

THE CIRCULAR.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.]

DEVOTED TO THE SOVEREIGNTY OF JESUS CHRIST.

[EDITED BY J. H. NOYES.]

VOL. I.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., NOVEMBER 30, 1851.

NO. 4.

TERMS AND MEANS.

The Circular may be obtained WITHOUT MONEY, by application through the mail; or at the office of publication, No. 43 Willow Place, Brooklyn.

Those who choose to PAY, may send ONE DOLLAR for a yearly volume.

Price of single copies, when exposed at book-stores, &c., TWO CENTS.

As a FREE press must have other resources than its subscription list, all who are interested in the establishment of such a press, and in the principles of this paper, are invited to co-operate by systematic MONTHLY contributions.

Communications should be addressed to—"THE CIRCULAR, Brooklyn, N. Y."

THE CIRCULAR may be obtained at Adriaance, Sherman & Co's., No. 2, Astor House; and at Fowler & Wells', 129 and 131 Nassau street, N. Y.

The Oneida Association.

The business men at Oneida who sometimes travel about the country, have frequently expressed a wish that we would furnish them with a pamphlet or print of some kind, containing, in the shortest possible compass, all necessary information about the history, principles, and condition of the Oneida Association, which they might present to inquirers, and so save a world of talk. Our own experience of the ludicrous and abusive misrepresentations which abound in the country, and find their way occasionally into the newspapers, (see for example the lucubrations of the Rondout editor in our last two numbers,) gave the more force to this call of the Oneida brethren, and we finally requested them to send us a list of the questions which are most frequently asked by strangers that examine them; promising on our part to answer them if possible in a summary, requiring not more than twenty minutes reading.—They have sent a dozen lists, out of which we have sifted some thirty of the most essential questions, which we will try to answer, doing our best to give the most information in the shortest space; and for this purpose confining our view to the single Association at Oneida, apart from the Community of Associations to which it belongs.

QUESTION 1.—Where is the Association located?

ANSWER.—On the Oneida creek, in the town of Lenox, Madison Co., N. Y., three miles south of Oneida Depot. The post-office address of the Association is Oneida Castle, Oneida Co., N. Y.

Q. 2.—What is the number of members?

A.—About 150; of whom one third are men, one third women, and one third children.

Q. 3.—Do these all live in one house, and eat at one table?

A.—You see in the picture on this page, all the buildings occupied as dwellings by the Association. The main building is sixty feet long, thirty-five feet wide, three stories high, with a habitable garret. The basement is divided into three equal rooms, each thirty-five feet long, (the width of the house,) and twenty feet wide. The first, (in front,) is the dining room, where all eat together. The second is the kitchen. The third, (which runs into the offset on which the house is situated,) is the cellar. Over the dining room is a parlor of the same size, for general gatherings. The rest of the house is divided into sleeping rooms; which, with those in the children's house and out-buildings, accommodate the whole family.

Q. 4.—How long has the Association been organized?

A.—Nearly four years. Many of the first members, however, were emigrants from Putney, Vt., where they had been organized in Association nine years previously.

Q. 5.—What are your principles?

A.—Our fundamental principle is religion.

Q. 6.—What denomination do you belong to?

A.—To none of the popular denominations. We are generally called Perfectionists.

Q. 7.—Who is the founder of your system?



COMMUNITY-HOUSE AT ONEIDA RESERVE.

The above wood-cut, engraved by our young friend, E. H. De Latre, gives a correct view of the main dwelling-house of the Oneida Association, with the children's house in the rear. The cottage on the right was formerly the dwelling of the original proprietor of the farm purchased by the Association. It is now occupied as a store, and place of reception for visitors.

A.—John H. Noyes, a graduate of Dartmouth College, who studied theology under Prof. Stuart of Andover, and Dr. Taylor of New Haven, and in 1834, while a student and licentiate of the Yale Theological Seminary, became a Perfectionist.

Q. 8.—Do you believe in the Bible?

A.—Most heartily, and study it more than all other books. It is in fact our only written creed and constitution.

Q. 9.—Are your views like those of Wesley?

A.—Quite different. He did not believe in the 'New Covenant', which enlists soldiers for life; or in other words, for perpetual holiness. We do.

Q. 10.—Have you any affinity with the Oberlin Perfectionists?

A.—Very little. They follow Wesley.

Q. 11.—What are your most important articles of faith?

A.—We believe, first, that Jesus Christ, the king of the world, came the second time and began to reign, 1800 years ago, i. e. within the lifetime of one generation from the time of his first coming; (according to Matt. 24: 34;) and secondly, that he is in us (as in all true believers) a Savior from all sin. These are the foundations of our whole theological and social system.

Q. 12.—Is your system any thing like that of Fourier?

A.—We have very little acquaintance with Fourier's writings; but find, from what we have seen of them, that we differ widely from him on the most essential points. He relies on attraction, i. e. the love of utilities, economics, luxuries, &c., for the motive power of Association. Our motive power is faith, i. e., attraction towards Christ, and spiritual life. He begins with industrial organization and physical improvements, expecting that a true religion and the true relation of the sexes will be found out three or four hundred years hence. We begin with religion and reconciliation of the sexes, and expect that industrial reform and physical improvement will follow, and that too within less than three or four hundred years. He thinks that the Pentecost principle—community of goods—is 'the grave of liberty'. We think it is the prime element of heavenly freedom.—We expect, however, to learn many things about externals, from Fourier.

Q. 13.—What are your rules and regulations?

A.—The Bible, as I said before, is our only written constitution. We have no systematic code of bye-laws. Or rather, we have no statute book. Unwritten bye-laws are constantly growing in us and among us, by the suggestions of experience. Wisdom, evolved by trials and established by precedents, is the

common law of all countries; and this is our code.

Q. 14.—You must have officers. How do you elect them?

A.—We do not elect them—we find them out. God and education make officers; and in a just society, they are sure to reach their places by a natural process.

Q. 15.—What do you rely upon for the regulation and discipline of members?

A.—On religious influence, free criticism, and education.

Q. 16.—What are your means of religious influence?

A.—We have meetings every evening, and they are generally devoted to religious conversation and reading; though business and other topics are not excluded. Then we have a religious meeting on Sunday, open to the public. The Bible is the daily study of men, women, and children.

Q. 17.—What is your system of Criticism?

A.—We tell each other plainly and kindly our thoughts about each other in various ways. Sometimes the whole Association criticise a member in meeting. Sometimes it is done more privately, by committees, and sometimes by individuals. In some cases, criticism is directed to general character, and in others to special faults and offenses. Generally, criticism is invited by the subject of it, and is regarded as a privilege. It is well understood that the moral health of the Association depends on the freest circulation of this plainness of speech; and all are ambitious to balance accounts in this way as often as possible.

Q. 18.—What are your provisions for education?

A.—We have a daily school for children in which common learning is taught, in connection with the fear of God and the law of love. But it is understood among us that the whole Association is a school; and all members, old and young, are supplied with books, and addict themselves to various branches of learning as they have opportunity.

Q. 19.—Do you hold to Community of property?

A.—The ideas of the Association in regard to the ownership and distribution of property, are stated in our 1st Annual Report as follows: We believe—

1. That all the systems of property-getting in vogue in the world, are forms of what is vulgarly called the 'grab-game,' i. e., the game in which the prizes are not distributed by any rules of wisdom and justice, but are seized by the strongest and craftiest; and that the laws of the world simply give rules, more or less civilized, for the conduct of this game.

2. That the whole system thus defined, is

based on the false assumption that the lands and goods of the world, previously to their possession by man, have no owner, and rightfully become the property of any one who first gets possession; which assumption denies the original title of the Creator, excludes him from his right of distribution, and makes the 'grab-game,' in one form or other, inevitable.

3. That God the Creator has the first and firmest title to all property whatsoever; that he therefore has the right of distribution; that no way of escape from the miseries of the 'grab-game' will ever be found, till his title and right of distribution are practically acknowledged; that in the approaching reign of inspiration, he will assert his ownership, be acknowledged and installed as distributor, and thus the reign of covetousness, competition and violence, will come to an end.

4. That God never so makes over property to man, as to divest himself of his own title; and of course that man can never in reality have absolute and exclusive ownership of lands, goods, or even of himself, or his productions, but only subordinate joint-ownership with God.

5. That in the kingdom of God, every loyal citizen is subordinate joint-owner with God, of all things. Rev. 21: 7.

6. That the right of individual possession of the specific goods of the universe, under this general joint-ownership, is determined by the arbitrament of God through inspiration, direct or indirect.

7. That there is no other right of property beyond these two; viz., the right of general joint-ownership by unity with God; and the right of possession as determined by inspiration.

8. That the right of possession, in the case of articles directly consumed in the use, is necessarily equivalent to exclusive ownership, but in all other cases, is only the right of beneficial use, subject to the principle of rotation, and to the distributive rights of God.

It will be seen from this statement of principles, that the Oneida Association cannot properly be said to stand on any ordinary platform of communism. Their doctrine is that of community, not merely or chiefly with each other, but with God; and for the security of individual rights, they look, not to constitutions or compacts with each other, but to the wisdom and goodness of the Spirit of truth, which is above all. The idea of their system, stated in its simplest form, is, that all believers constitute the family of God; that all valuables, whether persons or things, are family property; and that all the labors of the family, are directed, judged, and rewarded in the distribution of enjoyments, by the Father.

Perhaps the best encomium on these principles may be deduced from the fact that the Association, under the influence of them, has lived in entire harmony in relation to property interests for four years, and has met with no difficulty in respect to the distribution of possessions and privileges.

No accounts are kept between the members and the Association, or between the several members; and there is no more occasion for them than there is between man and wife, or than there was between the several members of the family which gathered around the apostles on the day of Pentecost. The Association believes that in the kingdom of heaven 'every man will be rewarded according to his works' with far greater exactness than is done in the kingdoms of this world; but it does not believe that money is the currency in which rewards are to be distributed and accounts balanced. Its idea is that love is the appropriate reward of labor; that in a just spiritual medium, every individual, by the fixed laws of attraction, will draw around him an amount of love exactly pro-

portioned to his intrinsic value and efficiency, and thus that all accounts will be punctually and justly balanced without the complicated and cumbersome machinery of book-keeping.

As to the legal titles of land and other property, no special measures have been taken to secure the Association from individuals. Those who owned or purchased lands in their own names at the beginning, have retained their deeds, and no formal transfer of any property brought in by the members, has been made to the Association. The stock of the company has been consolidated by love, and not by law.

The terms of admission so far as property is concerned, are stated in the Register of the Association as follows:

"On the admission of any member, all property belonging to him or her, becomes the property of the Association. A record of the estimated amount will be kept, and in case of the subsequent withdrawal of the member, the Association, according to its practice heretofore, will refund the property or an equivalent amount. This practice however stands on the ground, not of obligation, but of expediency and liberality; and the time and manner of refunding must be trusted to the discretion of the Association. While a person remains a member, his subsistence and education in the Association are held to be just equivalents for his labor; and no accounts are kept between him and the Association, and no claim of wages accrues to him in case of subsequent withdrawal."

Q. 20.—Do you carry out these principles, and apply them to social rights, i. e., property in wives and children?

A.—Certainly; read them over again, and see if you have any objection. We apply these principles, not only to property and social rights, but to our ownership of ourselves.

Q. 21.—Do you separate husbands and wives?

A.—No; but we teach them the law of love: 'Thou shalt love, [not merely thy wife and children, but] thy neighbor as thyself;' and when they have got that lesson by heart, they separate themselves far enough to let in their neighbor. You will find satisfaction about many curious questions on this delicate subject, in our three Annual Reports, especially the first. In this short catechism, we can only assure you, as to the results of our social system, that we live in peace, have good health, and are not troubled with involuntary propagation.

Q. 22.—Do parents take the care of their own children?

A.—Yes, if they please. But members, as fast as they become intelligent, come to regard the whole Association as one family, and all children as the children of the family.—Their special relation to their own children, though it is not extirpated or despised, is reduced to subordination to the general family relation. The care of the children, after the period of nursing, is committed to those who have the best talent and most taste for the business, and so the parents are made free for other avocations.

Q. 23.—What are your regulations about labor?

A.—Labor in the Association is free; and we find that 'free labor' is more profitable than 'slave labor.' Our men and women organize themselves, or are organized by the general managers, into groups, under chiefs, for the various departments of work. These groups are frequently changed, and constant rotation goes on, so that all have variety of occupation, and opportunity to find out what each one is best adapted to.

Q. 24.—What do you do with the lazy ones?

A.—This sort of persons cannot live under our system of religious influence, criticism and education. When cases of laziness or other bad behavior occur, our most common way of punishing the offender, has been, to dismiss him from his group, and request him to stop work. This brings him to terms sooner than any thing else. We have to criticize members for working too much, oftener than for being lazy.

Q. 25.—What amount of capital has the Association?

A.—We have not the means of an exact estimate, but it is safe to say \$50,000, including all

the outside property, such as lands, notes, &c., belonging to the members. About half of this sum is invested in permanent, available property at Oneida.

Q. 26.—Are you involved in debt?

A.—We owe the State for lands, about eight hundred dollars. Otherwise we are clear; and we make it a general rule, to pay as we go.

Q. 27.—How much land have you?

A.—About two hundred and seventy-five acres; mostly very good meadow land.

Q. 28.—What do you raise?

A.—Most of the articles commonly raised by farmers. We have this year, a considerable stock of broom-corn, which we shall manufacture for market. We have large orchards of various and choice fruit trees growing, and our vegetable garden has been very productive and profitable. We have one of the best amateur gardeners in the State—Mr. HENRY THACKER—and intend under his management, to devote our farm at some future time mostly to gardening and fruit-growing.

Q. 29.—Are you engaged in any manufactures?

A.—We have a mill, 68 feet long, 50 feet wide, three stories high, on a good water power. In this building, there is a saw-mill, a grist-mill, and a machine-shop. The grist-mill makes the best of flour, and is obtaining a large run of custom. The machine-shop is doing some business, and getting ready for more. Then we have a shoe-shop, and a blacksmith-shop in active operation, and are preparing for wagon-making.

Q. 30.—What are your expenses?

A.—The only estimate we have made is recorded in our Second Annual Report; according to which, the expense for board is 45 cents per week for each individual; or about \$24 per year, and for clothing \$10.50 per year.

Q. 31.—Does the Association support itself?

A.—During the first three years, we were engaged in preparatory labors, building mills, &c. and could not be said to have supported ourselves, except as we increased the value of the homestead. This year we have begun to use our preparations, and expect to be able to show in our Annual Report in February, that the Oneida Association is a self-supporting institution.

Q. 32.—What are your conditions of membership?

Any one proposing to join the Association, ought first, to understand and hold by heart, our religious and social doctrines; secondly, to count the cost of enlisting with us for life; thirdly, to get his freedom from any claims of kindred, &c., that may entangle us; and fourthly, to pay all his debts, or at least, disclose them to us, that we may know his situation. Joining us is like marriage; and these are simply the prudent preliminaries of such a decisive act. If the parties are not in sympathy, or are in external circumstances unfavorable to a union, it is better for them to remain friends, than to venture on a closer connexion.

Q. 33.—Are you receiving members from time to time?

A.—The Oneida Association is as full as it ought to be, with its present accommodations. But other affiliated associations are commencing in several parts of the country, where new members can be received.

Q. 34.—Can any one leave the Association?

A.—Of course. When any one is discontented, and threatens to leave, we always set the doors wide open. All malcontents and cowards have frequently been requested to leave, and we trust all of them have done so. Desertions have been very few; and several, after trying the world, have come back. Generally secession in our commonwealth, is more disagreeable to the individual states, than to the general government.

Q. 35.—Do you employ physicians?

A.—We have had very little occasion for their services. The only deaths that have occurred among us in the four years past, have been those of small children, five in all; and excepting a hard dysentery campaign in our first year,

(which we fought through without a doctor,) the Association has been almost entirely free from serious disease.

Q. 36.—Do you expect to be tolerated by the world around you?

A.—The prospect is fair in this respect.—We were abused in Vermont, but have been well treated in New York. The Tribune, a year or two ago, recognized our right to try our new fashion of society. Several distinguished lawyers and judges of the State, we understand, have expressed the same opinion. We sent copies of the First Report, which contains all of our most startling novelties, to the Governor, and other high functionaries in 1849, and have not heard that their peace was disturbed. You will find some signs of public opinion on this point, in an article under the caption, 'The Verdict of Protestantism,' in another column. Several temporary excitements have been stirred up against us in the circle of our immediate neighbors, by the efforts of deserters; and by the firebrands that have pursued us from Vermont. But they have always soon subsided, without serious hostilities. We have recently had a trial of this kind, owing partly to imprudences of our own, which, however, has terminated amicably. It threatened for a time to bring us into collision with the State authorities; but finally proved to be only an occasion of testing and manifesting their liberality. It also led to an open expression of the feelings of our neighbors, which we think goes far toward settling the question of toleration in our favor. We have always stood ready, in New York as in Vermont, to leave our settlement peaceably, and seek other quarters, if the people around us should pronounce us a nuisance; and in order to ascertain the state of our neighbors' feelings, we recently circulated among them a document, of which the following is a copy:

"TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE COUNTY OF ONEIDA, AND ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:—

This is to certify that we, the undersigned, citizens of the towns of Vernon and Lenox, are well acquainted with the general character of the Oneida Community, and are willing to testify, that we regard them as honorable business men, as good neighbors, and quiet, peaceable citizens. We believe them to be lovers of justice and good order—that they are men who mind their own business, and in no way interfere with the rights of their neighbors. We regard them, so far as we know, as persons of good moral character; and we have no sympathy with the recent attempts to disturb their peace."

This was readily signed by nearly every one we asked, and in most cases with hearty goodwill. The largest land-owner and the most influential citizen on the Oneida Reserve, voluntarily said to those who called on him, as he had said to others, that he considered us not only good, peaceable citizens, but the best class in this region; and regarded it as a blessing to the people around, to have us in their midst.

Toleration.

The following is an extract from our Second Annual Report, written nearly two years ago. The correctness of the views presented in it, and the justice of its compliment to the legal profession, are verified by our recent experience:

What have been the results of our experience on the point of toleration? Is the world prepared to allow our experiment, and give us fair play? Our experience at Oneida has established one fact, viz., that Putney does not present an average specimen of the civilization of this country. We are willing to look upon the foolish and mean transactions of 1847 with charity for the mass of the people there, and to attribute their proceedings to the imposition of a dark and malignant influence, which they were then unable to resist. But, whether their misfortune or voluntary crime, the character of the facts stands unchanged; the disgraceful index remains, that there is one receding point in the midst of an advancing world. Their brutal strokes at our press, at our private Association for Reform, at free opinion and free discussion, all belonged to the past age; for which, if they can forgive themselves, and regain the self-respect and moral security which should attend a right course, we certainly can freely forgive them.

In contrast with the course pursued at Putney, Gamaliel's principle of non-intervention prevails, and seems likely to prevail, in the State of New York. We have been well treat-

ed by the people immediately around us, though our principles are fully known, and the emissaries of the Putney inquisition have done all they could to disturb our relations with our neighbors. Our first annual Report has met with a civil, and in most cases a favorable reception, in the most respectable quarters.

Another important fact which our experience goes to establish, is, that of the three learned professions which rule society and determine public opinion, viz., the doctors, the lawyers, and the priests, the lawyers are far the most liberal towards us. There is a class of pettifoggers, it is true, who by no means deserve this commendation; but we have found lawyers who are really well educated and in good practice, so far as we have come in contact with them, to be immeasurably superior to the doctors and priests, in the civilization of free thought and discussion. So the very men into whose hands the intolerance of society is most likely to throw us, are the men who are most likely to prove liberal mediators between us and society, or at least Gamaliels.

One reason probably of the liberalism of the lawyers, is, that their minds are trained in a school where there are two sides to every question, and both sides are discussed and attended to; while the doctors and the priests give forth their wisdom as oracles, without being subject to the ordeal of reciprocal argument. The lawyer knows that all his positions will be keenly scrutinized and severely canvassed, and he has to do with judges who compel him to look well to the soundness of his facts and arguments; so he learns to feel the value of unanswerable truth. But the doctors and priests merely peddle out traditional science, to customers who ask no questions—an experience not very favorable to liberality and love of the truth, or even to any discipline of mind at all. Another reason of the liberalism of the lawyers, may be, that their profession gives them a truer insight into human nature than others have, whereby they learn the warping force of prejudice, and the deceitfulness of appearances; they thus form the habit of assuming that there are two sides to every question, and of suspending or moderating their judgment of persons and principles that are condemned by report and popular opinion.

Moreover, lawyers understand better than any other class, that TRUTH is the foundation of all law; and this is the very principle to which we appeal in our controversy with the law. We say that Truth is the constitution of the universe; and any law which has not the authority of Truth, is unconstitutional, and may be annulled by any process which shall bring the question of its constitutionality fairly before the supreme court of Reason. Lawyers, we repeat, understand this appeal better than any other class.

The Verdict of Protestantism.

Mr. Stephen Pearl Andrews, the pioneer of Phonography in this country, is issuing a series of pamphlets on the 'Science of Society,' two numbers of which are before us. In the first, he establishes the interesting proposition that all the great reform movements of modern times, tend to one and the same point, viz., the Sovereignty of the Individual; in other words, that man is rising, while institutions are going down.

He instances the Protestant Reformation, the Democratic Revolution that commenced with Cromwell, and the Socialist agitation of the present time, as the three great developments in connection with the Church, the State, and Society, most worthy of notice; and shows by a very clear analysis that they are the same in essence and spirit; the fundamental principle of each being the assertion of man's supremacy over the institutions and forms that Church, State, and Society, have imposed upon him. In the following passage he discusses the bearing of Protestantism and Democracy on the Marriage question, and makes an appropriate allusion to our Community:—

"When the battles which are thus already waged in these various departments of human affairs between Government and the Individual shall have been finally fought and won, the domain of Government will have shrunk to the merest fragment of its old dimensions. Hardly any sphere of legislation, worthy of the name, will remain, save that of the marriage and parental relations. These are subjects of great delicacy, and form, ordinarily, an insuperable barrier to the freedom of investigation in this direction. It is in connection with these subjects that men shrink with dismay from what they understand to be the programme of Socialism. A brief consideration of the subject, conducted with the boldness and impartiality of science, will demonstrate, however, that the most extreme proposition of Socialism does not transcend, in the least, the legitimate operation of the fundamental principle of either Protestantism or Democracy. There is that, both in one and the other, which, carried simply out to its logical and inevitable conclusion, covers the whole case of marriage & the love relations, and completely emancipates them from the impertinent interference of human legislation. First, what says Protestantism? Why, that the right of private judgment in matters of conscience, is paramount to all other authority whatsoever. But marriage has been, in all ages, a sub-

ject eminently under the dominion of conscience and the religious sense. Besides, it is one of the best recognized principles of high-toned religionism, that every action of the life is appropriately made matter of conscience, inasmuch as the responsibility of the individual toward God is held to extend to every, even the minutest thing, which the Individual does. No man, we are told, can answer for his brother. This, then, settles the whole question. It abandons the whole subject to the conscience of the Individual. It implies the charge of a spiritual despotism, wholly unwarranted, for any man to interfere with the conscientious determination of any other with regard to it. Nor can it be objected, with any effect, that this rule only applies when the determination of the Individual accords with, and is based upon his own conscientious conviction, for who shall determine whether it be so or not? Clearly no one but the Individual himself. Any tribunal assuming to do it for him would be the Inquisition over again, which is the special abhorrence of Protestantism.

Such, then, is the Protestant faith. But what, let us inquire, is the Protestant practice? Precisely what it should be, in strict accordance with the fundamental axiom of Protestantism. Every variety of conscience, and every variety of deportment in reference to this precise subject of love, is already tolerated among us. At one extreme of the scale, stand the Shakers, who abjure the connection of the sexes altogether. At the other extremity stands the association of Perfectionists, at Oneida, who hold and practice, and justify by the Scriptures, as a religious dogma, what they denominate complex marriage, or the freedom of love. We have, in this State, stringent laws against adultery and fornication; but laws of that sort fall powerless, in America, before the all-pervading sentiment of Protestantism, which vindicates the freedom of conscience to all persons and in all things, provided the consequences fall upon the parties themselves. Hence the Oneida Perfectionists live undisturbed and respected, in the heart of the State of New York, and in the face of the world; and the civil government, true to the democratic principle, which is only the same principle in another application, is little anxious to interfere with this branch of its own ordinances, so long as they cast none of the consequences of their conduct upon those who do not consent to bear them.

This is a very sensible view of the case for all parties; and we commend it to the studious attention of those well-meaning friends, who gave themselves so much trouble on our account, four years ago—particularly the editor of the Vermont Phoenix, whose simple conservatism at our movements, was very much like that of the old lady, who, travelling for the first time by railroad, was accustomed, every time the train stopped, or any unusual noise occurred, to thrust her head out of the window, and enquire, 'What's burst?' Among other things, this editor incontinently affirmed that our press would not be tolerated for a week, 'even in the tainted atmosphere of the city!'

Now if these good people would but keep cool, and give a little more scope to common sense, they would soon see that nothing has 'burst.' It will appear, by and by, not only that we are on the same platform with Luther, Cromwell, and the puritan democrats of our revolution, but that we are their proper heirs and representatives. The orthodoxy of our position, according to the Protestant and Democratic standard, is becoming more and more conspicuous to the intelligent, and is rapidly casting into shadow and question, the luminaries who have heretofore represented this standard, but who are now seen, weighed down by their own reputations, sticking fast in the ancient pharisaic mud. Daniel Webster, for instance, and such men as Drs. Stuart and Taylor of the church, begun well fifty years ago, as cadets of progress, Protestantism and Democracy; but every body can see that they have outlived the promise of this first position, and that as reputation, wealth and honors have grown upon them, they have lagged behind the spirit of the times, and finally have come to represent the stagnation of popish and pagan ages, rather than the heroic inspirations of the present and the future. Simply to stand still, is to leave the ranks of Protestantism and Democracy, and join the dark despots which they are raised up to combat. Forward or fall, is the only alternative of the field we have entered upon. And careful investigators will see, as Mr. Andrews does, that we are only obeying this law—that we have simply followed out the grand principles of Protestantism and Democracy to their ultimate issue; reaching the 'bull's eye of destiny,' not in the rash spirit of the French revolution, but by the guidance of God, and the deliberate natural pressure of the times. Mr. Andrews continues:

"Such, then, is the unlimited sweep of the fundamental axiom of Protestantism. Such its unhesitating indorsements, both theoretically and practically, of the whole doctrine of the absolute Sovereignty of the Individual. It does not help the matter, to assert that it is an irreligious or a very immoral act to do this, or that, or the other thing. Protestantism neither asserts or denies that. It merely asserts that there is no power to determine that question, higher than the Individual himself. It does not help the matter to affirm that the Scriptures, or the law of God, delivered in any form, has determined the nature and limits of marriage. Protestantism, again, neither denies that proposition nor affirms it. It merely affirms, again, that the Individual himself must decide for himself what the law of God is, and that there is no authority higher than himself to whose decision he can be required to submit. It is arrogance, self-righteousness, and spiritual despotism for me to assume that you have not a conscience as well as I, and that if you regulate your own conduct in the light of that conscience, it will not be as well regulated in the sight of God as it would be if I were to impose the decisions of my conscience upon you.

In general, however, Government still interferes

with the marriage and parental relations. Democracy in America has always proceeded with due deference to the prudential motto, *festina lente* [make haste slowly.] In France, at the time of the first Revolution, Democracy rushed with the explosive force of escapement from centuries of compression, point blank to the bull's eye of its final destiny, from which it recoiled with such force that the stupid world has dreamed, for half a century, that the vital principle of Democracy was dead. As logical sequence from Democratic principle, the legal obligation of marriage was sundered, and the Sovereignty of the Individual above the institution was vindicated.—That the principle of Democracy is, potentially, still the same, will appear upon slight examination.—Democracy denies all power to Government in matters of religion. No Democratic Government does, therefore, or can, base its interference with marriage upon the religious ground. It defines marriage to be, and regards it as being, a mere civil contract. It justifies its own interference with it upon the same ground that it justifies its interference with other contracts, namely, to enforce the civil obligations connected with it, and to insure the maintenance of children. But here, as in the case of ordinary obligations, if the conviction obtains, that different conditions of society will render the present relations of property between husband and wife, unnecessary, and secure, by the equitable distribution and general abundance of wealth, a universal deference on the part of parents, to the dictates of nature in behalf of children, Democracy will cease to make this subject an exception to her dominant principles. A tendency to change these conditions is already shown in the passage of laws to secure to the wife an independent or individual enjoyment of property. Already the observation is made, too, that children are never abandoned among the wealthy classes, and hence the natural inference that the scientific production, the equitable distribution, and the economical employment of wealth would render human laws unnecessary to enforce the first mandate of nature, hospitality and kindness toward offspring. The doctrine is already considerably diffused, that the union of the sexes would be, not only more pure, but more permanent, in the absence, under favorable circumstances, of all legal interference. But whether that be so or not, is not now the question. I am merely asserting that the inevitable tendency of Democracy, like that of Protestantism, is toward abandoning this subject to the sovereign determination of the Individual, and that Democracy in this country will attain, only more leisurely, the same point to which it went at a single leap, and from which it rebounded, in France."

THE CIRCULAR.

BROOKLYN, NOV. 30, 1851.

We print an extra number of this week's paper. Friends may obtain a supply for free circulation, by application through the mail or otherwise.

Memoranda.—On the 26th of November, four years ago, we evacuated Putney. On the same day, Messrs. Burt and Ackley commenced the Oneida Association. On the 26th of November, this year, we received a telegraphic dispatch, announcing the favorable crisis referred to in our last answer on the preceding page, which indicates the attainment of toleration at Oneida.

The Magyar Leader.

The extraordinary interest that has been gathering in anticipation of Kossuth's arrival, suffers no abatement. On the contrary, the more his character and movements are studied, the more marvelous and heart-stirring his providential mission appears.

Do our readers perceive the curious dramatic interest of his connection thus far with this country? Verily, we are like to have a romance on the largest scale; with nations and continents mixed up in a game of love, intrigue, jealousy, and all the *et ceteras* of a novel, and Kossuth at the centre of the plot. If we could personate Kossuth in the feminine, the elements of the romance would be complete. First, we send a national vessel to the confines of Asia, to rescue him from his persecutors. He is carried off, in defiance of the tyrannical old guardians, Austria and Russia. Then follows a breach—a proper lover's quarrel, induced by the lies and intrigue of enemies. Then, a speedy reconciliation, and exposure of the iniquity; and amidst the fluttering of editors and politicians, the expectant heart of the nation prepares his welcome. Thus far we have arrived; but still the consummation hangs in suspense. Kossuth turns aside to dally with the English, and uncertainty comes in to sharpen the eagerness of waiting.

Now can we not see through, and guess the outcome of this story? We should say it betokens the marriage of the old and new worlds. Here is Kossuth, a man raised up by God in the far central east, advancing by a procession of nations, and under universal acclaim, to take the hand of the free west. Observe his speeches, his conversation, his influence, and you will see that he is upon no ordinary errand. The faculty is evidently given to him, of being an international solvent and *menstruum*, in which the nominal and local barriers between people, melt away. His presence unties the narrow knot of mere nationality, and leaves them encircled in the broad bonds and brotherhood of freedom. For this purpose, he is apparently endowed with the gift of tongues. A Magyar by birth and education, he is now in England, more an Englishman than the English themselves; and captivates equally all classes, with his cosmopolitan views, and glowing eloquence. It would be the same in Germany, or France; and will be so here.

The most interesting feature of this movement, is the prevailing religious element of Kossuth's inspiration. The French infidels once tried to bring about this marriage of the nations, but it turned out a world-wide revelry of horror and blood. Kossuth's revolution has begun in a very different spirit. His speeches are full of reverent mention of God, and confessions of his providence. There is a tinge of oriental devotion and simplicity in his religious expressions, which reminds us that he comes from the region of Jerome, and John Huss. Hear his speech on the reception of a Bible; the present of some Manchester ladies:

MR. CHARLES REED came forward and presented M. KOSSUTH with a large German Bible, elegantly bound in crimson and gilt, with the initials of the illustrious exile embroidered on the back.

M. KOSSUTH said—I thank you. I take it for no merit in my life that I am a religious man, not for any merit of mine, but because it is a necessity to every honest and thinking man, and because it is the most rich and fruitful source of those sentiments and those feelings which lead to happiness in this world and bliss in the world to come. I shall value it because I take religion to be the most rich source of that consolation which I have wanted so often in my life. Being a religious man, and because religious, as well an enemy to superstition, intolerance, and fanaticism, as on the other hand the friend of freedom, I readily confess that it is from this great book that I have learned the principle of loving my neighbor as myself, and strength and courage to act in the great cause which has always been the guide of my life. Judge from this how I prize this gift to me presented on the part of some ladies, and of which a copy was also presented by an honorable working man to my wife at Winchester. This, sir, will remain as the choicest gift I have received.

There is the mark of the man, and the secret of his power. Kossuth's faith in God and the Bible gives him a magical hold upon human interest everywhere. It qualifies him to speak for mankind; and it is precisely this earnest outspoken faith that puzzles the conceited philosophers and skeptics who have hoped to speculate on his capital. He is as much beyond the reach of mere philanthropists, as he is of mere politicians. Neither can understand him or calculate his course.

We should probably differ with him on one point. His object is a noble, an inspired one; but he seems not to have so clear a conception of the means. As we understand it, he proposes to put down the rosy despots of the world at last, by force of arms. But this will not do; it is not up to the latest idea. War is not the means of meeting these barbarians; they are always strongest in that particular weapon. Kossuth should have learned that fact from the tremendous experience he has already had, and not require it to be repeated. How then shall we deal with the rascal oppressions that are abroad? We must conquer them by a spirit of peace, by peddling, by the press. Say to Despotism, 'Whale round with your armies as much as you please; we will Print. We will go peacefully among your people, in spite of you, and trade with them and teach them to read and write; and we will mow down armies faster with the press, the Spirit of truth, and the love of God, than you can with the sword.' That is the policy now, and it will succeed. We can outwit the powers of oppression—beat them by diplomacy, by the use of intelligence, but it is useless to try it with cannon. War is one of the *effete* institutions that are going down. It is part of the same old system, with monarchy and oppression. They belong together; and the attempt to use one against the other, is like trying to cast out devils by Beelzebub. It cannot be done. We hope Kossuth will reconsider his views on this point, and stand forth clear of war as well as the champion of progress.

Scenes of the Last Summer.—No. 3.

At our request, Mr. H. W. Burnham has furnished us with the following sketch of the last trip of the 'Rebecca Ford':—

Oneida, Nov. 26, 1851.

DEAR BRO. NOYES:—It is just four months to-day since the sloop sunk. The scenes of that hour, and of the trip as a whole, are still before me. I do not have to labor to recall a thousand incidents and impressions which cannot be told here. A summary glance is all that I will attempt.

We left Brooklyn on Tuesday, July 22, at 4 o'clock P. M. The crew generally were in fine spirits. It was new experience for the women. Mrs. Cragin expressed herself every way pleased with her circumstances; and as we plowed through the waters of the bay, and up the river, before a stiff south wind, enthusiasm was quite manifest. We sailed forty miles that evening, and anchored for the night near Stony Point. With the morning tide we floated up to the Highland ice-houses, where we anchored until 4 P. M. The day was pleasant, and by previous arrangement we visited Montgomery Lake, and whatever of interest that wild neighborhood afforded. We returned to our 'yacht,' as we called it, with thankful and happy hearts for the entertainment. Moving slowly along with the afternoon tide, with a map of the river before us, we learned the names and light of those long-distinguished Highland summits; also decayed monuments of revolutionary scenes, so peculiar to that vicinity, were sought out and commented upon with lively interest. West Point was alive with martial music and stir-

ring soldiers. We passed the night two miles above Newburg. Thursday we reached our place of destination and began to load our vessel. This was not finished until Saturday forenoon. It was Mrs. Cragin's wish to visit the old stone house, where Mr. Cragin and family, some ten years ago, resided.—To do this, Mrs. Cragin, Miss Allen, and myself, left in the yawl, about two hours before the loading was finished, and were to get on board below, whenever they should make sail. It was while sculling to this place, that Mrs. C. read with such emphasis, the eighth of Romans.

We were taken on board the sloop about 11 A. M. I was fresh for the work and took the helm, where I remained until about five minutes before she went down. The day was fine; the wind blew from the west mainly, but was quite 'contrary.' Nevertheless, by close attention to the helm, main sheet, &c., we laid our course, and congratulated one another upon our speed and good luck. Dinner was ready at one, and the men were called below, whenever they should make sail. It was while sculling to this place, that Mrs. C. read with such emphasis, the eighth of Romans.

I saw it was a severe gust, and walked out, followed immediately by Captain Smith. His quick eye observed that L. was manœuvring badly at the helm, and he took his place. But it was too late; the sloop had gone over too far to right herself, and there was no getting into the cabin. I sustained myself by clinging to the guards of the starboard quarter; and as she careened over, took my place on the side of the vessel which proved to be longest out of water.—From this point I could see all. The stone on deck were going with a crash; and every thing was chaos in the cabin. Mr. Seymour was the last one that escaped from thence; and he, on reaching the deck, stepped into the water. Mr. Smith saw Miss Allen, but could render her no assistance. The hatches were open, and the sloop filled almost instantly. The deafening roar of the air escaping through the open stern windows, the brilliant rainbow seen through the spray, added to the heart-rending consciousness of the fate of the women, made this the most thrilling, agonizing moment of my life. I was self-possessed, but helpless as a child. My inexperience in swimming, when finding myself afloat, made my case hopeless, unless God should interpose. And he did interpose the help of one of the oars, and then a plank; which floated directly to me. I buoyed myself up without any difficulty, until we were picked up. We lingered around the spot, while the least hope remained, and did not abandon it until after the mast disappeared. It was at once concluded that I should go to Brooklyn with the intelligence. But it was not till after we had gone on board of the Abilena, and while drying our drenched clothes, that the reality of our circumstances, and a sense of my message came over me. The sensation with Mr. Seymour, was simultaneous; and we wept like children. But stern duty compelled us to dry up our tears.—We knew that God was dealing with us, and we did not murmur. I was soon put ashore, and telegraphed from Poughkeepsie, as has been reported.

Yours truly, H. W. BURNHAM.

In looking over this paper, on the eve of its going to press, I perceive a providential combination of matter for joyful exultation, and matter for sorrowful humility. Vitality, hope, success, are pictured on the main breadth of the canvass; but here, almost at the center, is a terrible death-scene. We are rising triumphant, but where is our sweetest and brightest fellow-laborer? We are rebuked in the midst of victory. A voice of warning thrills through our spirits:—'Serve the Lord with fear, rejoice with trembling; he will not give his glory to another, nor his praise to graven images.'

To exult in success, as though we had achieved it, is to embezzle the property of the government we serve. Embezzlement is the most common and the worst vice in all human administrations; but it will not be tolerated in the kingdom of God.

The King of kings takes no counsel from fear of the reproaches of the party opposed to him, in his dealings with his own party and his own officers.—They will not escape criticism under the shelter of favoritism or policy. On the contrary, 'judgment begins at the house of God.' We have accepted this condition of service. We have invited the chastisements which we feel. Let us, then, in the midst of temptations to exultation, remember the integrity of God, and beware of embezzlement. We shall escape the rod only by consoing to need it, and we shall invite prosperity only by being able to bear it without glorying. 'All the haughtiness of man shall be brought low, and the Lord alone shall be exalted.'

I expressed these sentiments to the company engaged with me in the work of this paper, and they wish to join with me in inviting the spirit of sobriety and humility to preside over our thanksgivings.

J. H. N

[The series of "HOME-TALKS" (continued in this paper from the Onida Circular.) will be understood to be off-hand conversational lectures, spoken at our evening fireside. The following was reported by M. E. CRAIG, Jan. 1880.]

Home-Talk by J. H. N.—No. 71.

[SUGGESTED BY THE FOLLOWING POETRY FROM THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE.]

THE PAST AND THE FUTURE.

The world we leave is a brighter world
Than the world to which we go;
For dark are the clouds of the future furled
O'er the unborn forms of woe:
And the rainbow tints that our spirits wore
Will be changed to a darker dye;
For the hope will be bright in our souls no more,
Nor our souls have the stainless joy.

And the friends will no more be the trusted friends
That our guileless boyhood knew;
For the worldly heart with the world-breeze bends,
But the friends of youth are true.
Oh! the heart that is wrapt with the world's wild cares,
Will soon as the world be cold;
And in far, far spheres, through the mist of years,
We will sigh for the hearts of old.

And the love we leave is a brighter tie
Than the love that lies before;
For the heavenly beams of the melting eye
Will thrill as they thrilled no more.
We still may be wrapt by the tracing gaze,
And won with the whispering tongue,
But we'll feel no more of the bounding bliss
That swept through our souls when young.

Oh! if some power would renew the light
Of youth, when our youth is fled,
This world of ours would be ever bright,
And its joys ne'er withered:
But the Fate of our being is round us cast,
And "Oh" is its stern decree;
So our hearts may turn to the lovely Past,
But our steps must forward be.

A REFUGEE.

The sentiment of that poetry is undoubtedly the experience of mankind. Childhood is the greenest spot in life. First love is the best. And in what is called religious experience, the first baptism is always looked back to as the best and brightest. We have to admit, as things are, that there is serious truth in that picture of life. And it is really the voice of truth and experience that tells children they are seeing their best days, and warns lovers that they will awake from their pleasant dreams, and that tells young converts there is darkness before them. There is truth enough in all this to make out what may be called wisdom, in one sense of the word; but it is one-sided wisdom—it is the wisdom of death and despair, and the poetry of death and despair. I for one, am determined to enter my protest against it, with all the strength and ingenuity I possess. And I think it worth while to offer a premium to any one who will demonstrate the falsehood of that view of things. For if we are to give way to the influence described in such poetry as this, then existence is not worth having; and the sooner a man should, if it were possible, put himself into the eternal sleep, the better. But I have a strong conviction in my instinct, and in a good degree in my perceptions and feelings, that this philosophy is false. I know I shall be able to demonstrate thoroughly that it is false.

I suppose the main ground on which such philosophy would base itself, either openly or secretly, is this—that NOVELTY is the charm of all experience—that the principal element of happiness is novelty of sensation. In childhood every thing is new, and full of freshness and beauty. In first love, the heart develops itself in sensations that are entirely new. And in first religious experience, the joy of reconciliation with God is a novelty. This philosophy would tell us that we cannot have the novelty a second time, and hence, that all subsequent experience must be deficient in the zest which that novelty gives. This philosophy would say that all three of these experiences, and of existence in general, as some one has said of loving woman; that the *enigma is solved*. The idea is, that when a man marries, he has solved and sounded the depths of woman's love, and there is no more mystery about it—the best is past, and his enjoyment afterward must be stale.

Now if we look a little sharper into the third form of experience mentioned, viz., religious experience, we shall begin to see the fallacy of this philosophy disclosing itself.—In respect to acquaintance with God, there is something like blasphemy, in saying the *enigma is solved*. Religious experience is

the acquaintance of the heart with God. The same thing takes place as when two human hearts love each other. And now, the question comes up, Has man sounded the depths of God? Is there no more novelty in God? The principle is blasphemy. Paul exclaimed, after long acquaintance with God, 'O the depths of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!' And again, 'that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge.'

We are safe then, in utterly denying that the enigma of *divine* love is solved by our first acquaintance with God. We know the entire contrary of all this is true; and are sure from instinct and common sense, as well as by experience, that our first acquaintance with God is but the beginning; and that there is still chance for eternal novelty. There is eternal mystery in God; our curiosity is always on the stretch as we advance in his love. Instead of the enigma being solved, we have but just begun the great mystery, and eternity alone can solve it.

Now see what an argument we can draw from this. The fact is, the experience of mankind with regard to the *love of God*, under the teaching of the churches, is just as short-lived and disappointing, as is the love between man and woman. The same apostate law which makes childhood a bright, short-lived experience, and makes love between man and woman a bright, short-lived experience, makes also love between man and God of the same back-sliding character. Now we have reason to know that love in the latter case finds no deficiency in God—that it is not necessarily short-lived;—and we say that if men have found nothing but short-lived experience in that form where we are sure there is everlasting glory, then it is to be assumed that they are not competent to teach us the truth in regard to either form of experience. If, in loving God, we find that we have made out no better than in loving one another, and in the general course of our existence, then it is to be assumed that we are acting under false principles.

Let us see if an argument from the nature of God, cannot be extended from religious experience to other kinds of experience. Let us see if we cannot prove to a demonstration, that as the infinity of God offers to hearts everlasting novelties, and mysteries unfathomable, so it offers to all our senses and passions the same unlimited expanse. In reality the whole circle of enjoyments—enjoyment of food, of love, of intellectual pleasures—are the enjoyment of God. He comes to us in all these secondary ways, as well as by his direct approach to us as spiritual beings. All enjoyment of every kind we have, is God. If God is the fountain of beauty, as we are sure he is, then whenever we enjoy any thing, we touch the abyss of sweetness; and of course there is open to us an endless fountain of novelty. If we make our enjoyments short-lived, we have taken on this tone, not because there is a deficiency and lack of mystery, novelty and depth, in the things we enjoy, but because we do not *unlock* the mystery. We get a glimpse of things—pry into them a little—and then on the first small opening, say the enigma is solved; we have reached the end of all enjoyment there. That is a great mistake; the enigma is not solved; there are infinite depths above and below, which are yet to be sounded; and the only trouble is, that we lose our interest in trying those depths.

Take a specific example: Do people find an end to enjoyment in making discoveries in science? On the contrary, they go on year after year; each successive generation enters the field with renewed appetite and success. The men of the last generation did not use up all the enjoyment there is in making new discoveries; there are no signs of exhausting it—it goes on with increasing momentum. This shows the nature of God; and any man of sense would exclaim with Paul, 'O the depths, both of the knowledge

and wisdom of God.' There is an everlasting mystery opening itself before us, in glory after glory.

Take a more familiar example—that of eating and drinking. Does any one really believe that the pleasure and zest of eating and drinking lies in the novelty of it? When has experience taught us any such principle, as that our pleasure in this thing depends upon, or is proportioned to, the novelty experienced in our first coming in contact with food? On the contrary, there is a steady increase from childhood up. In many cases people have a positive dislike for things at first, which they afterwards learn to enjoy. Here too, if we understand the matter, we shall find the infinity of God open to us, and no end to the enjoyment in eating and drinking; for if we have found God, then in reality, infinite life comes to us in that thing, and we shall never fathom the depths we are capable of in it, until we have fathomed God himself.

We have now come to a spot where I think this subject has a most interesting bearing.—We have settled it pretty well, that the supposed necessity of a short-lived experience in religion is all humbug. We throw off this notion of the world with regard to religion, and, however we may fail to carry it out, believe that legitimate Christian experience is not a tapering concern; or rather that it tapers the right way, toward the beginning. 'The path of the just shineth more and more unto the perfect day.' We do not believe with the churches, that we are to begin at the great, and 'come out at the little end of the horn,' but exactly the reverse.

But in respect to the second branch of experience—*love*, there is a tendency to drop back into the views and feelings of the world. We shall find however, that the New Covenant reverses not only our religious experience, but also our experience in love. I think there is this great advantage to be derived from our position as believers in the New Covenant; that we can carry the same ideas and principles we have about religious experience, into our love experience.

I have a word to say on this point. You think you have solved the great enigma with regard to sexual love. Men think they know all about women, and *vice versa*. There is no further curiosity—no mystery remains, but it is all a plain affair. When you were young, the other sex seemed to you a sacred mystery. Curiosity was wide awake and you approached the enigma with a degree of awe. But you have entered the porch and solved the mystery and find it no great affair; and nothing more is to be expected in that line of things. You have seen your best days; your bright love time has gone by. I say this is an insult to men and women, and to God who made them. I should feel rather mortified to admit that my wife has fathomed me, and knows all about me, that the enigma between us is solved. I must be a poor wooden character—a more worthless thing, as an instrument of pleasure, than a violin, if the mystery of our companionship is fathomed, and we know all about each other. I say such a conclusion shows a very poor view of human nature; it shows that people have no respect for God. I should have more self-respect than to believe this; and back of that, more respect for God; for we are fearfully and wonderfully made. We are wonderful musical instruments; made to give and receive great pleasure in love. What a poor compliment to him to say, after merely tasting of each other, that the enigma is solved,—that we have mastered all there is in that instrument. In such a simple instrument as the violin, you may find men who devote their life-time, and all the powers of their musical nature to understand it; and they still say they are but just beginning to fathom it, and every few years some one comes out with a new understanding of its capabilities and powers. So to a true heart, one that appreciates God, the same woman is an endless mystery. And this necessarily flows from the first admission that God is unfathomable in depths of knowledge and wisdom.

Men are infants in their knowledge of beauty. I affirm in reference to every good thing, but specially of the relation of man and woman to each other, that it runs back into God.—No woman will exhaust the power of giving and receiving happiness that there is in man until she has exhausted God. And the converse is true. Woman is always an attractive mystery to me. If Christ is in us, the mystery of God is in us; and we cannot fathom the mystery of Christ at once. The same principle may be carried back to the joys of childhood, to all the joys of the senses—to all pleasant sights and sounds, tastes and perfumes of nature—to all social pleasures. There is where the bliss of childhood lies. If the element which gives happiness to the senses is a small affair, locked up in visible things, then it will be soon exhausted—the enigma will be easily solved. But if the element that gives us happiness is the breathing of God upon us, then the infinity of God comes to us, and the mystery of creation is perpetual. We may carry back the principle of the New Covenant and reverse all the experience of the world. The path of the just is a path that begins from the littleness of childhood, and expands forever in the same freshness of life and beauty.

Two things are required to make happiness: first, the outward, objective means, and second, the subjective state, the appetite. We have shown that the objective part is infinite as God, in regard to those three forms of happiness, childhood, love, and religion; and observe, this upsets the whole doctrine, that the enigma is solved. But the world will ask, is it not an inevitable law of our nature, that we must grow old, and lose interest in these great enigmas? Is there not a necessary failure in the subjective part, even though the matter of the objective part is infinite? Here then, we will begin at the other end, and say that the new covenant protects the subjective part. It brings into our life the well-spring of the resurrection. It is a perfect fountain of youth and life, and makes us young again. And if it is true that fellowship with Christ can give us growing life in religious experience, the same is true in every other experience. It is true that we have in us all the joy and blessedness that goes to make childhood happy.

This view is one of great importance, in itself, and in its consequences. There are many ways in which it will work. In the first place, it will alter our method of bringing up children. They are taught that they are seeing their best days. Reflect on that, and you will see that it leads to blasphemy. On the other hand, this truth will increase the effect of the resurrection upon us. Let it enter into our hearts, and it will place us in condition to revive and rekindle from time to time. Again, settlement of the truth on this subject will go a great way toward breaking up littleness of heart in regard to love. Most of the difficulties which have arisen in respect to our social theory, have been based on the idea that woman is a perishable article—that after her first experience in love, she is like an old newspaper, good for nothing. A virgin is usually considered more attractive than a married woman who has had experience. But the reverse of this should be the case, and when things come to their right bearing, it will be seen that the reverse of the common idea is the truth. It is a scandal to God, and man, and woman, that in the estimation of men, a virgin is better than a married woman. It is true they are universally so preferred, but why? It is because the woman has yielded to this worldly idea, and lost her self-respect. She supposes the enigma is solved, and does not carry about with her that fresh consciousness of mystery and worth, that a virgin does. The married settle into the feeling that the enigma is solved, and that makes them less attractive. The principle operates in the same way, in both sexes.

The conclusions for our hearts to rest upon, are these: that our relation to God is an opening universe of experience; that the enigma of love is not solved, and never will be; that a conversion back to the spirit of childhood is practicable for every one. The objective means of happiness are rich as the depths of God, and the subjective conditions are provided for us in the new covenant.

S. R. LEONARD & COMPANY, PRINTERS.

Orders for Job Printing are invited.