves.

All the relations between the sexes that are recognized as *legitimate* are denominated marriage. *But of what does marriage consist?* This very pertinent question requires settlement before any real progress can be made as to what Social Freedom and Prostitution mean. It is admitted by everybody that marriage is a union of the opposites in sex, but is it a principle of nature outside of all law, or is it a law outside of all nature? Where is the point before reaching which it is not marriage, but having reached which it is marriage? Is it where two meet and realize that the love elements of their nature are harmonious, and that they blend into and make *one* purpose of life? or is it where a *soulless form* is pronounced over two who know *no* commingling of life's hopes? Or are *both* these processes required—first, the marriage union *without* the law, to be afterward solemnized *by* the law? If *both* terms are required, does the marriage continue after the *first* departs? or if the *restrictions* of the law are removed and the *love* continues, does *marriage* continue? or if the law unite two who *hate* each other, is that marriage? Thus are presented all the possible aspects of the case.

The *courts* hold if the law solemnly pronounce two married, *that they are* married, whether love is present or not. But is this really such a marriage as this enlightened age should demand? No! It is a stupidly arbitrary law, which can find no analogies in nature. Nature proclaims in *broadest terms*, and all her subjects re-echo the same *grand* truth, that sexual unions, which result in reproduction, are marriage. And sex exists wherever there is reproduction.

By analogy, the same law ascends into the sphere of and applies among men and women; for are not they a part and parcel of nature in which this law exists as a principle? This law of nature by which men and women are united by love is God's marriage law, the enactments of men to the contrary notwithstanding. And the precise results of this marriage will be determined by the character of those united; all the experiences evolved from the marriage being the legitimate sequences thereof.

Marriage must consist either of love or of law, since it *may* exist in form with either term absent; that is to say, people may be married by *law* and all love be lacking; and they may also be married by *love* and lack all sanction of law. True marriage must in reality consist entirely either of law or love, since there can be *no* compromise between the law of nature and *statute* law by which the former shall yield to the latter.

Law cannot change what nature has already determined. Neither will love obey if law command. Law cannot compel two to love. It has nothing to do either *with* love or with its absence. Love is superior to all law, and so also is hate, indifference, disgust and all other human sentiments which are evoked in the relations of the sexes. It legitimately and logically follows, if *love* have *anything* to do with marriage, that *law* has *nothing* to do with it. And on the contrary, if *law* have *anything* to do with marriage, that *love* has nothing to do with it. And there is no escaping the deduction.



If the test of the rights of the individual be applied to determine which of these propositions is the true one, what will be the result?

Two persons, a male and a female, meet, and are drawn together by a *mutual* attraction—a *natural* feeling unconsciously arising within their natures of which *neither* has any control—which is denominated love. This is a matter that concerns *these two*, and *no* other living soul has *any human* right to say aye, yes or no, since it is a matter in which none except the two have any right to be involved, and from which it is the duty of these two to exclude every other person, since no one can love for another or determine why another loves.

If true, mutual, natural attraction be sufficiently strong to be the *dominant* power, then it decides marriage; and if it be so decided, no law which may be in force can *any more* prevent the union than a *human* law could prevent the transformation of water into vapor, or the confluence of two streams; and for *precisely* the same reasons: that it is a *natural* law which is obeyed; which law is as *high above human law* as perfection is high above imperfection. They marry and obey this higher law than man can make—a law as old as the universe and as immortal as the elements, and for which there is no substitute.

They are sexually united, to be which is to be married by nature, and to be thus married is to be united by God. This marriage is performed without special mental volition upon the part of either, although the intellect *may* approve what the affections determine; that is to say, they marry because they love, and they love because they can neither *prevent* nor *assist* it. Suppose after this marriage has continued an indefinite time, the *unity* between them departs, could they any more prevent it than they can prevent the love? It *came* without their bidding, may it not also *go* without their bidding? And if it go, does not the marriage cease, and should any third persons or parties, either as *individuals* or as *government*, attempt to compel the *continuance* of a unity wherein *none* of the elements of the union remain?

At no point in the process designated has there been *any* other than an exercise of the right of the two individuals to pursue happiness in their *own* way, *which* way has neither *crossed* nor interfered with *any one else's* right to the *same* pursuit; therefore, there is *no* call for a law to change, modify, protect or punish this exercise. It must be concluded, then, if individuals have the Constitutional right to pursue happiness in their *own* way, that all compelling laws of marriage and divorce are despotic, being *remnants* of the barbaric ages in which they were originated, and *utterly unfitted* for an age so *advanced* upon that, and so *enlightened* in the general principles of freedom and equality, as is this.

It must be remembered that it is the sphere of government to perform the *duties* which are required of it by the people, and that it has, in itself, no rights to exercise. These belong *exclusively* to the people whom it represents. It is *one* of the rights of a citizen to have a voice in determining what the duties of government shall be, and also provide how that right may be exercised; but government should not *prohibit* any right.

To love is a right *higher* than Constitutions or laws. It is a right which Constitutions and laws can *neither give* nor take, and with which they have nothing whatever to do, since in its *very* nature it is forever independent of both Constitutions and laws, and exists—comes and goes—in *spite* of them. Governments might just as well assume to determine how people shall exercise their right to *think* or to say that they shall not think at all, as to assume to determine that they shall not love, or how they may love, or that they shall love.

The proper sphere of government in regard to the relations of the sexes, is to enact such laws as in the present conditions of society are necessary to *protect each* individual in the *free* exercise of his or her *right* to love, and also to protect each individual from the forced interference of *every other* person, that would compel him or her to submit to *any* action which is against their *wish* and *will*. If the law do this it fulfills its duty. If the law do not afford this protection, and *worse still*, if it *sanction* this *interference* with the rights of an individual, then it is *infamous* law and worthy only of the *old-time* despotism; since individual tyranny forms *no* part of the guarantee of, or the right to, individual freedom.

It is therefore a strictly legitimate conclusion that where there is *no* love as a basis of marriage there should be *no* marriage, and if that which was the *basis* of a marriage is taken away that the *marriage* also ceases from that time, statute laws to the contrary notwithstanding.

Such is the character of the law that permeates nature from simplest organic forms—units of nucleated protoplasm to the most complex aggregation thereof—the human form. Having determined that marriage consists of a union resulting from love, without any regard whatever to the sanction of law, and consequently that the sexual relations resulting therefrom are strictly legitimate and natural, it is a very simple matter to determine what part of the sexual relations which are maintained are prostitutions of the relations.

It is certain by this Higher Law, that marriages of convenience, and, still more, marriages characterized by mutual or partial repugnance, are adulterous. And it does not matter whether the repugnance arises before or subsequently to the marriage ceremony. Compulsion, whether of the law or of a false public opinion, is detestable, as an element even, in the regulation of the most tender and important of all human relations.

I do not care where it is that sexual commerce results from the dominant power of *one sex* over *the other*, compelling him or her to submission against the *instincts of love*, and where hate or disgust is present, whether it be in the gilded palaces of Fifth avenue or in the lowest purlieus of Greene street, *there* is prostitution, and *all* the law that a *thousand* State Assemblies may pass cannot make it otherwise.

I know whereof I speak; I have seen the most *damning* misery resulting from legalized prostitution. Misery such as the most degraded of those against whom society has shut her doors never know. Thousands of poor, weak, unresisting wives are yearly murdered, who stand in spirit-life looking down upon the sickly, half made-up children left behind, imploring humanity for the sake of honor and virtue to look into this matter, to look into it to the very bottom, and bring out into the fair daylight all the blackened, sickening deformities that have so long been hidden by the screen of public opinion and a sham morality.

It does not matter how much it may still be attempted to *gloss* these things over and to *label* them sound and pure; you, each and every one of you, *know* that what I say is truth, and if you question your own souls you *dare* not reply: it is not so. If these things to which I refer, but of which I shudder to think, are not abuses of the sexual relations, what are?

You may or may not think there is help for them, but *I* say Heaven help us if *such* barbarism cannot be cured.

I would not be understood to say that there are no good conditions in the present marriage state. By no means do I say this; on the contrary, a very large proportion of present social relations are commendable—are as good as the present status of society makes possible. But what I *do* assert, and that most *positively*, is, that *all* which *is* good and commendable, now existing, would *continue* to exist if all marriage laws were repealed to-morrow. Do you not perceive that law has nothing to do in continuing the relations which are based upon continuous love? These are not results of the law to which, perhaps, their subjects yielded a willing or unwilling obedience. Such relations exist in *spite* of the law; would have existed *had there been* no law, and would continue to exist were the law *annulled*.

It is not of the *good* there is in the present condition of marriage that I complain, but of the *ill*, nearly the *whole* of which is the *direct* result of the law which continues the relations in which it exists. It seems to be the general argument that if the law of marriage were *annulled* it would follow that *everybody* must necessarily separate, and that all *present family* relations would be sundered, and complete anarchy result therefrom. Now, whoever makes that argument either does so thoughtlessly or else he is dishonest; since if he make it after having given any consideration thereto, he must know it to be false. And if he have given it no consideration then is he no proper judge. I give it as my opinion, founded upon an extensive knowledge of, and intimate acquaintance with, married people, if marriage laws were repealed that less than a *fourth* of those now married would immediately separate, and that *one-half* of these would return to their allegiance *voluntarily* within *one* year; only those who, under every consideration of virtue and good, should be separate, would permanently remain separated. And objectors as well as I know it would be so. I assert that it is *false* to assume that chaos would result from the abrogation of marriage laws, and on the contrary affirm that *from that very hour* the *chaos* *now*



existing would *begin* to turn into order and harmony. What then creates social disorder? Very clearly, the attempt to exercise powers over human rights which are not warrantable upon the hypothesis of the existence of human rights which are inalienable in, and sacred to, the individual.

It is true there is no *enacted* law compelling people to marry, and it is therefore *argued* that if they *do* marry they should always be compelled to abide thereby. But there is a law *higher* than any human enactments which does compel marriage—the law of nature—the law of God. There being this law in the constitution of humanity, which, operating freely, guarantees marriage, why should men enforce arbitrary rules and forms? These, though having no virtue in themselves, if not complied with by men and women, they in the meantime obeying the law of their nature, bring down upon them the condemnations of an interfering community. Should people, then, voluntarily entering legal marriage be held thereby “till death do them part?” Most *emphatically* NO, if the desire to do so do not remain. How can people who enter upon marriage in utter *ignorance* of that which is to render the union happy or miserable be able to say that they will always “love and live together.” They may take these vows upon them in perfect good faith and repent of them in sackcloth and ashes within a twelve-month.

I think it will be generally conceded that without love there should be no marriage. In the constitution of things *nothing* can be more certain. This basic fact is fatal to the theory of marriage for life: since if love is what *determines* marriage, so, also, should it determine its continuance. If it be primarily right of men and women to take on the marriage relation of their own free will and accord, *so*, too, does it remain their right to determine *how* long it shall continue and when it shall cease. But to be respectable (?) people must comply with the law, and thousands do comply therewith, while in their hearts they protest against it as an unwarrantable interference and proscription of their rights. Marriage laws that would be consistent with the theory of individual rights would be such as would *regulate* these relations, such as regulate *all other* associations of people. They should only be obliged to file marriage articles, containing whatever provisions may be agreed upon, as to their personal rights, rights of property, of children, or whatever else they may deem proper for them to agree upon. And whatever these articles might be, they should in all cases be equally entitled to public respect and protection. Should separation afterward come, *nothing* more should be required than the simple filing of counter articles.

There are hundreds of lawyers who subsist by inventing schemes by which people may *obtain* divorces, and the people *desiring* divorces resort to *all sorts* of tricks and crimes to get them. And *all this* exists because there are laws which would *compel* the *oneness* of those to whom *unity* is beyond the realm of possibility. There are another class of persons who, while virtually divorced, endeavor to maintain a respectable position in society, by *agreeing to disagree*, each following his and her individual ways, behind the cloak of legal marriage. Thus there are *hundreds* of men and women who to *external* appearances are husband and wife, but in reality are husband or wife to quite different persons.

If the conditions of society were completely analyzed, it would be found that *all* persons whom the law holds married against their wishes find *some* way to *evade* the law and to live the life they desire. Of what use, then, is the law except to make *hypocrites* and *pretenders* of a sham respectability?

But, exclaims a very fastidious person, then you would have all women become prostitutes! By *no means* would I have *any* woman become a prostitute. But if by nature women *are* so, *all* the *virtue* they possess being of the *legal* kind, and not that which should exist with or without law, *then* I say they will not become prostitutes because the law is repealed, since at heart they are already so. If there is no virtue, no honesty, no purity, no trust among women except as created by the *law*, I say heaven help our morality, for nothing human can help it.

It seems to me that no grosser insult could be offered to woman than to insinuate that she is honest and virtuous only because the law compels her to be so; and little do men and women realize the obloquy thus cast upon society, and still less do women realize what they admit of their sex by such assertions. I honor and worship that purity which exists in the soul of every noble man or woman, while I pity the woman who is virtuous simply because a law compels her.

But, says another objector, though the repeal of marriage laws might operate well enough in all those cases where a *mutual* love or hate would determine *continuous* marriage or *immediate* divorce, how can a third class of cases be justified, in which but *one* of the parties desire the separation, while the other *clings* to the unity?

I assume, in the first place, when there is not mutual love there is no union to continue and nothing to justify, and it has already been determined that, as marriage should have love as a basis, if love depart marriage also departs. But laying this aside, see if there can any real good or happiness possibly result from an enforced continuance of marriage upon the part of one party thereto. Let all persons take this question home to their own souls, and there determine if they could find happiness in holding unwilling hearts in bondage. It is *against* the *nature of things* that *any* satisfaction can result from such a state of things except it be the satisfaction of knowing that you have succeeded in virtually imprisoning the person whom you *profess* to love, and that would be demoniacal.

Again. It must be remembered that the individual affairs of two persons are not the subject of interference by any third party, and if one of them choose to separate, there is no power outside of the two which can rightly interfere to prevent. Beside, who is to determine whether there will be more happiness sacrificed by a *continuation* or a *separation*. If a person is *fully* determined to separate, it is proof positive that another feeling *stronger* than all his or her sentiments of duty determine it. And here, again, *who* but the individual is to determine which course will secure the most good? Suppose that a separation is desired because one of the two loves and is loved elsewhere. In this case, if the union be maintained by force, at least *two* of three, and, probably, *all three* persons will be made unhappy thereby; whereas if separation come and the other union be consummated, there will be but one, unhappy. So even here, if the greatest good of the greatest number is to rule, separation is not only legitimate, *but* desirable. In all other things except marriage it is always held to be the right thing to do to *break a bad bargain* or *promise* just as soon as possible, and I hold that of *all things* in which this rule should apply, it should *first* apply to marriages.

Now, let me ask, would it not rather be the *Christian* way, in such cases, to say to the disaffected party: “Since you no longer love me, go your way and be happy, and make those to whom you go happy also.” I know of no higher, holier love than that described, and of no more beautiful expression of it than was given in the columns of the *Woman's Journal*, of Boston, whose conductors have felt called upon to endeavor to convince the people that it has no affiliation with those who hold to no more radical doctrine of Free Love than they proclaim as follows:

“The love that I cannot command is not mine; let me not disturb myself about it, nor attempt to filch it from its rightful owner. A heart that I supposed mine has drifted and gone. Shall I go in pursuit? Shall I forcibly capture the truant and transfix it with the barb of my selfish affections, pin it to the wall of my chamber? God forbid! Rather let me leave my doors and windows open, intent only on living so nobly that the best cannot fail to be drawn to me by an irresistible attraction.”

To me it is impossible to frame words into sentences *more holy, pure* and true than are these. I would ever carry them in my soul as my guide and guard, feeling that in *living* by them happiness would certainly be mine. To the loving wife who mourns a lost heart, let me recommend them as a panacea. To the loving husband whose soul is desolate, let me offer these as words of healing balm. They will live in history, to make their writer the *loved* and *revered* of unborn generations.

The tenth commandment of the Decalogue says: “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.” And Jesus, in the beautiful parable of the Samaritan who fell among thieves, asks: “Who is thy neighbor?” and answers his own question in a way to lift the conception wholly out of the category of mere local proximity into a sublime spiritual conception. In other words, he spiritualizes the word and sublimates the morality of the commandment. In the same spirit I ask now, Who is a *wife*? And I answer, not the woman who, ignorant of her own feelings, or with lying lips, has promised, in hollow ceremonial, and before the law, to love, but *she who really loves most, and most truly*, the man who commands her affections, and who in turn loves her, with or without the ceremony of marriage; and the man who holds the



heart of such a woman in such a relation is "thy neighbor," and that woman is "thy neighbor's wife" meant in the commandment; and who-soever, though he should have been a hundred times married to her by the law, shall claim, or covet even, the possession of that woman as against her true lover and husband in the spirit, sins against the commandment.

We know positively that Jesus would have answered in that way. He has defined for us "the neighbor," not in the paltry and commonplace sense, but spiritually. He has said: "He that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." So, therefore, he spiritualized the idea of adultery. In the kingdom of heaven, to be prayed for daily, to come on earth, there is to be no "marrying or giving in marriage;" that is to say, formally and legally; but spiritual marriage must always exist, and had Jesus been called on to define a wife, can anybody doubt that he would, in the same spirit, the spiritualizing tendency and character of all his doctrine, have spiritualized the marriage relation as absolutely as he did the breach of it? that he would, in other words, have said in meaning precisely what I now say? And when Christian ministers are no longer afraid or ashamed to be Christians they will embrace this doctrine. Free Love will be an integral part of the religion of the future.

It can now be asked: What is the legitimate sequence of Social Freedom? To which I unhesitatingly reply: Free Love, or freedom of the affections. "And are you a Free Lover?" is the almost incredulous query.

I repeat a frequent reply: "I am; and I can honestly, in the fullness of my soul, raise my voice to my Maker, and thank Him that I am, and that I have had the strength and the devotion to truth to stand before this traducing and vilifying community in a manner representative of that which shall come with healing on its wings for the bruised hearts and crushed affections of humanity."

And to those who denounce me for this I reply: "Yes, I am a Free Lover. I have an *inalienable, constitutional and natural* right to love whom I may, to love as long or as short a period as I can; to change that love every day if I please, and with that right neither you nor any law you can frame have any right to interfere. And I have the further right to demand a free and unrestricted exercise of that right, and it is your duty not only to accord it, but, as a community, to see that I am protected in it. I trust that I am fully understood, for I mean just that, and nothing less!

To speak thus plainly and pointedly is a duty I owe to myself. The press have stigmatized me to the world as an advocate, theoretically and practically, of the doctrine of Free Love, upon which they have placed their stamp of moral deformity; the vulgar and inconsequent definition which they hold makes the theory an abomination. And though this conclusion is a no more legitimate and reasonable one than that would be which should call the Golden Rule a general license to all sorts of debauch, since Free Love bears the same relations to the moral deformities of which it stands accused as does the Golden Rule to the Law of the Despot, yet it obtains among many intelligent people. But they claim, in the language of one of these exponents, that "Words belong to the people; they are the common property of the mob. Now the common use, among the mob, of the term Free Love, is a synonym for promiscuity." Against this absurd proposition I oppose the assertion that words do not belong to the mob, but to that which they represent. Words are the exponents and interpretations of ideas. If I use a word which exactly interprets and represents what I would be understood to mean, shall I go to the mob and ask of them what interpretation they choose to place upon it? If lexicographers, when they prepare their dictionaries, were to go to the mob for the rendition of words, what kind of language would we have?

I claim that freedom means to be free, let the mob claim to the contrary as strenuously as they may. And I claim that love means an exhibition of the affections, let the mob claim what they may. And therefore, in compounding these words into Free Love, I claim that united they mean, and should be used to convey, their united definitions, the mob to the contrary notwithstanding. And when the term Free Love finds a place in dictionaries, it will prove my claim to have been correct, and that the mob have not received the attention of the lexicographers, since it will not be set down to signify sexual debauchery, and that only, or in any governing sense.

It is not only usual but also just, when people adopt a new theory,

or promulgate a new doctrine, that they give it a name significant of its character. There are, however, exceptional cases to be found in all ages. The Jews coined the name of Christians, and, with withering contempt, hurled it upon the early followers of Christ. It was the most opprobrious epithet they could invent to express their detestation of those humble but honest and brave people. That name has now come to be considered as a synonym of all that is good, true and beautiful in the highest departments of our natures, and is revered in all civilized nations.

In precisely the same manner the Pharisees of to-day, who hold themselves to be representative of all there is that is good and pure, as did the Pharisees of old, have coined the word Free-Love, and flung it upon all who believe not alone in Religious and Political Freedom, but in that larger Freedom, which includes both these, Social Freedom.

For my part, I am extremely obliged to our thoughtful Pharisaical neighbors for the kindness shown us in the invention of so appropriate a name. If there is a more beautiful word in the English language than love, that word is freedom, and that these two words, which, with us, attach or belong to everything that is pure and good, should have been joined by our enemies, and handed over to us already coined, is certainly a high consideration, for which we should never cease to be thankful. And when we shall be accused of all sorts of wickedness and vileness by our enemies, who in this have been so just, may I not hope that, remembering how much they have done for us, we may be able to say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," and to forgive them ourselves with our whole hearts.

Of the love that says: "Bless me, darling;" of the love so called, which is nothing but selfishness, the appropriation of another soul as the means of one's own happiness merely, there is abundance in the world; and the still more animal, the mere desire for temporary gratification, with little worthy the name of love, also abounds. Even these are best left free, since as evils they will thus be best cured; but of that celestial love which says: "Bless you, darling," and which strives continually to confer blessings; of that genuine love whose office it is to bless others or another, there cannot be too much in the world, and when it shall be fully understood that this is the love which we mean and commend there will be no objection to the term Free Love, and none to the thing signified.

We not only accept our name, but we contend that none other could so well signify the real character of that which it designates—to be free and to love. But our enemies must be reminded, that the fact of the existence and advocacy of such a doctrine cannot immediately elevate to high condition the great number who have been kept in degradation and misery by previous false systems. They must not expect at this early day of the new doctrine, that all debauchery has been cleansed out of men and women. In the haunts where it retreats, the benign influence of its magic presence has not yet penetrated. They must not expect that brutish men and debased women have as yet been touched by its wand of hope, and that they have already obeyed the bidding to come up higher. They must not expect that ignorance and fleshly lust have already been lifted to the region of intellect and moral purity. They must not expect that Free Love, before it is more than barely announced to the world, can perform what Christianity in eighteen hundred years has failed to do.

They must not expect any of these things have already been accomplished, but I will tell you what they may expect. They may expect more good to result from the perfect freedom which we advocate in one century than has resulted in a hundred centuries from all other causes, since the results will be in exact proportion to the extended application of the freedom. We have a legitimate right to predicate such results, since all freedom that has been practiced in all ages of the world has been beneficial just in proportion to the extent of human nature it covered.

Will any of you dare to stand up and assert that Religious Freedom ever produced a single bad result? or that Political Freedom ever injured a single soul who embraced and practiced it? If you can do so, then you may legitimately assert that Social Freedom may also produce equally bad results, but you cannot do otherwise, and be either conscientious or honest.

It is too late in the age for intelligent people to cry out thief, unless they have first been robbed, and it is equally late for them to succeed



## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

## PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

One copy for one year, - - - - -	\$3 00
One copy for six months, - - - - -	1 50
Single copies, - - - - -	10

## CLUB RATES.

Five copies for one year, - - - - -	\$12 00
Ten copies for one year, - - - - -	22 00
Twenty copies (or more at same rate), - - - - -	40 00
Six months, - - - - -	One-half these rates.

## FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTION

CAN BE MADE TO THE AGENCY OF THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, LONDON, ENGLAND.

One copy for one year, - - - - -	\$4 00
One copy for six months, - - - - -	2 00

## RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Per line (according to location), - - - - - From \$1 00 to \$2 50  
Time, column and page advertisements by special contract.

Special place in advertising columns cannot be permanently given.

Advertiser's bills will be collected from the office of this journal, and must in all cases, bear the signature of VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

Specimen copies sent free.

Newsdealers supplied by the American News Company, No. 121 Nassau street, New York.

All communications, business or editorial, must be addressed

**Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly,**

48 Broad Street, New York City.



NEW YORK, SATURDAY, AUG. 16, 1873.

## EXCURSION TICKETS FOR THE CONVENTION.

It is advisable that all persons designing to attend the Chicago Convention should immediately inform me, so that the necessary arrangements may be made to secure the half-rate fares.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL,

President of the American Association of Spiritualists.

## A NOVEL WITHOUT A NAME.

The introductory chapter to this really grand romance is necessarily deferred until next week, by reason of the great length of "The Principles of Social Freedom."

## BILLS FOR SUBSCRIPTION.

The names of all persons to whom bills are sent will be stricken from the list after a reasonable time has elapsed in which to make a remittance. As a duty, we urge those who do not wish to continue the paper to so advise us at once. Hereafter bills will be sent at the expiration of the time for which payment has been made. Friends will please give attention to this notice.

NELLIE L. DAVIS.

This young and talented and withal radical reformer is open to engagements to lecture anywhere in the West for the ensuing season. Wherever she speaks we hear the highest encomiums regarding her unswerving devotion to what she feels to be the truth and her fidelity to the vital issues of the day.

## THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY.

This company has again accepted the general agency for the WEEKLY, and hereafter will supply all city and country orders. This is very advantageous to us, inasmuch as it not only relieves us from a general odium among newsmen in the country, as publishers of a paper that the News Company cannot deal in, but it also takes from us a great deal of care and labor. We hope our friends everywhere will second this movement of the News Company, and endeavor to extend the circulation of the WEEKLY wherever it is possible. The News Company will supply the trade, returnable, until No. 149 inclusive, after which regular orders only will be filled.

## THE CONVENTION AT CHICAGO.

The Convention that is to convene in Grow's Opera Hall in Chicago on the 16th of September, will be one of the most important gatherings of reformers that ever assembled. Questions involving the most vital interests of humanity will be discussed, and methods for their propagation and attainment considered. The time has come in which a positive stand must be taken against the threatened encroachments of the Y. M. C. A. upon the liberties of the people, and it belongs to the Spiritualists, as the most advanced reformers of the age, to take the initiative.

In view of these immense issues, we trust that every town and city in the country, where there is a band of Spiritualists, will be represented in the Convention; and we would specially urge one and all to see to it that action is had at

an early day. It is but five weeks until the Convention, and not a day should be lost in idly waiting. The Convention is called. Let the societies respond at once to the call for the selection of delegates, by whom representation may be had. Let it be said this year that the Spiritualists of the country have had a rousing Convention, and that its effects have been felt all over the country. And let it not be said by Spiritualists themselves—at least, with any reason of justice—that the coming Convention has no right to assume that it is representative of the Spiritualists of the country.

EVERY person who voluntarily takes the WEEKLY should see to it that there are never any arrearages. Three dollars is a small sum to the individual, but when this is multiplied by unpaid hundreds and thousands, it becomes an immense amount to the publishers of a paper.

## SOCIAL FREEDOM.

By special requests received from hundreds of persons, we reproduce in this issue the Steinway Hall speech, "The Principles of Social Freedom." It is this speech that inaugurated the prominent events that will ultimately bring on the Social Revolution, and eventuate in woman's complete freedom. This is the question of the day, besides which all others sink into insignificance. In the consideration of the subject, the first question to be asked is: Is freedom something to which people have an inherent natural right? Upon the decision that shall be arrived at depends the whole issue. If it be right, then, let the results be what they may, seemingly bad even, it cannot be denied; but if it be wrong, then the controversy does not proceed beyond this single question.

We believe it is the result of a general desire on the part of those interested in this problem that has called for the publication of this speech in the WEEKLY. It contains the fundamental propositions by which it must be determined which side of this question people will take. If this decision be in favor of freedom, then the entire issue is remanded from the sphere of enforced control to the domain of education. Then will arise all the issues that belong to the sexual relations; as to the conditions under which children should be begotten, and in which they should be grown and educated; as to the natural conditions of sexuality and the underlying laws that govern its best manifestations; as to what constitutes sexual vice and virtue, and as to the best methods of general education in regard to the whole subject.

All these are questions of vital import to every individual living, and in this sense they are more pregnant of good or ill to the race than all other problems combined. They constitute the foundations upon which the superstructure of individuality is constructed, and bear the same relations to the superstructure as the foundations of a building do to the building itself. If they are faulty, the building is at all times liable to tumble in ruins. If they are perfect, any defects in the building may be remedied without the destruction of the entire structure. The foundation of individuality is the physical structure. If it be perfect at the outset and is kept in perfect repair, the defects of character as acquired by contact with other characters may be remedied. If the physical structure, however, be not sound, the individuality is always tottering, and is liable to tumble in ruins at any time. It is evident, then, that this question of the relations of the sexes is the first and main one to be considered and solved, deny it who may; and in presenting the lengthy consideration of the question in the speech, we feel we are not only complying with a general desire among our readers, but also answering a great need.

In the heated season, when almost everybody relaxes active exertions in everything, is the time when the friends and advocates of social freedom should press onward with renewed vigor, as having the field clear to themselves. Let the friends take advantage of this season to spread the circulation of the WEEKLY—the only organ of reform which treats of this important subject radically.

## WHAT IS CONSISTENCY?

In a recent number we reprinted from the *Banner of Light* an article entitled "Consistency a Jewel," by Mrs. Emma Taylor. In it there were some remarks to which A. E. Newton took exception as misrepresenting his position. He made a short reply entitled "Unfairness is not a Jewel," in which, if he have not committed the same error of which he complains, then we do not comprehend language. Now, we do not care for misrepresentation, except as it may affect others toward the principles of freedom; and this entire matter was thoroughly canvassed in the Newton-Woodhull correspondence. But when it is intimated that we have ever been so inconsistent as to recognize anything to be freedom which was restricted, we beg to demur. Restriction means limitation; means something short of the whole. To say that the earth is limited to its own orbit, is to declare its natural freedom, while to say that all planets are guaranteed their natural freedom is to insure each in its individual freedom. But this is not in any natural sense a restriction. It is natural freedom merely. To add "restriction to individual sphere" to the guarantee of freedom in individual sphere is to improvise words with which to cloud the understanding and to bring false issues into the contro-

versy, seemingly to us for the sake of muddling it merely. Nor have we ever been "more careful of late" to recognize anything else.

Again, to even insinuate that freedom can in any sense mean license is to attempt to impeach one of the divinest sentiments of the human soul. Does Mr. Newton, as a public teacher, desire that public to understand that he believes murdering, thieving and ravishing are functions of freedom? What, then, is despotism, which to us is the imposition of self upon others, against their will; or is there no such thing as despotism; is there no tyrannic power exerted in the world? According to Newton, the absolute monarch, only exercises freedom when he reduces millions to his will as against their own.

To us this is the supremest inconsistency. Of course we do not dispute Mr. Newton's right to call it consistency; but we have the right to show it to the public, and let it decide. We say, as free as the winds, when we know that this freedom is to obey the laws of its own conditions. There is no such thing in nature as anything that is absolutely free from everything else; and when we consider any subject, if we wish to arrive at natural conclusions, we must not travel outside of the natural order of the universe; and we beg to inform our readers if they have understood us to have "inconsistently and inconsiderately repudiated" these distinctions, that they have misapprehended our language. We know that language is treacherous, but we remember of none we have ever used upon which such a construction could possibly be placed. Perhaps Mr. Newton may.

REMEMBER that a radical, reformatory paper cannot live under the pressure that it must inevitably bear, unless its friends, who are brave and pure and devoted enough, take it upon their shoulders and support it. If only those of the readers of the WEEKLY who are interested in it from personal motives would assiduously exert themselves to extend its circulation, we should not be under the necessity of ever calling attention to its pecuniary needs.

Professor R. W. Hume, of this city, who has for years been one of the ablest speakers and writers in the field of reform, will be prepared, immediately after the Vineland Convention, to deliver lectures on the intellectual phase of Spiritualism and the issues connected therewith. His long services in the cause of humanity, as an abolitionist in the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, as an opponent of usury or interest in the *Trades' Advocate* of New York, as a defender of the rights of producers in the *Boston Voice* and *Workingman's Advocate* of Chicago, as a champion of the cause of woman in the *Woman's Advocate* of this city, and his very numerous and highly-valuable contributions, extending over the past three years, to the WEEKLY, prove him to be well posted in all the reforms of the age. Added to this, he is a fluent and energetic orator, always welcomed, both at Apollo where he has delivered two lectures by appointment, and among the Cosmopolitans, before whom he has delivered many. We do not hesitate to fully indorse him both as an elocutionist and as a sound thinker and reasoner—as one "who will not keep back part of the price," but give to the public the whole truth on the most important questions of the age. Friends of the cause of humanity in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, we have done our duty in this matter; now it is for you to do yours, and forward this apostle of freedom on his way.

NO PERSON who desires the success of the cause of freedom, and the emancipation of womanhood from her slavery, should attempt to excuse himself or herself from active labor for the WEEKLY, under the pretense that there are a sufficient number of others who will not excuse themselves. In exigencies like the present, inaction is more than dangerous—it is criminal.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## A CHALLENGE.

## RELIGIOUS FREEDOM VS. CONJUGAL FREEDOM.

STOCKHOLM, St. Lawrence Co., N. Y.

On the conjugal love question, I have been thirty years radical where Mrs. Woodhull is not. But I have never favored some of her and Mr. Tilton's radical views as to our present best means to attain a higher, more just and purer conjugal life. I here assume agreement with Mrs. Woodhull where I have had some doubts, and I invite a short discussion.

Resolved, That the principles of freedom which American Protestants generally claim for religion may be logically and justly applied to conjugal love.

I take the affirmative; my opponent must take the negative. This covers Mrs. Woodhull's entire meaning. The parties must be confined to the resolution, with no outside issues, and with no allusions to anybody's personal character or motives. My opponent, if he or she does not believe, must assume the justice and wisdom of religious freedom to the extent that Protestants claim it, and the United States Constitution aims to secure it.

I think I can, and I promise to write logically. And I ask no one to go into the discussion with me who is not willing to be held to the substance of the sternest logic. I care little for forms. Loose, chaotic and random composition is to me a bore.

Judge Holbrook only asks the same government control in conjugal as in religious and money matters, as in all other matters. This is Mrs. Woodhull's position. Judge Edmonds does not show wherein he differs in principle from Mrs. W. If no one objects to my "resolution," then Mrs. Woodhull has none but imaginary opponents. But since many



have so declared themselves, I assume that she has, and wait for any such person to clearly and logically state their objections to her principles or to my resolution.

Should any person decline to discuss with me on the ground that I do not fairly represent Mrs. Woodhull's position of principles, I invite them to clearly state wherein I do not. But were I to affirm—as I here do—my right to hold any religious faith or no faith; to worship one God, many Gods, or no God; to worship bread, water, a stone, a snake, or a devil, as many have and do; to set up in my house or front yard any number of Gods or image of Gods, and to invite my neighbors and their children to worship them; or to change my religious faith and worship daily, or as often as I chose or must, the statement would not disturb one of Mrs. W.'s opponents. They all concede I have that right. Nor does such an affirmation necessarily imply, as some of Mrs. W.'s opponents have asserted, that one thinks any or all these things possible. It may only be an emphatic manner of saying, "It is no other person's business," which it is not. I have the same right to love and to lust that I have to worship God, a snake, or a devil. Pure religious or conjugal love harms no one. Who will say that undeveloped conjugal love has caused more misery than undeveloped and false religion? But whether it has or not, we call for the evidence that the remedy is not the same in both cases. If our free principles are right, and the best thing to aid the growth of the mental, moral and religious man, who is quite sure that they are not good, if not as good, and the best to promote and hasten our growth into the purest and best conjugal relations? I am not. Reason and logic are all on the side of freedom. We agree in the utility of free discussion. I wait, then, for some one to tell us why we may not apply our religious principles of "liberty of conscience" in faith and worship to conjugal love, life and action. As I do not desire to be the means of what, to me, would be an unnecessarily long spun out discussion, I confine my opponent to five articles, averaging not over one column in the WEEKLY each. And I pledge myself to occupy less space than my opponent. My resolution covers but a small part of the ground; but it is the first, most essential and vital part of it. I repeat, all side points, even of vast importance, must be passed in this discussion. Their place comes in after this is ended. If no one attempts a direct reply and refutation of our "resolution," I shall take it as a confession that they now see that, on principles, they do not differ from Mrs. Woodhull, or that they are not sure that they can defend their position. This challenge is meant for Mrs. Hardinge-Britten, Judge Holbrook, Mr. Warren Harris, and a score of others who have written in opposition to and complained of Mrs. W.'s "principles."

It may interest some Spiritualists to know that I give out this challenge, and respectfully defy you, and act, not the medium, but the attorney for Miss Social Freedom, by the desire and request of certain radical spirits in the other life.

AUSTIN KENT.

A CARD.

STOCKHOLM, New York, July 28, 1873.  
Do not send me money for "Social Freedom" till further notice. I am still grateful to those who send me one dollar, or less if poor, for my book, "Free Love."

AUSTIN KENT.

[From the Banner of Light.]

"A LITERARY SENSATION—'EDWIN DROOD' NO LONGER A MYSTERY."

Such is the heading to a long article in the Springfield Union of July 26, 1873. Our readers are aware that we published in this paper an article from the Boston Post upon the same subject months ago. We printed it simply on the authority of that paper. In due time the London papers scouted the idea of the spirit of Chas. Dickens finishing "Edwin Drood" through a "Yankee" medium, and London Punch was particularly severe upon the American Spiritualists for assuming that such a thing could be possible. There the matter rested until the present week, when the subject flashed upon our community in the columns of the Boston press—the Advertiser, Herald, Journal, etc.—as something new.

The Springfield Republican, in alluding to the subject, judiciously says:

"It is of course impossible to judge of this phenomenon, until the work appears and all circumstances of its preparation are subject to careful scrutiny. If it is of the ordinary run of mediumistic productions, it will be simply a novel in its pretensions; if it turns out to be an imposture, it will be simply audacious; if it proves an approximation in any way to Dickens' work and has been wrought without study of him, it will indeed be a mystery."

The Traveller of Tuesday evening also refers to this matter as follows:

"The more we examine the apparently mysterious continuation of Edwin Drood by the self-constituted medium of Dickens, the less mysterious it becomes; and, stripped of the robe of humbug with which he has covered himself, the author stands revealed as a successful paraphraser, but utterly without common sense. A close examination conclusively shows him to be a person who has been a constant and admiring reader of Dickens, the characters and incidents of the continuation, and many of their names even, having evidently been suggested by previous perusal of the master's works. It becomes equally evident that the work is the production of one who has not the common sense to be honest, but has taken a method of attracting attention as unfortunate as it is absurd. Had the author published his work as an attempt to continue 'Edwin Drood,' he would have met with the applause that the success of his paraphrase deserves. But, as it is, the public will be prejudiced against the book by its absurd pretense to have been the direct inspiration of Dickens, and will receive it with apathy, or perhaps disgust, and instead of being a stepping-stone to literary success, as

it might have been, it will be but a stumbling-block in its author's path."

A gentleman of this city called at our office a few days since and furnished us with a manuscript copy of a message said to have been written by Dickens through the medium in question, wherein the writer expresses an earnest desire that his amanuensis should remain faithful to him, etc., and admonishes him particularly to be very careful of his health. This message not being satisfactory to us as having emanated from the source attributed to it, we have written to Brattleboro' for information from the Spiritualists there as to the truth or falsity of the statements first given to the public through the Boston Post, and reiterated in other dailies the present week. Whether true or false, we know not at this writing, but shall wait further developments upon the subject with deep interest.

[From the N. Y. Star, Express and other City Papers.]

CHOLERA.

The disproportionate number of diarrheal deaths in the city shows the cholera tendency, a tendency which, gorging with such vile trash, as in the case in Greenwich street, or drinking such abominable water, as in Tennessee, or living in such filth, as in villages in Indiana, may at any time develop into the disease itself. Actually, nearly all the cholera in the country thus far, has been simply atrocious—a result brought on by fools and know-nothings. Then it proves that we need not in the least fear it, because it proves that we can perfectly control it.

Diarrhea, as the forerunner of the disease, should be positively prohibited and prevented, even if one be compelled to rest for a time on his back. And drinking ice-water very often superinduces diarrhea, as it has just done in my own case. Though I knew the tendency, and tried to drink sparingly, yet the very little more I drank one afternoon, produced the effect, which I did not entirely outgrow in four days. I frequently see others swallow at one of their ordinary drafts, what would send me to stool in half an hour, and though all are not equally sensitive, yet multitudes do bring on diarrhea by the drinking.

But more different things will cure actual cholera than will any other disease, for one thing will always cure it, and any number of things will accomplish that one thing. Perpiration induced and established, is the instant and utter end of cholera: the moment the action of the body is determined to the surface, that moment it is diverted from the bowels. Then every one will know at once, how to go to work to cure the patient, each in the way of his or her own suggestion, but let the patient lie on his back. Drinking simple hot water has never been known to fail yet, but the same result would follow with hot herb-drinks, or with tea. Hot ginger tea would be just the thing, and if ever any one wants to drink pepper, now is the time. Brandy would cure a man who had never drank any, but most men have drank too much, now. I cured a Doctor (from London) once, by simply putting bed-clothes on him, and though he had often scouted the theory, yet now he cried out, "pile on, pile on!" Rubbing a man all over with the hands, a flesh-brush, or crash towel, will cure him, even in cramp and coma—witness Victor Hugo restoring his son. Magnetism will call the action to the surface, so will the galvanic battery; and Dr. Chapman of England never fails to produce the same effect, by applying ice to the spine. Any of these ways, or a great many others which wit will invent, and no one can ever die of cholera. One day, cholera will be nothing, and it would be nothing now, if we were only wise.

JOSEPH TREAT, M. D.

New York, August 4, 1873.

NERO-SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANS.

BY WILLIAM CHAMBLESS ELLIOTT,  
Author of "A B C of Religion," "Religiosophic Bible," and "Orations against Superstition."

Go and search the true history of the Church. For belief in the teachings of Peter Waldo, in the dismal year of 1179, thirty men and women were burned at Lyons, France. Who were the burners? Christians. John Wickliffe was accused of "heresy" in 1380. Who were his accusers? The popular disciples of fabled Christ; Christians, who dug up and burned his bones after he had been buried for thirty years. John Huss, because he believed in Wickliffe's bible, was made to perish at the fiery stake in 1414. By whom was he thus martyred? By those who are called "Babes of the Gospel"—Christians. In 1431 Joan of Arc was burned for claiming to be inspired, and her burners were those "dear lambs of Jesus," whose common title is that of Christians.

It is the same old story of Nero proclaimed by the flying ages.

Who, in 1511, burned Herman of Ryswick? Devotees of Christianity, who are said to have civilized the world. Who destroyed at the flaming stake Lucilio Vanini, an Italian, for his atheistic opinions? Blind Christians. Who cut off the tongue, arms and head of Chevalier de la Barre for burlesquing the Roman Catholic religion? Religious bigots, who pretended to be followers of so-called Christ. Who burned Bruno? Catholics. Who, not long ago, in the Great Mountain State, Vermont, whipped his little boy to death? A Christian minister, like another such man of God in the Empire State, New York. Who, of England, cruelly murdered his wife? Rev. Mr. Graham.

It is the same old spirit of Nero in all ancient as in all modern scraps of history; and who is found to exercise it to a greater extent than Christians?

Go back once more into the historic past. John Calvin, the founder of a sect in Christendom, the Presbyterian, caused Michael Servetus to be martyred in a slow-burning fire of green wood. Those who, in 1553, kindled the fires at Smithfield for the purpose of killing heretics were Christians; and so were those who, in 1555, burned John Rogers because he differed from them in opinion, as well as those who in the same year consumed by fire Latimer and Ridley for denying the Creed; and those, too, who during the very same fateful

twelvemonth consigned to the burning fagots young William Hunter for simply reading the Bible. It is estimated that during the last eighteen hundred years about one billion and three hundred millions of men, women and children have been put to death in various ways by the avowed followers of Jesus for the sake of old theology. But the cause of so much and such refined cruelty in Church and State is the Nero of superstition. Christians are a body of bigots, and Christianity is a false religion.

PEARLS FROM THE SEA OF THOUGHT.

BY HELEN NASH.

There is—there can be—no other rule of social life than to allow intercourse to be regulated by elective affinity; that is, to let those who are conscious of congeniality with each other associate to such a degree and on such terms as they shall find mutually satisfactory.—Pittsburg Gazette.

The molecule of oxygen roams lonely through the vast universe, yearning for its mate, and finding no rest, till of a sudden it meets the molecule of hydrogen in a quiet work, when lo, a rush, an embrace, and then no more either oxygen or hydrogen, but a diamond drop of dew, sparkling on the white bosom of the lily.—Gail Hamilton.

The taste forever refines in the study of women.—N. P. Willis.

In jealousy there is more self-love than love.—La Roche-foucault.

When love begins to sicken and decay,  
It useth an enforced ceremony.

Shakespeare.

The public mind is educated quickly by events, slowly by arguments.—Anon.

A profound conviction raises a man above the feeling of ridicule.—John Stuart Mill.

Ridicule is the test of truth.—Lord Shaftsbury.

They say best men are molded out of faults,  
And for the most become much more the better  
For being a little bad.

Shakespeare.

Our enemies speak of us as they hear; we judge of ourselves as we feel.—Hannah Moore.

It is our hearers who inspire us.—Vinet.

I will oblige my daughter to marry for love.—Madam De Stael.

Health is the soul that animates all the enjoyments of life.—Sir W. Temple.

He who, in obedience to a false world, silences the purer instincts of his nature, but garners up for his future years a harvest of disappointment and remorse.—Helen McCartney.

There are two forms of government struggling for the mastery: a pure Imperialism, the rule of one, and a pure democracy, the rule of the whole.—Madox.

The Universal Republic is beating the pulse of the civilized world.—Madox.

BY LAURA CUPPY SMITH.

George Sand might have loved one man permanently if she could have found one contemporary with her, who could interest and command her throughout her range; but this was hardly possible for such a person, thus she has naturally changed the objects of her affection, and many times.—Margaret Fuller.

Genius can only breathe freely in an atmosphere of freedom. Persons of genius are *ex bi termini* more individual than any other people—less capable, consequently, of fitting themselves, without hurtful compression, into any of the small number of molds which society provides in order to save its members the trouble of forming their own character. If from timidity they consent to be forced into one of these molds and to let all that part of themselves which cannot expand under the pressure remain unexpanded, society will be little the better for their genius. If they are of a strong character and "break their fetters," they become a mark for the society which has not succeeded in reducing them to common place to point, at with solemn warning as "wild," "erratic," and the like, much as if one should complain of the Niagara river for not flowing smoothly between its banks like a Dutch canal.—John Stuart Mill.

O, crooked world!" I cried, "ridiculous,  
If not so lamentable! It's the way,  
My Marion—always hard upon the rent  
In any sister's virtue! While they keep  
Their chastity so damed with perfidy  
That, though a rag itself, it looks as well  
Across a street, in balcony or coach,  
As any stronger stuff might. For my part  
I'd rather take the wind side of the stew  
Than touch such women with my finger end.  
They top the poor street-walker by their lie,  
And look the better for being so much worse.  
The devil's most devilish when respectable.

—Elizabeth Barrett Browning.

For let a man once show the world that he feels  
Afraid of its bark, 'twill fly at his heels;  
Let him fearlessly face it, 'twill leave him alone,  
But 'twill fawn at his feet if he flings it a bone.

—Owen Meredith.

CORRECTION AND SUGGESTION.

Our friend, Edward H. G. Clark, seems to have been misunderstood in that passage of the *Thunderbolt*: "Free Love—the one thing 'beastly and abominable' that inhabits the earth!" His marks of quotation (inclosing words from a paper in his own city), expressed the characterization of free love by the great world. Then, the true idea of free love being free women, women free to love, friend Clark's noble vindication of a free press, suggests the ten-fold greater necessity of his equally open and public vindication of free love, free love being thus as much more than free press as woman is than a sheet of inked paper, and the sheet of paper good for nothing except as a means to her.

And that other passage in the *Thunderbolt*: "Marriage is



not a relation of two individuals solely, but of their children as well. And has my neighbor no right to protect himself against the enforced support of *my children*?"—suggests, 1. That Free Schools are the confessed compulsion of friend Clark to educate his neighbor's children. 2. That we are proud to quote a heathen as saying, "Whatever concerns man concerns me." 3. That Free Love is only another name for a Social Reorganization which shall provide for every human being. And 4. That Society to-day, incurs the full responsibility of providing for every child born into it, in that sheer fact of its *being* born.

May not friend Clark's paper thus need to go a little further before it can personate and say,

Deep within me burns a fire,  
Flaming, ever, higher and higher:  
Thunderbolt from heaven hurled,  
I shall one day rule the world!

J. T.

## THE INTERNATIONAL.

THE FORTHCOMING GENERAL CONGRESS OF THE I. W. A. AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.

It is now nearly a year since the disastrous failure of the last General Congress of this association, held at the Hague, in Holland. The proceedings of that Congress were so manifestly dictated by a clique of adventurers, almost openly enlisted in the service of partisan leaders, in defiance of the will of their supposed constituents, that not one Federation has yet accepted its acts. On the contrary, those acts have been, with wonderful unanimity, repudiated by the Federations of America, England, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and Spain.

Meanwhile, the time which has elapsed has been improved by preparations for another Congress, which will be held at Geneva, Switzerland, on the 1st of September. The Executive Committee of the Jurassien Federation, to whom has been assigned the duty of making the necessary arrangements, have engaged the hall of the large brewery in Geneva, called "Scheys" au Paquis, where the delegates are invited to meet on the 31st of August, in time to avail themselves of the hospitality of their Swiss brethren. "Logements" have been provided, and there is reason to expect a large attendance from the European Federations. The American Federation, however, may not be represented by any delegate. The distance is too great, the expense too heavy to justify the appointment of any one under the existing circumstances. But the American Internationalists will not for this reason be entirely misrepresented. The Federal Council has adopted an address, which we herewith print, and believe will not be passed unnoticed by the body to which it is addressed.

One thing is certain, namely, this Congress will be a true representative body, and its acts will be submitted to its constituents for ratification. There will be no "caucussing," no "packing," and no usurpation of authority not delegated, such as were exhibited at the Congress of the Hague. The legitimate business of the association will be transacted and resumed at the point where it was left by the Congress in 1869, at Basle. And the first business in order (after the Revision of its administrative rules, rendered necessary by the despotism of the Hague Congress), will be the subject of the reconstitution of the State on the principle of the referendum and Popular Initiative, referred by the Basle Congress to its successors. The social question had already been then fully determined. It now remains to discover and determine how the social question may be resolved by political, not to say revolutionary, means. If it be possible, let the movement for the emancipation of labor put its enemies in the position of rebels, and let the workmen be the vindicators and administrators of law.

WILLIAM WEST.

## THE AMERICAN FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE I. W. A.

TO THE GENERAL CONGRESS SITTING AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND:

Companions—We gratefully acknowledge the receipt of a communication from L. Pindy, Corresponding Secretary of the Committee of the Jurassien Federation, bearing date the 8th ult. We are glad to learn that accommodations have been made for the reception of the delegates, but we have not yet learned whether any of our sections will be represented by any member in person. The expense of a voyage to and from Europe is quite heavy, and it is therefore improbable that we will be represented at all, except by this paper, our reply to the communication referred to.

L. Pindy submits to us certain propositions authorized by the St. Imier Congress of September 15th and 16th, 1872, with a view to elicit our opinions concerning the future action of the I. W. A. The propositions relate to

1. The definitive constitution and solidarity of the several Federations adhering to the I. W. A.
2. The revision of the "General Statutes" of the Association.
3. The "General Strike."
4. A universal organization of commissions of resistance and of complete tabular statistics of labor.

And the Corresponding Secretary desires to learn if we shall be represented in your body, and if so, by how many delegates.

Believing that you were to have assembled in May last, information to that effect having been received, the American Federal Council adopted an address, which, by its direction, was sent to the officers of the St. Imier Congress for presentation to you. In that address the Council frankly expressed its opinions concerning the general principles and objects of the Association, and of the means by which those principles and objects may in each nationality be attained. Copies of the address are herewith transmitted. But in view of recent developments in Spain, Italy, France and Belgium, and the propositions of the St. Imier Congress, it is proper to make such additions thereto as may be necessary to a better understanding.

We heartily approve of the proposition of universal soli-

arity, and of the reconstitution of the Association in conformity thereto. Certainly, the working-classes of all the Federations adhering to the Association should help the working-classes of either of the Federations requiring assistance, in whatever manner that Federation may ask for it. Differences of circumstances and conditions in the several Federations may not require the same remedies, but each Federation must judge for itself what is most desirable and practical. This recognition of the solidarity of humanity, which guarantees assistance to the struggling Federations, is the first duty of members of the Association everywhere.

We approve of the revision of the general statutes of the Association. They should guarantee the right of initiative to each member of every section, to each section, and to each Federation, and be so framed as to admit of progressive methods of action. The necessities of to-morrow may require other methods than those which may be deemed advisable to-day, and the statutes should be so framed as to leave each and all members of the Association perfectly free to propose and promulgate whatever measures may at the time seem to be most feasible.

It should be understood, however, that the responsibility of this initiative must be limited to the individual, or sections, or Federations taking it, so that while it guarantees the autonomy of each individual, of each section, and of each Federation, the subject matter thereof, if it be not approved, shall not be promulgated in the name of the entire association, but solely by the individual, or section, or Federation assuming the initiative.

Of course, we favor and advise the limitation of the functions of the General and Federal Councils to strictly executive purposes. All experience has shown that representative Legislative bodies are too prone to substitute themselves for their constituents, and to assume and to exercise powers never delegated.

Of the "General Strike," we need only to say that it is your business. If the social and political status of any people render a strike the only practicable means of bettering their social condition, it is the sole judge of its necessities. Other peoples, bound to it by ties of solidarity, have but one duty—namely, to acquiesce in its judgment and to support it by all available means. The experience of "strikes," so-called, in these United States of America, has proved that they must generally result in simple waste of resources without corresponding benefit, except as an educational means. But if the working people, organized and affiliated with us, should fix upon a day certain for a "general strike," not merely to obtain an opportunity to work a little less time for a little more pay, but to find the means of existence in co-operative workshops, groups and colonies, we could not refrain from assisting them, and should confidently appeal to all adhering nationalities for moral and material aid.

The necessity of the appointment of commissions of resistance and of complete tabular statistics of labor (much wanted) we fully recognize, and will nominate in such manner as the Congress may direct the members of these Commissions for our Federation.

In short, upon this subject we approve of the propositions of the Belgian Congress, held on the 1st and 2d days of June of this year, which we find in the bulletin of the Jurassien Federation of July 6th.

And now, perhaps in our turn we may be permitted to make a single suggestion of a subject proper for the action of the Congress. It relates to a cheap method of International communication, through governmental agency, by open postal cards, such as are now used for strictly home purposes in this country, in Great Britain and in some of the Continental States. There can be no reason assigned for limiting this means of communication within national boundaries. The efforts that are now making to extend the system should, therefore, receive the indorsement of the Congress. A Postal Congress is to meet in Switzerland on the 9th of September, charged by the several governments which will be represented therein with the establishment of International postal relations; and an appeal might well be made by you to that body in behalf of this object.

Finally, companions, defenders and propagators of the social revolution, we salute you! Once more in the eventful history of our association you freely meet to discuss how the last vestiges of despotism—military, theocratic and capitalistic—shall give place to a genuine and permanent social republic; how labor may be organized, and the now oppressed workers converted into free, powerful and cultivated citizens of the great social collectivity; how the thought, feeling and activity of the proletariat may be directed to the emancipation of the human race. Grand and noble task! May love and wisdom rule your counsels!

Live the Social Revolution!

Live the International!

Accept our fraternal congratulations!

B. HUBERT, Gen. Cor. Sec.

T. KINGET, English Cor. Sec.

WM. WEST, Rec. Sec.

Hugh McGregor,  
B. Hubert,  
Wm. West, } Committee.

The London *Catholic Times* says:

"In educational matters our just claims for religious equality are spurned. In social life the cursed infidelity of the times unceasingly attacks us. Our poor are threatened with peril, both moral and physical, by being driven under the hoofs of that bigoted Bumbledom which sees in every Catholic a Guy Fawkes, and in every Irishman a rebel."

If the *Catholic Times* wishes to mend this state of affairs, why does it not contend for the abolition of interest for money, which is the real oppression of the workingman. The smallest interest is condemned as "mortal sin" by the Catholic Church. What is the use of whining? If the Catholic Church means anything it must fight. But latterly it has been tarred with the same stick, having borrowed money on interest, and it dare not.

## CÆSARISM.

"Some of the newspapers seem to be haunted with the fear that the country is about to fall a prey to what they call Cæsarism. There are grounds for apprehension that if the reign of corruption continues and grows worse and worse, and centralization and absolutism move forward at their present rate of speed a few years longer, our republican institutions may be overthrown by some long-headed, strong-armed usurper. But it will require a real Cæsar to play this great role. In our age and nation a third or fourth rate performer would be hooted out of the arena. Republics have had their Cæsars in different ages of history, and we may have ours in the evil days before us. But he has not yet appeared.

"Shakespeare, reflecting the history of ancient Rome, puts into the mouth of one of his characters the declaration that Julius Cæsar was the foremost man in all this world—the greatest that ever lived in the tide of time.

"The liberties of this country may yet be overthrown by such a Cæsar as that; but our representative system will never succumb to any mere imitation."—*N. Y. Sun*, July 17, 1873.

TRENTON, N. J., July 20, 1873.

EDITORS OF THE WEEKLY:

In response to your call for vari-sided contributions, and with the above extract from the *N. Y. Sun* as my text, with a few prefatory remarks I would introduce to your revolutionary readers a person who, should a temporary Cæsarism become necessary to restore order out of the chaos into which incompetent rulers or worn out systems seem likely soon to plunge the American people, I can commend, after more than a decade of intimate acquaintance, as the one man best calculated of all living men, according to my judgment, to act the part of a real Cæsar.

In the winter of 1855-6 I once had the pleasure of meeting your estimable and clear-headed friend, Stephen Pearl Andrews, in company with some other progressive minds. In the course of a conversation touching the failure of associative efforts to improve the old social conditions, he was asked in what way he thought the new and higher conditions would be inaugurated. He replied, "Through a benevolent despotism." The reply made a deep impression upon my mind at the time, and my later experiences with the contentious minds of selfish men, have led me to think it may be prophetic.

If I had no faith in a higher power than man in leading the peoples of earth through the wilderness into which they now seem to be entering, my hopes for national salvation would be very slender. But, as in all times past, I doubt not that in the present and future special agents of the great unseen, earth-governing and nation-creating Power will appear upon the stage of action at the critical juncture, when their services shall most be needed by the bewildered people.

ROBERT SINNICKSON.

TO VICTORIA C. WOODHULL:

Respected Madam—Believing that the power of self-sustenance in woman, which has been much deteriorated by ages of false civilization, must be restored before woman can command her personal, legal and political rights, I send you an extract from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, tenth vol., pp. 573, on the character and conduct of the ancient women of Germany:

"Notwithstanding the grossness of manners among the German tribes, the females were held in high estimation; and while the men were brave the women were chaste. Polygamy was not in use excepting amongst the princes; and amongst them only for the sake of multiplying their alliances. Divorces were prohibited by manners rather than by laws. Adulteries were punished as rare and inexpiable crimes; nor was seduction justified by example and by fashion. The unpolished wives of the Germans partook of few of those gratifications which tend to inflame the passions, and their fidelity was in some measure secured by the exposure to which they were subject in open huts, and by poverty, solitude and the painful cares of domestic occupation. Besides these restraints, the Germans treated their women with esteem and confidence, consulted them on every occasion of importance, and fondly believed that in their breasts resided a sanctity and wisdom more than human. Some of these interpreters of fate, such as Velleda, in the Batavian war, governed, in the name of the deity, the fiercest nations of Germany. The rest of the sex were respected as the free and equal companions of soldiers, associated, even by the ceremony of marriage, to a life of toil, of danger and of glory. In their great invasions, the camp of the barbarians was filled with a multitude of women, who remained firm and undaunted amidst the sound of arms, the various forms of destruction, and the honorable wounds of their sons and husbands. Fainting armies of Germans have more than once been driven back upon the enemy by the generous despair of the women, who dreaded death much less than servitude."

From the stand-point of this effete and luxury-poisoned age, the writer concludes thus:

"Heroines of such a description may claim admiration, but they can scarcely inspire the passions of love. They who attempt to imitate the sterner virtues of man must lose the attractive softness of their own sex, which is their principal charm. Conscious pride taught the German nations to suppress every tender emotion which stood in competition with honor; and the first honor of the sex has ever been that of chastity."

It is manifest that the last sentence contains an assertion which is not applied to both man and woman, but to woman solus. This is not just. Were women the acknowledged equals of men, as in ancient Germany, this omission would be rectified. As to woman, she has her choice to accept the hardihood and liberty she held in ancient Germany, or remain degraded as a doll or serf of our present civilization.

R. W. HUME.



in crying down *anything* as of the devil to which a name attaches that angels love. It may be very proper and legitimate, and withal perfectly consistent, for philosophers of the *Tribune* school to bundle all the murderers, robbers and rascals together, and hand them over to our camp, labeled as Free Lovers. We will only object that they ought to hand the whole of humanity over, good, bad and indifferent, and not assort its worst representatives.

My friends, you see this thing we call Freedom is a large word, implying a deal more than people have ever yet been able to recognize. It reaches out its all-embracing arms, and while encircling our good friends and neighbors, does not neglect to also include their less worthy brothers and sisters, every one of whom is just as much entitled to the use of his freedom as is either one of us.

But objectors tell us that freedom is a dangerous thing to have, and that they must be its conservators, dealing it out to such people, and upon such matters, as they shall appoint. Having coined our name, they straightway proceed to define it, and to give force to their definition, set about citing illustrations to prove not only their definition to be a true one, but also that its application is just.

Among the cases cited as evidences of the evil tendencies of Free Love are those of Richardson and Crittenden. The celebrated McFarland-Richardson case was heralded world-wide as a case of this sort. So far as Richardson and Mrs. McFarland were concerned, I have every reason to believe it was a genuine one, in so far as the preventing obstacles framed by the "conservators" would permit. But when they assert that the murder of Richardson by McFarland was the *legitimate result* of Free Love, then I deny it *in toto*. McFarland murdered Richardson because he believed that the law had sold Abby Sage *soul* and *body* to him, and, consequently, that he *owned* her, and that *no* other person had *any* right to her favor, and that she had *no* right to bestow her love upon any other person, unless *that ownership* was first satisfied. The murder of Richardson, then, is not chargeable to his love or her love, but to the fact of the supposed ownership, which right of possession the law of marriage conferred on McFarland.

If anything further is needed to make the refutation of that charge clear, I will give it by illustration. Suppose that a pagan should be converted to Christianity through the efforts of some Christian minister, and that the remaining pagans should *kill* that minister for what he had done, would the crime be chargeable upon the Christian religion? Will any of you make that assertion? If not, neither can you charge that the death of Richardson should be charged to Free Love. But a more *recent* case is a still *clearer* proof of the correctness of my position. Mrs. Fair killed Crittenden. Why? Because she believed in the spirit of the marriage law; that she had a *better right* to him than had Mrs. Crittenden, to whom the law had granted him; and rather than to give him up to her, to whom he evidently desired to go, and where, following his right to freedom, he *did* go, she killed him. Could a more *perfect* case of the *spirit* of the marriage law be formulated? Most assuredly, no!

Now, from the standpoint of marriage, reverse this case to that of Free Love, and see what would have been the result had all those parties been believers in and practicers of that theory. When Mr. Crittenden evinced a desire to return to Mrs. Crittenden, Mrs. Fair, in practicing the doctrine of Free Love, would have said, "I have no right to you, other than you freely give; you loved me and exercised your right of freedom in so doing. You now desire to return to Mrs. Crittenden, which is equally your right, and which I must respect. Go, and in peace, and my blessing shall follow, and if it can return you to happiness, then will you be happy."

Would not *that* have been the *better*, the *Christian* course, and would not every soul in the broad land capable of a noble impulse, and having knowledge of all the relevant facts, have *honored* Mrs. Fair for it? Instead of a murder, with the probability of another to complement it, would not *all* parties have been *happy* in having done right? Would not Mrs. Crittenden have even *loved* Mrs. Fair for such an example of nobility, and could she not *safely* have received her even into her own heart and home, and have been a *sister* to her, instead of the means of her conviction of murder?

I tell you, my friends and my foes, that you have taken hold of the *wrong* end of this business. You are shouldering upon Free Love the results that flow from precisely its antithesis, which is the spirit, if

not the letter, of your marriage theory, which is slavery, and not freedom.

I have a better right to speak, as one having authority in this matter, than most of you have, since it has been my province to study it in all its various lights and shades. When I practiced clairvoyance, *hundreds*, aye thousands, of desolate, heart-broken men, as well as women, came to me for advice. And they were from all walks of life, from the humblest daily laborer to the haughtiest dame of wealth. The tales of horror, of wrongs inflicted and endured, which were poured into my ears, first awakened me to a realization of the hollowness and the rottenness of society, and compelled me to consider whether laws which were prolific of so *much* crime and misery as I found to exist should be continued; and to ask the question whether it were not *better* to let the bond go free. In time I was fully convinced that marriage laws were productive of precisely the *reverse* of that for which they are supposed to have been framed, and I came to recommend the grant of entire freedom to those who were complained of as inconstant; and the frank asking for it by those who desired it. My *invariable* advice was: "Withdraw lovingly, but completely, all claim and all complaint as an injured and deserted husband or wife. You need not perhaps disguise the fact that you suffer keenly from it, but take on yourself all the fault that you have not been able to command a more continuous love; that you have not proved to be *all* that you once seemed to be. Show magnanimity, and in order to *show* it, try to *feel* it. Cultivate that kind of love which loves the happiness and well-being of your partner *most*, his or her person next, and yourself last. Be kind to, and sympathize with, the new attraction rather than waspish and indignant. Know for a certainty that love *cannot* be clutched or gained by being *fought* for; while it is not *impossible* that it may be won back by the nobility of one's own deportment. If it cannot be, then it is gone forever, and you must make the best of it and reconcile yourself to it, and do the next best thing—you may perhaps continue to *hold on* to a slave, but you have *lost* a lover."

Some may indeed think if I can keep the *semblance* of a husband or wife, even if it be not a lover, *better still* that it be so. Such is not my philosophy or my faith, and for such I have no advice to give. I address myself to such as have *souls*, and whose souls are in question; if you belong to the other sort, take advice of a Tombs lawyer and not of me. I have seen a *few* instances of the most magnanimous action among the persons involved in a knot of love, and with the most angelic results. I believe that the love which goes forth to bless, and if it be to *surrender* in order to bless, is love in the *true* sense, and that it tends greatly to beget love, and that the love which is demanding, thinking only of self, is not love.

I have learned that the first *great* error most married people commit is in endeavoring to *hide* from each other the little irregularities into which all are liable to fall. *Nothing* is so conducive to continuous happiness as mutual confidence. In *whom*, if not in the husband or the wife, should one confide? Should they not be each other's *best* friends, *never* failing in time of anxiety, trouble and temptation to give disinterested and unselfish counsel? From such a perfect confidence as I would have men and women cultivate, it is *impossible* that bad or wrong should flow. On the contrary, it is the *only* condition in which love and happiness can go hand in hand. It is the *only* practice that can insure continuous respect, without which love withers and dies out. Can you not see that in mutual confidence and freedom the very *strongest* bonds of love are forged? It is more blessed to grant favors than to demand them, and the blessing is large and prolific of happiness, or small and insignificant in results, just in proportion as the favor granted is large or small. Tried by this rule, the greater the *blessing* or happiness you can confer on your partners, in which your own selfish feelings are not consulted, the greater the satisfaction that will redound to yourself. Think of this mode of adjusting your difficulties, and see what a clear way opens before you. There are none who have once felt the influence of a high order of love, so *callous*, but that they *intuitively* recognize the true grandeur and nobility of such a line of conduct. It must always be remembered that you can never do *right* until you are first free to do *wrong*; since the doing of a thing under *compulsion* is evidence *neither* of good nor bad intent; and if under compulsion, who shall decide what would be the substituted rule of action under full freedom?

In freedom *alone* is there safety and happiness, and when people



learn this great fact, they will have just begun to know how to live. Instead then of being the destroying angel of the household, I would become the angel of purification to purge out all insincerity, all deception, all baseness and all vice, and to replace them by honor, confidence and truth.

I know very well that much of the *material* upon which the work must begin is very bad and far gone in decay. But I would have everybody perfectly free to do either right or wrong, according to the highest standard, and if there are those so unfortunate as not to know how to do that which can alone bring happiness, I would treat them as we treat those who are intellectually without culture—who are ignorant and illiterate. There are none so ignorant but they may be taught. So, too, are there none so unfortunate in their understanding of the true and high relation of the sexes as not to be amenable to the right kind of instruction. First of all, however, the would-be-teachers of humanity must become truly Christian, meek and lowly in spirit, forgiving and kind in action, and ever ready to do as did Christ to the Magdalen. We are not so greatly different from what the accusing multitude were in that time. But Christians, forgetting the teaching of Christ, condemn and say, "Go on in your sin." Christians must learn to claim *nothing* for themselves that they are unwilling to accord others. They must remember that *all* people endeavor, so far as lies in their power, and so far as it is possible for them to judge, to exercise their human right, or determine what their action shall be, that will bring them most happiness; and instead of being *condemned* and *cast out* of society therefor, they should be *protected* therein, so long as others' rights are not infringed upon. We think they do not do the *best* thing; it is our duty to endeavor to *show* them the better and the higher, and to induce them to walk therein. But because a person chooses to perform an act that *we* think a *bad* one, we have no right to put the brand of excommunication upon him. It is our Christian and brotherly duty to persuade him instead that it is more to his good to do something better next time, at the same time, however, assuring him he only did what he had a right to do.

If our sisters who inhabit Greene street and other filthy localities choose to remain in debauch, and if our brothers choose to visit them there, they are only exercising the *same* right that we exercise in remaining away, and we have no *more* right to abuse and condemn them for exercising their rights that way, than they have to abuse and condemn us for exercising our rights our way. But we have a *duty*, and that is by our love, kindness and sympathy to endeavor to prevail upon them to desert those ways which we feel are so damaging to all that is high and pure and true in the relations of the sexes.

If these are the *stray sheep* from the fold of truth and purity, should we not go out and gather them in, rather than remain within the fold and hold the door shut, lest they should enter in and defile the fold? Nay, my friends, we have only an assumed right to thus sit in judgment over our unfortunate sisters, which is the same right of which men have made use to prevent women from participation in government.

The sin of all time has been the exercise of assumed powers. This is the essence of tyranny. Liberty is a great lesson to learn. It is a great step to vindicate our own freedom. It is more, far more, to learn to leave others free, and free to do just what we perhaps may deem wholly wrong. We must recognize that others have consciences and judgment and rights as well as we, and religiously abstain from the effort to make them better by the use of any means to which we have no right to resort, and to which we cannot resort without abridging the great doctrine, the charter of all our liberties, the doctrine of Human Rights.

But the public press, either in real or affected ignorance of what they speak, denounce Free Love as the justification of, and apologist for, all manner and kind of sexual debauchery, and thus, instead of being the *teachers* of the people, as they *should* be, are the power which inculcates falsehood and wrong. The teachings of Christ, whom so many now profess to imitate, were *direct* and simple upon this point. He was not too good to acknowledge all men as brothers and all women as sisters; it mattered not whether they were highly advanced in knowledge and morals, or if they were of low intellectual and moral culture.

It is seriously to be doubted if any of Christ's disciples, or men

equally as good as were they, could gain fellowship in *any* of your Fifth avenue church palaces, since they were nothing more than the *humblest* of fishermen, of no social or mental standing. Nevertheless, they were *quite* good enough for Christ to associate with, and fit to be appointed by Him to be "fishers of men." The Church seems to have forgotten that good *does* sometimes come out of the Nazareths of the world, and that wisdom *may* fall from the mouths of "babes and sucklings." Quite *too much* of the old pharisaical spirit exists in society to-day to warrant its members' claims, that they are the representatives and followers of Christ. For they are the I-am-holier-than-thou kind of people, who affect to, and to a great extent do, prescribe the standards of public opinion, and who ostracise *everybody* who will not bow to their mandates.

Talk of Freedom, of equality, of justice! I tell you there is scarcely a *thought* put in practice that is *worthy* to be the offspring of those noble words. The *veriest systems of despotism* still reign in *all* matters pertaining to social life. Caste stands as boldly out in this country as it does in political life in the kingdoms of Europe.

It is true that we are obliged to accept the situation *just as it is*. If we accord freedom to all persons we must expect them to make their own best use thereof, and, as I have already said, must protect them in such use until they learn to put it to better uses. But in our predication we must be consistent, and now ask who among you would be *worse* men and women were *all* social laws repealed?

Would you *necessarily* dissolve your present relations, *desert* your dependent husbands—for there are even some of them—and wives and children simply because you have the *right* so to do? You are all trying to deceive yourselves about this matter. Let me ask of husbands if they think there would be fifty thousand women of the town supported by them if their wives were ambitious to have an *equal* number of men of the town to support, and for the same purposes? I tell you, nay! It is because men are held *innocent* of this support, and all the vengeance is visited upon the *victims*, that they have come to have an immunity in their practices.

Until women come to hold men to equal account as they do the women with whom they consort; or until they regard these women as just as respectable as the men who support them, society will remain in its present scale of moral excellence. A man who is well known to have been the constant visitor to these women is accepted into society, and if he be *rich* is eagerly *sought* both by mothers having marriageable daughters and by the daughters themselves. But the women with whom they have consorted are *too vile* to be even acknowledged as worthy of Christian burial, to say nothing of common Christian treatment. I have heard women reply when this difficulty was pressed upon them, "We cannot ostracise *men* as we are compelled to *women*, since we are *dependent* on them for *support*." Ah! here's the rub. But do you not see that these *other* sisters are *also* dependent upon men for *their* support, and *mainly* so because you render it next to impossible for them to follow any *legitimate* means of livelihood? And are only those who have been fortunate enough to secure *legal* support entitled to live?

When I hear *that* argument advanced, my heart sinks within me at the degraded condition of my sisters. They submit to a degradation simply because they *see no alternative* except self-support, and they see no means for that. To put on the semblance of holiness they cry out against those who, for like reasons, submit to like degradation; the only difference between the two being in a licensed ceremony, and a slip of printed paper costing twenty-five cents and upward.

The good women of one of the interior cities of New York some two years since organized a movement to put down prostitution. They were, by stratagem, to find out who visited houses of prostitution, and then were to ostracise them. They pushed the matter until they found their own husbands, brothers and sons involved, and then suddenly desisted, and nothing has since been heard of the eradication of prostitution in that city. If the same experiment were to be tried in New York the result would be the same. The supporters of prostitution would be found to be those whom women cannot ostracise. The same disability excuses the presence of women in the very home, and I need not tell you that Mormonism is practiced in *other* places beside Utah. But what is the logic of these things? Why, simply this: A woman, be she wife or mistress, who



consorts with a man who consorts with *other* women, is equally, with *them and him*, morally responsible, since the receiver is held to be as culpable as the thief.

The false and hollow relations of the sexes are thus resolved into the mere question of the *dependence* of women upon men for support, and women, whether married or single, are supported *by* men because they *are* women and their opposites in sex. I can see no moral difference between a woman who marries and lives with a man because he can provide for her wants, and the woman who is *not* married, but who is provided for at the same price. There is a *legal* difference, to be sure, upon one side of which is set the seal of respectability, but there is no virtue in law. In the *fact* of law, however, is the evidence of the lack of virtue, since if the law be *required* to enforce virtue, its real presence is wanting; and women need to comprehend this truth.

The sexual relation, must be rescued from this *insidious* form of slavery. Women must rise from their position as *ministers* to the passions of men to be their equals. Their entire system of education must be changed. They must be trained to be *like* men, permanent and independent individualities, and not their mere appendages or adjuncts, with them forming but one member of society. They must be the companions of men from *choice*, never from necessity.

It is a libel upon nature and God to say this world is not calculated to make women, equally with men, self-reliant and self-supporting individuals. In present customs, however, this is apparently impossible. There must come a change, and one of the direct steps to it will be found in the newly claimed political equality of women with men. This attained, one degree of subjugation will be removed. Next will come, following equality of right, equality of duty, which includes the duty of self-hood, or independence as an individual. Nature is male and female throughout, and each sex is equally dependent upon nature for sustenance. It is an infamous thing to say a condition of society which requires women to enter into and maintain sexual relations with men is their legitimate method of protecting life. Sexual relations should be the result of entirely different motives than for the purpose of physical support. The *spirit* of the present theory is, that they are entered upon and maintained as a *means* of physical gratification, regardless of the consequences which may result therefrom, and are administered by the dictum of the husband, which is often in direct opposition to the will and wish of the wife. She has *no* control over her own person, having been taught to "submit herself to her husband."

I protest against this form of slavery, I *protest* against the custom which compels women to give the control of their maternal functions over to anybody. It should be *theirs* to determine *when*, and under what circumstances, the greatest of all constructive processes—the formation of an immortal soul—should be begun. It is a *fearful* responsibility with which women are intrusted by nature, and the very *last* thing that they should be compelled to do is to *perform* the office of that responsibility against their will, under improper conditions or by disgusting means.

What can be more terrible than for a delicate, sensitively organized woman to be compelled to endure the presence of a beast in the shape of a man, who knows nothing beyond the blind passion with which he is filled, and to which is often added the delirium of intoxication? You do not need to be informed that there are many persons who, during the acquaintance preceding marriage, preserve a delicacy, tenderness and regard for womanly sensitiveness and modest refinement which are characteristic of true women, thus winning and drawing out their love-nature to the extreme, but who, when the decree has been pronounced which makes them indissolubly theirs, cast all these aside and reveal themselves in their *true* character, as without regard, human or divine, for aught save their own desires. I know I speak the truth, and you too know I speak the truth, when I say that thousands of the most noble, loving-natured women by whom the world was ever blessed, prepared for, and desirous of pouring their whole life into the bond of union, prophesied by marriage, have had all these generous and warm impulses thrust back upon them by the rude monster into which the previous gentleman developed. To these natures thus frosted and stultified in their fresh youth and vigor, life becomes a burden almost too terrible to be borne, and thousands of pallid cheeks, sunken eyes, distorted imaginations and diseased functions testify too directly and truly to leave a shade of doubt as to

their real cause. Yet women, in the first instance, and men through them as their mothers, with an ignorant persistence worthy only of the most savage despotism, seem determined that it shall not be investigated; and so upon this voluntary ignorance and willful persistence society builds. It is *high* time, however, that they should be investigated, *high* time that your sisters and daughters should no longer be led to the *altar* like sheep to the shambles, in ignorance of the uncertainties they must inevitably encounter. For it is no slight thing to hazard a life's happiness upon a single act.

I deem it a false and perverse modesty that shuts off discussion, and consequently knowledge, upon *these* subjects. They are *vital*, and I never performed a duty which I felt *more* called upon to perform than I *now* do in denouncing as *barbarous* the ignorance which is allowed to prevail among young women about to enter those relations which, under present customs, as often bring a life-long *misery* as happiness.

Mistakes made in this most important duty of life can never be rectified; a commentary upon the system which of itself is sufficient in the sight of common sense to forever condemn it. In marriage, however, common sense is *dispensed* with, and a *usage* substituted therefor which barbarism has bequeathed us, and which becomes *more* barbarous as the spiritual natures of women gain the ascendancy over the mere material. The former slaves, before realizing that freedom was their God-appointed right, did not feel the *horrors* of their condition. But when, here and there, some among them began to have an *interior* knowledge that they were held in obedience by an *unrighteous* power, they then began to *rebel* in their souls. So, too, is it with women. So long as they knew nothing beyond a blind and servile obedience and perfect self-abnegation to the will and wish of men, they did not rebel; but the time *has* arrived wherein, here and there, a soul is awakened by some terrible ordeal, or some divine inspiration, to the fact that women as much as men are *personalities*, *responsible* to themselves for the use which they permit to be made of themselves, and they rebel demanding freedom, freedom to hold their own lives and bodies from the demoralizing influence of sexual relations that are not founded in and maintained by love. And this rebellion will continue, too, until love, unshackled, shall be free to go to bless the object that can call it forth, and until, when called forth, it shall be respected as holy, pure and true. Every day *farther* and wider does it spread, and *bolder* does it speak. None *too soon* will the yoke fall by which the *unwilling* are made to render a hypocritical obedience to the despotism of public opinion, which, distorted and blinded by a sham sentimentality, is a false standard of morals and virtue, and which is utterly destructive to true morality and to real virtue, which can only be fostered and cultivated by freedom of the affections.

Free Love, then, is the law by which men and women of *all* grades and kinds are attracted to or repelled from each other, and does not describe the results accomplished by either; these results depend upon the condition and development of the individual subjects. It is the *natural* operation of the *affectional* motives of the sexes, unbiased by *any* enacted law or *standard* of public opinion. It is the opportunity which gives the opposites in sex the conditions in which the law of chemical affinities raised into the domain of the affections can have unrestricted sway, as it has in *all* departments of nature *except* in enforced sexual relations among men and women.

It is an impossibility to compel incompatible elements of *matter* to unite. So also is it impossible to compel incompatible elements of *human* nature to unite. The sphere of chemical science is to bring together such elements as will produce harmonious compounds. The sphere of social science is to accomplish the same thing in humanity. Anything that stands in the way of this accomplishment in either department is an *obstruction* to the natural order of the universe. There would be just as much common sense for the chemist to write a law *commanding* that two incompatible elements should unite, or that two, once united, should so remain, even if a third, having a stronger affinity for one of them than they have for each other, should be introduced, as it is for chemists of society to attempt to do the same by individuals; for both are impossible. If in chemistry two properties are united by which the environment is not profited, it is the same law of affinity which operates as where a compound is made that is of the greatest service to society. This law holds in social chemistry; the results obtained from social compounds will be just such as their respective properties determine.

Thus I might go on almost infinitely to illustrate the difference which *must* be recognized between the operations of a law and the *law*.



*itself.* Now the whole difficulty in marriage law is that it endeavors to *compel* unity between elements in which it is impossible; consequently there is an attempt made to subvert not only the general order of the universe, but also the special intentions of nature, which are those of God. The results, then, flowing from operations of the law of Free Love will be *high, pure and lasting*, or *low, debauched and promiscuous*, just in the degree that those loving, are high or low in the scale of sexual progress; while each and all are strictly natural, and therefore legitimate in their respective spheres.

Promiscuity in sexuality is simply the *anarchical stage of development* wherein the passions rule supreme. When spirituality comes in and rescues the real man or woman from the domain of the purely material, promiscuity is simply impossible. As promiscuity is the analogue to anarchy, so is spirituality to scientific selection and adjustment. Therefore I am fully persuaded that the very highest sexual unions are those that are monogamic, and that these are perfect in proportion as they are lasting. Now if to this be added the fact that the highest kind of love is that which is utterly freed from and devoid of selfishness, and whose highest gratification comes from rendering its object the greatest amount of happiness, let that happiness depend upon whatever it may, then you have my ideal of the highest order of love and the most perfect degree of order to which humanity can attain. An affection that does not desire to bless its object, instead of appropriating it by a selfish possession to its own uses, is not worthy the name of love. Love is that which exists to *do good*, not merely to *get good*, which is constantly giving instead of desiring.

A Cæsar is admired by humanity, but a Christ is revered. Those persons who have lived and sacrificed themselves most for the good of humanity, without thought of recompense, are held in greatest respect. Christians believe that Christ died to save the world, giving His life as a ransom therefor. That was the greatest gift He could make to show His love for mankind.

The generalist of love to-day is entirely different from that which Christ gave. That is now deemed the greatest love which has the strongest and most uncontrollable wish to be made happy, by the appropriation, and if need be the sacrifice, of all the preferences of its object. It says: "Be mine. Whatever may be your wish, yield it up to me." How different would the world be were this sort of selfishness supplanted by the Christ love, which says: Let this cup pass from me. Nevertheless, not my will but thine be done. Were the relations of the sexes thus regulated, misery, crime and vice would be banished, and the pale, wan face of female humanity replaced by one glowing with radiant delight and healthful bloom, and the heart of humanity beat with a heightened vigor and renewed strength, and its intellect cleared of all shadows, sorrows and blights. Contemplate this, and then denounce me for advocating Freedom if you can, and I will bear your curse with a better resignation.

Oh! my brothers and sisters, let me entreat you to have more faith in the self-regulating efficacy of freedom. Do you not see how beautifully it works among us in other respects? In America everybody is free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or even not to worship anything, notwithstanding you or I may think that very wicked or wrong. The respect for freedom we make paramount over our individual opinions, and the result is peace and harmony, when the people of other countries are still throting and destroying each other to enforce their individual opinions on others. Free Love is only the appreciation of this beautiful principle of freedom. One step further I entreat you to trust it still, and though you may see a thousand dangers, I see peace and happiness and steady improvement as the result.

To more specifically define Free Love I would say that I prefer to use the word *love* with *lust* as its antithesis, *love* representing the spiritual and *lust* the animal; the perfect and harmonious interrelations of the two being the perfected human. This use has its justification in other pairs of words; as good and evil; heat and cold; light and dark; up and down; north and south; which in *principle* are the same, but in *practice* we are obliged to judge of them as *relatively* different. The point from which judgment is made is that which we occupy, or are related to, individually, at any given time. Thus what would be up to one person might be down to another differently situated, along the line which up and down describe. So

also is it of good and evil. What is good to one low down the ladder may not only be, but actually is, evil to one further ascended; nevertheless it is the same ladder up which both climb. It is the comprehension of this scientific fact that guarantees the *best* religion. And it is the *non-comprehension* of it that sets us as judges of our brothers and sisters, who are below us in the scale of development, to whom we should reach down the kind and loving hand of assistance, rather than force them to retreat farther away from us by unkindness, denunciation and hate.

In fine, and to resume: We have found that humanity is composed of men and women of all grades of development, from the most hideous human monster up to the highest perfected saint: that all of them, under our theory of government, are entitled to worship God after the dictates of their several consciences; that God is worshiped just as essentially in political and social thought and action as He is in religious thought and action; that no second person or persons have any right to interfere with the action of the individual unless he interfere with others' rights, and then only to protect such rights; that the thoughts and actions of all individuals, whether high and pure, or low and debauched, are equally entitled to the protection of the laws, and, through them, to that of all members of the community. Religious thought and action already receive the equal protection of the laws. Political thought and action are about to secure the equal protection of the laws. What social thought and action demand of the laws and their administrators is the same protection which Religion has, and Politics is about to have.

I know full well how strong is the appeal that can be made in behalf of marriage, an appeal based on the sanctions of usage and inherited respect, and on the sanctions of religion reinforced by the sanctions of law. I know how much can be said, and how forcibly it can be said, on the ground that women, and especially that the children born of the union of the sexes, must be protected, and must, therefore, have the solemn contract of the husband and father to that effect. I know how long and how powerfully the ideality and sentiment of mankind have clustered, as it were in a halo, around this time-honored institution of marriage. And yet I solemnly believe that *all that* belongs to a dispensation of force and contract, and of a low and unworthy sense of mutual ownership, which is passing, and which is destined rapidly to pass, completely away; not to leave us without love, nor without the happiness and beauty of the most tender relation of human souls; nor without security for woman, and ample protection for children; but to lift us to a higher level in the enjoyment of every blessing. I believe in *love with liberty*; in *protection without slavery*; in *the care and culture of offspring by new and better methods*, and *without the tragedy of self-immolation on the part of parents*. I believe in the family, *spiritually constituted*, expanded, amplified, and scientifically and artistically organized, as a unitary home. I believe in the most wonderful transformation of human society as about to come, as even now at the very door, through general progress, science and the influential intervention of the spirit world. I believe in more than all that the millennium has ever signified to the most religious mind; and I believe that in order to prepare minds to contemplate and desire and enact the new and better life, it is necessary that the old and still prevalent superstitious veneration for the legal marriage tie be relaxed and weakened; not to pander to immorality, but as introductory to a nobler manhood and a more glorified womanhood; as, indeed, the veritable gateway to a paradise regained.

Do not criticise me, therefore, from a commonplace point of view. Question me, first, of the grounds of my faith. Conceive, if you can, the outlook for that humanity which comes trooping through the long, bright vista of futurity, as seen by the eyes of a devout spiritualist and a transcendental socialist. My whole nature is prophetic. I do not and cannot live merely in the present. Credit, first, the burden of my prophecy; and from the new standing-ground so projected forth into the future, look back upon our times, and so judge of my doctrine; and if, still, you cannot concede either the premises or the conclusion, you may, perhaps, think more kindly of me personally, as an amiable enthusiast, than if you deemed me deliberately wicked in seeking to disturb the foundations of our existing social order.

I prize dearly the good opinion of my fellow-beings. I would, so *gladly*, have you think well of me, and not ill. It is because I love



you all, and love your well-being still more than I love you, that I tell you my vision of the future, and that I would willingly disturb your confidence, so long cherished, in the old dead or dying-out past. Believe me honest, my dear friends, and so forgive and think of me lovingly in turn, even if you are compelled still to regard me as deceived. I repeat that I love you all; that I love every human creature and their well being; and that I believe, with the profoundest conviction, that what I have urged in this discourse is conducive to that end.

Thus have I explained to you what Social Freedom or, as some choose to denominate it, Free Love, is, and what its advocates demand. Society says, to grant it is to precipitate itself into anarchy. I oppose to this arbitrary assumption the logic of general freedom, and aver that order and harmony will be secured where anarchy now reigns. The order of nature will soon determine whether society is or I am right. Let that be as it may, I repeat: "The love that I cannot command is not mine; let me not disturb myself about it, nor attempt to filch it from its rightful owner. A heart that I supposed mine has drifted and gone. Shall I go in pursuit? Shall I forcibly capture the truant and transfix it with the barb of my selfish affection, and pin it to the wall of my chamber? Rather let me leave my doors and windows open, intent only on living so nobly that the best cannot fail to be drawn to me by an irresistible attraction."

JOSIAH WARREN'S MISTAKE.

Many of us have thought, for over twenty years, that friend Warren was running Individualism into the ground. We were only surprised that he lately gave in his adhesion to the International of Philadelphia, and now we are not surprised that he recants that act. He makes the mistake of supposing that it is against Individualism to work with others. But I doubt that he is as Individual as I, for I differ from all the Doctors, all the Scientists, supersede Universal Gravitation, have no Religion, no Conscience, believe in no Duty, but only in nature and pleasure, know there is no God nor Immortality, am satisfied and glad to go out, and can not love any one (much) who is not, thus all my life departing from, departed from,

Lone and lonely, all alone,

even till I have to pray, Let me go to the Future, Oh! let me go home: they will greet me there as their own, and I shall then be with the many and the strong!—and yet I am a Communist, an Absolute Communist, and know that Josiah Warren can never begin to be so Individual, standing alone, as he could and would be if he were member of a Community, for then, what every other one owned would be his, to enjoy, to use, to be greated and Individualized by—the same piano which no man could purchase alone, would serve and satisfy twenty, as if each owned it exclusively. But even if friend Warren could own all things, standing apart, yet being himself in solitude, with nobody to act upon him, would be no Individualism at all, compared with being himself in Community, with everybody to act upon him—which is like a flash of lightning! I am a Communist to achieve that intense Individualism. J. T.

[From New York Sun.]

WANTED, A REAL CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

The threatened decay of the Young Men's Christian Association, as at present organized, may be traced, without any difficulty or doubt, to its cause, and fortunately that cause is no plainer than the remedy to be applied.

The association is declining because in some important matters it has not been true to its name. It has not in all things been a Christian association. It is no office of Christianity to gloze over the errors, nor to say crimes, of public officers, or to do honor to public plunderers.

When the Young Men's Christian Association after the virtual conviction of Schuyler Colfax of malfeasance in office, and of trying to conceal his fault by false swearing, undertook to sustain him, it played a part which did him little if any good, but which has proved well nigh fatal to its own existence. Any religious organization which so far mistakes its mission as to become the ally of corruption is doomed to perish.

The remedy is obvious. We must have a Christian Association true to its name; not a respecter of persons, but welded together in a conscientious, stanch, active, practical faith in Christian principles. It is an enterprise worthy of the best efforts of the best young men of the day. Who will undertake it? The organization should be begun at once.

We consider that the existing association was in its day very useful. Perhaps no society was ever more useful. It has done good in a variety of ways. We should be sorry to see it dwindle into nothingness without some substitute to undertake the good work for which it has in part incapacitated itself. The public confidence which has been withdrawn, in a measure, from the present association would be generously extended to a new one which should steer clear of party politics.

Let us, then, have a real Young Men's Christian Association. The field for its labors is vast, and its influence would be altogether beneficent. The old one accomplished enough good to show what can be done.

"WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?"

Now ready, E. Anne Hinman's lecture with above title, given from the residence of Mr. G. N. Wilcox, Madison, Conn., June 8, on the occasion of the public halls being closed against her.

Orders can be addressed to the author, West Winsted, Conn., P. O. Box 323, or to G. N. Wilcox, Madison, Conn. Price: Single copies, 10 cents, and one cent stamp to pre-pay postage. Discount made to those purchasing by the dozen.

[This was the lecture at which it had been threatened

that she would be treated to rotten eggs if she should attempt to deliver it.]

Beecher not afraid of Ben. Butler any more than he is of the devil or Victoria Woodhull. He is credited with advising Massachusetts to "spew Ben. up." The funny man of the New York Commercial, rather goes back on his friend "Captain Tricky," by broadly hinting, "it's just what the old Bay State can't do."—Express.

SILVER LAKE GROVE MEETING.

The fourth annual camp meeting of the Spiritualists of Massachusetts will be held at Silver Lake Grove, Plympton, on the old Colony railroad, commencing Tuesday, August 5, and closing on Sunday, August 17.

The managers will spare no effort to secure every convenience for the comfort and enjoyment of all who may visit the Grove. As far as practicable, those intending to camp should furnish their blankets and camp equipments. Tents and lodgings may be obtained by applying by letter to Dr. A. H. Richardson, Charleston, Mass.

Friday, the 8th, and Wednesday and Friday, the 13th and 15th, will be special picnic days. Speaking, dancing, boating, fishing, etc., will be in order. A small admission fee will be required of all persons visiting the Grove except those coming by railroad. Dancing free. All liberals, under whatever name, are cordially invited to unite with us on this occasion.

On Sunday, August 10, the exercises will consist of a lecture, at 10:30 o'clock, by the able and eloquent inspirational speaker,

MISS JENNIE LEYS.

In the afternoon, at two o'clock, Prof. Wm. Denton will lecture, after which a grand sacred concert, by a full band of twenty-five pieces, will conclude the exercises. The musical department during the entire camp meeting will be under the direction of Mr. J. Howard Richardson.

On Sunday, August 17,

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL

will be present and take part in the exercises.

The regular trains leave Boston daily, except Sundays, for the Grove at 8 A. M., and 2:30 and 5 o'clock P. M., stopping at stations below Wollaston.

From all stations on the Old Colony Railroad and its branches, including South Shore and Duxbury, Cape Cod, Fall River, Somerset and Dighton, Bridgewater and South Abington, all the regular trains will take passengers to and from the Grove at greatly reduced rates of fare for the round trip. Excursion tickets, good from August 4 to 18 inclusive, may be obtained at all the stations.

On Wednesday, August 6, a special train will leave the Old Colony Depot, Boston, at 12 o'clock, to accommodate all that desire to join the camp who cannot reach the city in time for the early train.

On special picnic days, August 8, 13 and 15, a special train will leave Boston for the Grove, stopping at all way stations, at 8:45 and 12 o'clock precisely. On Sunday, August 10, special trains will leave for the Camp Ground, stopping at all way stations as follows: Boston at 9 and 12 o'clock, Fall River via Old Road to South Braintree at 7:40 o'clock, Somerset 8 o'clock, Plymouth 9:30 o'clock, Duxbury and South Shore 7:45 o'clock.

Fare from Boston and return, \$1; Fall River, \$1.50; Dighton, \$1.30; Plymouth, 40 cents, and way stations in proportion. On Sundays, special trains will leave the Grove for Fall River, Taunton and Somerset, at 4:40 o'clock. For Boston and way stations at 5 o'clock.

We hope to meet all friends of Human Progress at these meetings.

DR. A. H. RICHARDSON, Managers.

H. F. GARDNER,

BOSTON, July 12, 1873.

SPIRITUALISTS' GRAND UNION EXCURSION.

From Philadelphia to Atlantic City, Wednesday Morning, 6 A. M., August 27, 1873. Tickets for the Round Trip—Adults, \$1.50; Children 12 Years and Under, 75 Cents.

MRS. WOODHULL:

Dear Friend—We most cordially extend to you an invitation to join us in our Grand Union Excursion. We say "Union," as we hereby extend an invitation to all Spiritualists and friends, not only of Philadelphia, but of Camden, Vineland and other parts of New Jersey; also of Wilmington, Del., and from all parts of Pennsylvania. And we would be most happy to see a good delegation from New York, with yourself as the leader. We shall have a suitable hall at Atlantic City for that day, as headquarters and for speaking. We intend making this the grandest excursion the Spiritualists have ever had; and we most earnestly ask the friends of the cause to lend us a helping hand in disposing of the tickets, and aiding us in every way to make it a success, that we may show to the world that we are strong in numbers as well as in spirit. For any further information, call on or address either of the managers. As this excursion is for the benefit of our society, the friends are requested to buy tickets on that morning from none but Dr. J. H. Rhodes, who will be at Second and Vine streets from 5 to 6 o'clock.

Tickets for sale and distribution by the managers.

H. T. CHILDS, M. D., 634 Race street.

J. H. RHODES, M. D., 918 Spring Garden.

OUR AGE.

A weekly journal, devoted to the interests of Spiritualism in the broad sense of that term; does not admit that there are side issues.

Can there be sides to a perfect circle, or a perfect sphere? A religion which will meet the wants of humanity must be both.

Free press, free speech and has no love to sell.

Repudiates enormous advertising rates and will be uniform therein. Those who can pay for only one or two insertions

shall have them at the same rate as those who can afford to advertise yearly, and should we be prospered till the subscription list reaches 50 or 100,000 names, we shall make no change in charge per line, but shall use agate type instead of nonpareil, thus giving more lines to the inch. All advertisements measured by the space occupied, 10 lines to the inch, nonpareil type being the standard till further announcement.

TERMS.—Ten cents per line for first insertion; six cents a line for all subsequent insertions.

Terms of Subscription.—\$2.50 per year.

Published by

LOIS WAISBROOKER, Editor and Proprietor.

Office: 68 Cherry street, Battle Creek, Mich.

All letters or communications intended for "Todd's Department" should be addressed to Charlotte, Mich.; all others to the Editor at Battle Creek, Mich.

Our Age will be sent to subscribers no longer than pre-paid, and those intending to renew will please do so in time to prevent their names being dropped from the list. Let money be sent by post-office order, if possible, or by check, or registered letter.

LIBERAL INSTITUTE.

CARVERSVILLE, BUCKS CO., PA.

This institute will be opened in September, for persons of both sexes. There will be an educational department, and also a healing department, under the care of competent persons. Address, Wm. R. EVANS.

Public meetings at Liberal Institute, Carversville, Bucks Co. Pa., on Saturday, August 3d, at 10 and 3. Addresses by Caroline H. and John M. Spear and Henry T. Child, M. D.

REFORMATORY LECTURERS.

In view of the determination recently manifested by certain would-be authorities in Spiritualism, and from a sincere desire to promote their expressed purposes, to set up a distinction that will produce a free and a muzzled rostrum; we shall henceforth publish in this list the names and addresses of such speakers, now before the public and hereafter to appear, as will accept no engagement to speak from any committee of arrangement, with any proviso whatever, as to what subject they shall treat, or regarding the manner in which it shall be treated. A reformatory movement, such as Spiritualism really is, cannot afford so soon to adopt the customs of the Church and fall into its dotage. On the contrary, it demands an unflinching advocacy of all subjects upon which the Spirit world inspires their mediums under the absolute freedom of the advocate. To all those speakers who wish to be understood as being something above the muzzled ox which treads out the corn, this column is now open:

- C. Fannie Allyn, Stoneham, Mass.
- J. I. Arnold, Clyde, O.
- Rev. J. O. Barrett, Battle Creek, Mich.
- Mrs. H. F. M. Brown, National City, Cal.
- Annie Denton Cridge, Wellesley, Mass.
- Warren Chase, St. Louis, Mo.
- A. Briggs Davis, Clinton, Mass.
- Mrs. L. E. Drake, Plainwell, Mich.
- Miss Nellie L. Davis, North Billerica, Mass.
- Lizzie Doten, Pavilion, 57 Tremont street, Boston, Mass.
- R. G. Eccles, Andover, Ohio.
- Mrs. Elvira Hull, Vineland, N. J.
- Moses Hull, Vineland, N. J.
- D. W. Hull, Hobart, Ind.
- Charles Holt, Warren, Pa.
- E. Annie Hinman, West Winsted, Ct.
- Anthony Higgins, Jersey City, N. J.
- W. F. Jamieson, 139 Monroe street, Chicago, Ill.
- Miss Jennie Leys, 4 Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass.
- Cephas B. Lynn, Sturgis, Mich.
- Mrs. F. A. Logan, Buffalo, N. Y.
- Anna M. Middlebrook, Bridgeport, Ct.
- J. H. Randall, Clyde, O.
- A. C. Robinson, Lynn, Mass.
- Mrs. J. H. Severance, Milwaukee, Wis.
- Laura Cuppy Smith, No. 1 Atlantic street, Lynn, Mass.
- M. L. Sherman, Adrian, Mich.
- John Brown Smith, 812 N. 10th st, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Mrs. H. F. Stearns, Corry, Pa.
- Dr. H. B. Storer, 137 Harrison avenue, Boston, Mass.
- C. W. Stewart, Janesville, Wis.
- J. H. W. Toohy, Providence, R. I.
- F. L. H. Willis, Willimantic, Ct.
- Lois Waisbrooker, Battle Creek, Mich.
- Prof. E. Whipple, Clyde, Ohio.
- John B. Wolf, 510 Pearl street, N. Y.
- Wm. Rose, M. D., 102 Murison street, Cleveland,
- Dr. Geo. Newcomes, Jackson, Mich.
- Mrs. L. H. Perkins, Kansas City, Mo.
- James Foran, M. D., Waverly, N. Y.
- Mrs. C. M. Stowe, San Jose, Cal.
- Clara A. Field, Newport, Maine.
- Hannah T. Stearns, Trance Speaker, Corry, Penn.
- H. H. Brown, 387 W. Madison street, Chicago, Ill
- J. T. Haughey, Paola, Kansas.
- J. P. Greenleaf, 27 Milford street, Boston, Mass.
- Elvira Wheelock Ruggles, Havana, Ill.

THE ALDERNEY DAIRY.

Country daires in cities are becoming quite the rage. At 113 Nassau street, Mr. J. B. Gibbs, a hotel and restaurant keeper of thirty years' experience, has opened a large and sumptuously appointed "dairy" under the above name. Here those who have never visited the country may find a large farm-house in active operation. Everything that is produced on a farm which enters into the composition of articles of diet is here to be found fresh, pure and rich. Milk, cream, butter, berries, eggs, and every article of diet possible to compound from them are constantly on hand. From 10 A. M. to 4 P. M. these rooms, especially the basement, recently fitted up on account of hot weather, are crowded. The habitues of Nassau street and Park row, famous as the centre of newspaperdom, are continually resorting here to quench their thirst with the cold milk, or to stay their hunger on the delicacies and health-giving dishes. Undoubtedly restaurants of the old sort suffer from the introduction of this new candidate for public favor. At least, if one follow the crowd in that quarter during "lunch time," he will find himself in the Alderney Dairy.



## FLOWERS AND RUSTIC WORK.

Flowers are one of the few things in life that bring us unmixed pleasure. They are the most innocent tribute of courtesy or affection as acceptable in the day of feasting as in the house of mourning. Florists are thus in a sense public benefactors. Hodgson, at No. 403 Fifth avenue, from among the palace takes us away to the sights and odors of the country with his rustic work, his gnarled boughs, and curiously crooked seats, his fragrant flowers and beautifully assorted bouquets.

Of all the ornaments now devised for beautifying gentlemen's grounds, there are none that can surpass rustic work, either in grandeur, beauty, utility or durability. It may be introduced almost anywhere if the surroundings are in the least rural; in many cases it can be placed where nothing else could be, oftentimes converting an eyesore into a place of great beauty, and yet ornamental and useful. As it is, there are few that have either the taste or good judgment for the judicious arrangement of the materials out of which the best rustic is made. To make or design rustic objects, the maker or designer must exercise good judgment as to the best place for his object—whether it is a house, bridge, vase, basket or any of the many objects that may be formed of rustic work—for if the object is in a bad position, be the object ever so good, it loses half the effect, or even becomes an eyesore. There must be something rural in the locality, something in tone with the object. Perfect taste is required for the form of any object, although in anything rustic the form will be much modified; yet there must be an original design to give meaning and grace to the object. In all cases, unless working with straight material, nature must be followed as nearly as possible, avoiding right angles or anything that looks formal; every piece should look as if joined by nature. This not only gives beauty but stability to the work. To all this must be combined the skill of the builder, to give strength, finish and neatness to the whole work. Many people think that as a matter of course carpenters can build rustic, but there are few if any that can give the natural rusticity so necessary to it. It is a trade by itself, and requires men with a natural taste and inventive genius. Some men work at it for years and cannot do it creditably.

There is nothing that may not be made in rustic work, from a dwelling-house to a cage, a bridge to a card basket. Many of the vases are filled with plants and look very handsome, with ivy half hiding the woodwork, and fine flowering plants capping the whole and making it a thing complete in itself. There are also many fine baskets filled. Certainly nothing could be more ornamental or better in a window than one of these. But these things, to be appreciated, must be seen; for large constructions we would advise any one to visit the grounds of Mr. Hoey, at Long Branch, or Peter B. King, Esq., on the Palisades overlooking the Hudson, or General Ward's estate.

## FOR USE IN FAMILIES,

## THE FAMOUS

## HALFORD LEICESTERSHIRE

## Table Sauce,

## THE BEST RELISH

Put up in any part of the world for Family Use.

Can be bought of any First-Class Grocer

A FEARLESS EXPOSITION OF THE SOCIAL DISEASE!

## THE PROHIBITED LECTURE

## ON Woodhull and Beecher, FREE-LOVE!

By SIMON M. LANDIS, M.D., D.D.

## SYNOPSIS OF LECTURE.

1. Introduction. 2. Analyzing Free-Love. 3. Social Love. 4. What will create Thinking Brain. 5. What brutifies mankind. 6. "Free-Love." 7. Free Lust Teachings and Practices. 8. Victoria C. Woodhull's Doctrines. 9. Summing up the Woodhull Doctrine. 10. Henry Ward Beecher's Doctrines. 11. Beecher a sly fellow. 12. Beecher's Teachings productive of lust. 13. Beecher's private acts. 14. Beecher feeds his people on flowers, but denies them the necessities of life. 15. Whoredom or Murder. 16. Beecher's doctrines crucify Christ. 17. Recapitulation.

This is the Lecture that was advertised to be delivered at the Assembly buildings, Philadelphia, Sunday, April 13, 1873, but Mayor Stockley threatened to arrest Dr. Landis should he deliver it.

Published by "THE INDIGNATION LEAGUE." Price 15c. Sold by Agents and Newsdealers. Address Dr. S. M. LANDIS, No. 13 N. Eleventh st., above the Bingham House, Philadelphia, where he cures all diseases of the sexes without drugs.

## WHITE STAR LINE.

For Queenstown and Liverpool, Carrying the UNITED STATES MAIL. New and full-powered steamships. Sailing from New York on Saturday, from Liverpool on Thursday, calling at Cork Harbor each way. Adriatic, Saturday, February 1, 3.00 p. m. Oceanic, Saturday, February 8, at 3.00 p. m. Baltic, Saturday, February 15, at 3.00 p. m. Celtic, Saturday, February 22, at 1.00 p. m. Atlantic, Saturday, March 1, at 3.00 p. m.

From the White Star Dock, PAVONIA FERRY, Jersey City. Passenger accommodations (for all classes) unrivaled combining Safety, Speed, and Comfort.

Saloons, state-rooms, smoking room, and bath rooms in midship section, where least motion is felt. Surgeons and stewardesses accompany these steamers.

Rates—Saloon \$80, gold. (For sailing after 1st of April, \$100 gold.) Steerage, \$30, currency. Those wishing to send for friends from the Old Country can now obtain steerage prepaid certificates, \$30, currency.

Passengers booked to or from all parts of America, Paris, Hamburg, Norway, Sweden, India, Australia, China, &c.

Drafts from £1 upward. For inspection of plans and other information, apply at the Company's offices, No. 10 Broadway, New York. J. H. SPARKS, Agent.

## ONLY DIRECT LINE TO FRANCE. THE GENERAL TRANSATLANTIC COMPANY'S MAIL STEAMSHIPS BETWEEN NEW YORK AND HAVRE, CALLING AT BREST.

The splendid vessels on this favorite route for the Continent will sail from Pier No. 50, North River, as follows:

"Ville de Paris" Surmont, Saturday, January 28. "Washington," Roussan, Saturday, February 8. "St. Laurent," Lemarie, Saturday, February 22. "Peretie," Danre, Saturday, March 8.

Price of passage in gold (including wine) to Brest or Havre:

First Cabin.....\$125 | Second Cabin.....\$75.

## EXCURSION TICKETS AT REDUCED RATES.

These steamers do not carry steerage passengers. American travelers going to or returning from the Continent of Europe, by taking the steamers of this line, avoid both transit by English railway and the discomforts of crossing the Channel, besides saving time and expense.

GEO. MACKENZIE, Agent, No. 58 Broadway.

## The Most Wonderful Discovery of any Age.

## PROF. D. MEEKER'S

## INFALLIBLE CURE FOR THE OPIUM HABIT.

A reliable and painless remedy for the Opium habit. Cures without any inconvenience to or interruption of business. Pamphlets sent free on application.

Address,

DRS. D. & L. MEEKER,

P. O. Drawer 475, La Porte, Ind.

## SAFETY, SPEED AND COMFORT. NORWICH LINE.

For Boston, Worcester, Fitchburg, Groton Junction, Lowell, Lawrence, Nashua, Manchester, Concord, Palmer, Brattleboro, and intersecting points.

The new and staunch steamers CITY OF BOSTON. CITY OF NEW YORK. CITY OF LAWRENCE and CITY OF NORWICH

Will leave New York daily (Sundays excepted) at 4 o'clock p. m., from Pier No. 40, North River, foot of Canal and Wats streets.

For New London and Norwich, their connecting with Express trains for the above points, via Vermont Central, Norwich and Worcester, and Boston, Hartford and Erie Railroads.

For through tickets and rates for freight, apply at the office, Pier 40, North River.

W. F. PARKER, Agent. New York, June 7, 1872.

## SPERMATORRHEA

CURED BY A SPIRIT PRESCRIPTION, AND WARRANTED, FOR \$10.

It is an outside application. No medicine given. Send for free circular to

DR. E. WOODRUFF, Grand Rapids, Mich.

## PROTOZONE.

THE FINEST AND MOST PERFECT BRAIN AND NERVE INVIGORANT IN THE WORLD.

Physicians and others will find it wholly unequalled in all cases of illness arising from excessive or perverted sexism, even when insanity and chronic unrest have resulted. The female illnesses springing from bad magnetism, inducing amative horror and disgust, brain disturbance and exhaustion, vital depletion and suicidal thought, all yield to PROTOZONE, while barrenness, sterility and brain softening are at once relieved.

There is but one place where it is made, viz.,

Protozone Laboratory, 17 CAMPBELL BLOCK, TOLEDO, O.,

and but one agency in America, viz.,

MRS. SARAH P. THOMPSON, 1 Phillips Court, Boston, Mass.

Price (single pound flasks) \$5.00

DISCOUNT BY DOZENS OR GROSS. ADDRESS AS ABOVE.

## PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD—UNITED RAILROADS OF NEW JERSEY DIVISION. Foot of Desbrosses street and foot of Cortlandt street.

Change of hour. Commencing Sunday, Oct. 27, 1872. For West Philadelphia, 8 and 9:30 A. M., 12:30, 4, 5, \*6, \*8:30 P. M., 12 Night.

For Philadelphia via Camden, 7 A. M., 2 P. M.

## THROUGH TRAINS.

9:00 A. M., Great Southern Morning Express, for Baltimore and Washington; for the West, via West Philadelphia, Baltimore, and for the South, via Baltimore, and via Washington, with Drawing Room Car attached.

9:30 A. M., Western Express for West Philadelphia, Pittsburg and the West, with Pullman's Palace Cars, through from New York to Pittsburg, Fort Wayne, and Chicago, Columbus, Cincinnati and Louisville, and with Parlor Cars from New York to Pittsburg.

1:00 P. M., Express for Baltimore and Washington, and for the West, via Baltimore, with Drawing Room Car attached.

\*5:00 P. M., Daily Western Express, for Pittsburg and the West, with Pullman's Palace Car, through from New York to Pittsburg, Indianapolis, Louisville and St. Louis, to Columbus, Cincinnati and Chicago.

\*7:00 P. M., Daily Western Express, for Pittsburg and the West, with Pullman's Palace Cars, for Pittsburg, Cincinnati and Indianapolis.

\*8:30 P. M., Daily Western Express, for West Philadelphia, Pittsburg and the West, with Pullman's Palace Cars, through without change, to Pittsburg, Crestline, Fort Wayne and Chicago.

9:00 P. M., Daily Great Southern Evening Express for Baltimore and Washington, with Reclining Chair Cars, and with Pullman Palace Cars through from New York to Washington.

Tickets for sale at Ticket Offices, foot of Desbrosses and Cortlandt streets, and in Depot, Jersey City; and at New York Transfer Co.'s offices (Dodd's Express), No. 944 Broadway, New York, and No. 1 Court street, Brooklyn. Passengers, by leaving suitable notices at these offices, can have their baggage called for at residence or hotel, and carried through to destination.

Tickets for seats in reclining chair cars and compartment cars for sale at the Desbrosses street office A. J. CASSATT, F. W. JACKSON, Gen'l Manager, Gen'l Supt. \* Daily.

## THE NEW MOLA! Kate Corson's Discovery!

THE LAWS AND PRINCIPLES OF MAGNETISM, CLAIRVOYANCE & MEDIUMISM.

This is unquestionably the most important monograph on Mediumship ever yet published in any country on the globe.

How to obtain the Phenomenon in all its phases—Conglomerate Mediumship.—New and Startling Doctrine of Mixed Identities.—A handbook of White Magic.—Explicit forms for all phases of Cabalistic Incantatory and Thaumaturgic Science and Practice.

Miss K. V. Corson, Edtress and Publisher, Toledo, O.

It is requested that subscriptions for this extraordinary Treatise be in Clubs to one address, rather than by single copies, to save time and trouble in mailing, as they

COST BUT FIFTY CENTS EACH.

## Synopsis:

White Magic an actual fact.—Identification of the returning dead.—Conditions essential to their reappearance. Essentials of Mediumship and Clairvoyance.—Blonde and Brunette Media.—Curious reasons. A vast discovery of inestimable importance.—Conglomerate Circles.—The Yu-Yang.—Psychic Force.—Medial Aura.—Spanning the Gulf of Eternity!—A Spirit.—Electric People.—To get the Phenomena when alone.—Odylic Insulation.—To form a Splendid Circle.—Double Circles and new arrangement of the sitters.—Materialization of Spirits, and how to bring it about!—The Phantom hand of Toledo.—The Spirit-room.—Machinery essential to Physical Manifestations!—An Astonishing Idea: Atrilism!—Mergement of Identities.—A dead one walks, talks, eats, drinks and does what it chooses while occupying another's body, while the latter's soul is quiescent, and consciousness and identity wholly lost! A most momentous problem, of enormous importance to every Physician, Judge, Juror, Minister, Spiritualist, husband, wife, in short to every human being. It is the most astounding thought yet evolved since Spiritualism became a fixed fact, as it accounts for much heretofore wholly unaccountable.

PART II.—How to Mesmerize.—Clairvoyance.—Psychometry, their laws and differences.—The Eastern Mystery of obtaining Seership.—The Mystical Mirror, in a drop of common ink.—To reach Clairvoyance.—The Breath-Power.—An Arab Secret.—Magnetic Spells.—"Voodooism" Black Magic.—Second Youth and how to gain it.

Single Copies, 60 cents.

## Published in Pamphlet Form.

## THE BEECHER-TILTON SCANDAL,

With numerous Extracts from THE PRESS OF THE COUNTRY ON THE Prosecution and Illegal Arrest of the brave defenders of freedom,

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL,

TENNIE CLAFLIN,

AND

COLONEL BLOOD.

Price of pamphlet reduced to \$15 per hundred.

Apply to the Editor or 1 Publisher,

CHARLOTTE BARBER, Toledo, Ohio.

## FREDERICK KURTZ'S

## DINING ROOMS,

23 New St. and 60 Broadway

AND

76 Maiden Lane & 1 Liberty St.

Mr. Kurtz invites to his warm and comfortably furnished dining apartments the down-town public, assuring them that they will always find there the choicest viands, served in the most elegant style, the most carefully-selected brands of wines and liquors, as well as the most prompt attention by accomplished waiters.

NEW YORK CENTRAL AND HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD.—Commencing Monday, June 23, 1873. Through Trains will leave Grand Central Depot—

8:00 A. M., Chicago and Montreal Express, with drawing-room cars through to Rochester and St. Albans.

9:00 A. M., Saratoga Special Express.

10:00 A. M., Special Chicago Express, with drawing-room cars to Rochester, Buffalo, &c.

10:45 A. M., Northern and Western Express.

3:40 P. M., Special Express for Albany, Troy and Saratoga, commencing Saturday, 21st inst.

4:00 P. M., Montreal Express, with sleeping cars from New York to St. Albans.

7:00 P. M., Express, Daily, with sleeping cars for Watertown and Canandaigua.

8:30 P. M., Pacific Express, Daily, with sleeping cars from Rochester, Buffalo and Niagara Falls; also for Chicago, via both L. S. and M. C. Railroads.

11:00 P. M., Express, with sleeping cars for Troy and Albany.

2:00 P. M., Hudson train.

7:00 A. M., and 5:30 P. M., Poughkeepsie trains.

9:10 A. M., 4:15, 6:20 and 7:45 P. M., Peekskill trains.

5:00 P. M., Sing Sing train.

Tarrytown trains from 30th Street Depot, stopping at all Stations, leave at 6:45, 8:25 and 10:20 A. M., 1:00, 3:00, 4:00, 4:40, 5:15, 6:30, 8:00 and 11:30 P. M.

Sunday Way Trains.—For Tarrytown, from 30th street, at 8:25 A. M., and 1:00 P. M.

For Poughkeepsie, from 4th avenue and 42d street Station, 9:10 A. M.

C. H. KENDRICK, General Passenger Agent.

JERRY P. THOMAS' MUSEUM AND ART GALLERY, 1,239 Broadway.

JERRY THOMAS would respectfully inform his friends and the public in general that, having entirely renovated and refitted his Museum and Art Gallery, and made many important additions thereto, will have a

GRAND REOPENING,

WEDNESDAY EVENING, JULY 9, 1873,

on which occasion a full band will discourse enlightening strains, and a fine collation will be spread for the benefit of his patrons. All free.

THURSDAY, July 10, the establishment will be thrown open exclusively for ladies.

## TWENTY YEARS' PRACTICE.

DR. PERKINS

Can be consulted as usual at his office,

No. 9 FIFTH STREET (South Side),

OPPOSITE PUBLIC SQUARE,

KANSAS CITY, MO.,

or by mail, box 1,227, on the various symptoms of Private Diseases. The afflicted will take notice that I am the only man on the American continent that can cure you of Spermatorrhea, Loss of Manhood, etc., caused by self abuse or disease. I challenge the combined medical faculty to refute the above statement by successful competition. The symptoms of disease produced by nightly seminal emissions or by excessive sexual indulgence, or by self abuse are as follows: Loss of memory, sallow countenance, pains in the back, weakness of limbs, chronic costiveness of the bowels, confused vision, blunted intellect, loss of confidence in approaching strangers, great nervousness, fetid breath, consumption, parched tongue, and frequently insanity and death, unless combated by scientific medical aid. Reader, remember Dr. Perkins is the only man that will guarantee to cure you or refund the fee if a cure is not permanently made. Also remember that I am permanently located at No. 9 Fifth street, south, opposite the public square, Kansas City, Mo., and I have the largest medical rooms in the city. Call and see me; a friendly chat costs you nothing, and all is strictly confidential. Post box 1,227.

Dr. PERKINS, Kansas City, Mo.