

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

A MEDIUM

FOR THE FREE DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES  
AND PRACTICAL MEASURES,

P E R T A I N I N G T O

HUMAN PROGRESS

A N D G E N E R A L W E L L - B E I N G .

THE CAUSE OF TRUTH IS BEST PROMOTED BY FREE INQUIRY. ERROR  
ALONE FEARS INVESTIGATION.

JOHN PATTERSON, RESIDENT EDITOR; WILLIAM DENTON, CORRESPOND-  
ING EDITOR.

CONTRIBUTORS.—W. S. Bush, Alfred Cridge, Mrs. Anne D. Cridge, Wm. McDiarmid, T. P. Wright,  
L. A. Hine, J. H. Cook, J. W. Towner, J. P. Lasley, E. C. Cochran, Francis Barry, J. M. Stahl,  
L. H. Bigarel, J. B. Wolff, J. P. Davis, E. L. Crane, Joseph Treat, J. D. Gage.

## C O N T E N T S .

The Human Brain, - - -	163	Mathematics Briefly Reviewed, - - -	181
Social Compacts vs. Individual Freedom, - - -	165	Material Union, - - -	182
All is Harmony, - - -	168	To Peter Socialist, - - -	187
An Autobiography, - - -	169	Nut for "Peter" to crack, - - -	187
Free Love Again, - - -	173	Mercy for Friend Hine, - - -	187
Nothing but a Dream, - - -	174	Injustice to Friend Hine, - - -	188
That Mathematical Problem, - - -	177	Talk about the Social Revolutionist, - - -	189

PUBLISHED BY THE RISING STAR ASSOCIATION.

L. H. BIGAREL, PRINTER.

FOR SALE BY F. BLY, VINE STREET, CINCINNATI; BELA MARSH, 15 FRANKLIN  
STREET, BOSTON; C. BLANCHARD, 76 NASSAU ST., NEW YORK.

TERMS, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR; FIVE COPIES, FOUR DOLLARS.

Our Post Office Address:—GREENVILLE, DARKE Co., OHIO.

**THE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONIST.**—Subscribers will please specify what year they wish the journal for.—We would prefer for subscribers to commence with the first No. of a vol.—We have still a few entire sets of vols. one and two which we would be glad to dispose of.—If any who are entitled to them have failed to receive all of these two volumes, we will send the missing Nos. to such as may order them.—It would be most convenient to us, if subscribers would renew at once, that we may estimate the better how large an edition to print. Jan. No. (for 1857,) will not be sent to any till they signify their wish to receive it.—We will send copies in separate wrappers to any who so order it. Several copies to the same post office, if sent to the address of one of the club, would be opened by him, and not by the Post Master.—Let it be understood that the next vol. will contain 32 pages beside the cover.—Odd Nos. for this year, accompanied by the Extra and an explanatory note, will be sent gratis as specimens to such persons as our friends may name to us, as likely to appreciate the journal.—Specimen Nos. of the new vol. will be sent on the receipt of three three-cent postage stamps, or a dime for each.

**MATTER FOR THE JOURNAL.**—By a private note from the Cor. Editor of the S. R., we learn that the matter he intended for this No. has been lost.—A. S. Davis' "Rejoinder" to "Free Love—A Reply," has been received, but too late for this No.; it will appear in the next.—A Psychometric delineation of the character of Wm. Denton, too late for this No., and "Character vs. Reputation," put on file for this issue, but not getting in for want of room, will find their place in Jan. No. So much matter has been received on the marriage question, that the Res. Ed. has suspended his series on that subject, and he cannot now say when it will be resumed.—A report of the BERLIN MOVEMENT has just been received; it will be out in next No.

**TO CONTRIBUTORS.**—The choice of matter for any No. must be made from the articles on file, so that contributors who write beforehand that they will have certain articles for a particular No., cannot get them in any sooner on that account;—the articles must be here, and then take their turn according to a complication of considerations, which involve justice to contributors, to the S. R. and its readers.

**CHARLES HOPEWELL.**—It might be convenient for some of our readers, when they renew their subscription, to send for "Society as it is," etc., which has been advertised on cover of S. R. It is sold at low rates, and whatever it brings in will be so much added to our capital for reform. The editor of this journal wrote the book, it is true, but it may not be much worse for that; though he has not the knack of puffing his own wares. It was written four years ago, and the principal portions of it he could not write any better now—some of them not so well, perhaps. It is not so radical on one or two points, as the Social Revolutionist; but some might think it the better for that. It would have its uses as a means of agitation, and our friends may help it into its legitimate field of labor. Many of its readers have thought well of it, as their testimony evinces, and it is but natural for us to wish it would find its way into the hands of others. It is furnished by the dozen, at a trifle above cost. Paper covers, 50 cents per single copy; muslin, 75 cts, postage pre-paid.

**POEMS FOR REFORMERS.**—Shall be pleased, also, to receive orders for "Poems for Reformers." These Poems have been very generally and favorably noticed by the liberal journals of the day. Price, 56 cents per copy; four copies, \$2—postage pre-paid.

**THE PEOPLE'S PAPER.**—Our readers will give L. A. Hine's advertisement the attention it deserves. The People's Paper is not to be a free paper, its editor says; and we like this straight-forward course better than the questionable one of claiming that a paper is free, and then excluding well-written articles on the most vital questions which can affect humanity, just because such questions are yet unpopular. We like a free paper—it is a special hobby with us just now; but we are not so silly as to think every editor should ride it because we do. Every one has a right to make just such a paper as he pleases, or as he can. It would be folly for any one to waste his energies trying to make a free paper, when he can accomplish much more good by making a liberal one; and let him sail under true colors. Friend Hine's paper we presume will be his own organ, devoted to "Land Reform and Democratic Education;" and if any one deserves success for faithful, but ill-requried service in behalf of these specific reforms, for the last ten or twelve years, it is L. A. Hine. No one can bring these subjects more clearly and forcibly before the people, than he. "The People's Paper" will do a work which no other can do so well, and we trust that the "people" will see that it is well sustained.

THE

# SOCIAL REVOLUTIONIST.

---

DECEMBER, 1856.

---

## THE HUMAN BRAIN, IN ITS RELATIONS TO HUMAN SOCIETY.

BY J. H. COOK.

I here ask a very important question which every one will answer as best he can. Is it more promotive of true progress to check, restrain or suppress the natural action of any excessive human development, by keeping aloof from all exciting causes, than to give it far more scope and freedom of action, than the world at present sanctions? Is it more promotive of chastity and sexual purity to stifle, smother and suppress the excessive amative functions, by arbitrary and stoical power, or leave them to act more freely, subject only to the natural check-power, antagonism and reaction of the higher brain in general, and Spiritual Love in particular, which is the natural cooperative with, regulator and purifier of Amativeness? The old way was to deny a feverish man water, no matter how much he might crave it; but a better and more natural way is to let him have more or less water. A glutton can not be cured of gluttony by starving him, unless you starve him to death, or so emaciate his system as thus to do him more hurt than good. A person with large Alimentiveness craves and can eat quantities of food that are not desired or needed by, nor adapted to persons with small Alimentiveness; and this principle applies to all the organs of the brain. In ignorance of the true structure and functions of the brain, the world imposes unnatural restraints upon men and women, and at the same time suppresses and prevents more or less the natural growth and controlling power of the upper brain. If we wish the waters of human life to become pure, we must not dam them up. Impure and discordant action is far better than no action, if it be natural; for it will sooner or later develop purity and harmony. Who have destroyed life and health by self-pollution? Those who have been deprived of free and natural association with the opposite sex—the fires of sexual love, pent up like the internal fires of the earth, have burst the superincumbent strata of blind and superstitious laws, customs and religions, scattering disease, devastation and death far and wide, through human (inhuman, too,) society. I am not to be understood here as contending for an indiscriminate freedom of all from outward restraint, for such an idea is not the offspring of true philosophy. I am only saying that many of our social laws and customs are oppressive to a large class of minds, whose developments are such, that FREEDOM is what they need, and

what their expansive natures must and will have. Spiritual Love, or the group of Love Organs, is located in the top of the head, in the peaceable, heavenly, free and exalted region of the brain, and is above all human law, being "a law unto itself." Its reaction upon the powers that are now vainly and ignorantly attempting to limit its scope of action, will prove to be irresistible. When love shall have its natural range and freedom, it will elevate, purify and keep within its legitimate sphere, blind and destructive animality. If men and women are born with predominant animal brains, they must act out the animal, if they act at all. The lower part of man's nature is held permanently in its legitimate sphere only by the higher brain. It is true, we may by arbitrary power, suppress all action, but that does not develop the man into a condition of self-government or freedom. There are many whose vitality and stamina have been destroyed or greatly impaired by excessive amative indulgence WITHOUT love to absorb, control, direct and elevate it, who now discard, for themselves and others in a like condition, any exercise of the amative function, even WITH love. Such men and women need the warm, inspiring, invigorating, magnetism of those among the opposite sex, for whom they have a strong affinity. Such natures can only be improved and happified by being often in long continued physical contact with those whose temperament can supply them with the pabulum of life, for which they are now famishing. Do not understand me here as advocating, necessarily, the procreative act. I only mean a close proximity to, or contact of the two, or the several affinities. Those who have a predominant love-nature suffer no less for the want of outlets or conductors of their love, than those who are wanting in love, do for the want of love-fountains to supply them, or loving atmospheres in which to "live, and move, and have a being." How pure and exquisite the physical contact, embrace or magnetic atmosphere of those whose physical love is tempered by the exalted life-giving and life-sustaining potency of the Love Group of the upper brain.

Much is said about the virtue of the Water Cure and many other cures, but who comprehends and appreciates the potency and all-healing nature and character of the Love Cure, to those whose developments render them sufficiently susceptible to its impressions. Every true and spontaneous affinity is, ex officio, a true and never-failing physician. All human loves, of whatever name or character, are both hygienic and therapeutic; and were they allowed their full, free and natural scope and action, much of the disease of human life would be cured. The legalizing of perpetual contact between uncongenial natures, where love never does and never can exist, is an evil of such magnitude and so universal that very few have hitherto seen or felt it. Rapes upon females without LICENSE, excites universal indignation, but who shall estimate the number of rapes and the evils thereof, committed continually by men under the sanction of Legal Marriage?—Is it saying too much that nine-tenths of the rapes in our land are sanctioned by law, and that the poor victims have no redress? I verily believe it. Truly, the "conjugal duties" of married(?) women are onerous, destructive and repulsive. O, if they only dared to tell the story of their long years of suffering, repulsion and social starvation under the tyrannical and unspiritualized animality of their legal oppressors and murderers, they "COULD a tale unfold that would make each particular hair stand on end like quills upon a fretful porcupine." True love blended with a true philosophy shall come to the relief of these helpless victims to an ignorant and irrational public opinion. The love-nature of humanity by an invincible natural law, is surely growing into power, and in time it will sit upon the throne and put all enemies under its feet.

## SOCIAL COMPACTS VS. INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM.

BY W. S. BUSH.

Sacrifice the rights of the individual, for the good of Society, says civilization, whenever, and wherever, they conflict. Just now, the nation is excited about Slavery-extension. One party denies the manhood of the negro, by chattelizing him, and claims the right to do this everywhere. The other party makes him a human nondescript, who has no right to exist, but as a chattel in the slave states, or a freeman in Africa. Both deny the inalienability of man's rights, and put the heel of society on the individual; differing only as to how, and where, and when, those rights shall be outraged. What hope of freedom from them? None—till they return to the forgotten Dec. of Independence, and learn again, that man has certain inherent and inalienable rights, which no social compacts are empowered to infringe or abridge. So radicals have ever taught. So victims of despotism have ever claimed.

While others hear only the wail of Hungary, or the woe of Ireland, or the wrongs of Kansas, let us not be deaf to the nearer voice of the women of Ohio, asking for the abolition of those "laws which place the married woman of Ohio nearly upon a level with the poor slave woman of the South." Is their claim just? If so, then the laws, or the marriage relation, or both, must give way in favor of human rights.

But how came woman to be thus enslaved? Where were her manacles forged? In the universal smithery of all outrages on human rights—the bible. That myth has created woman out of man, to be with him and of him, "flesh of his flesh," the twain one, and that one, the man. It makes her no co-equal with him in creation, in character, or, in rights. He not made for her, but she for him. After Adam's fall, we are told, God cursed woman with this curse: "Thy desires shall be unto thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." A curse, which David and Solomon took special pains to visit upon woman! Paul, the high-priest of the new Dispensation, confirms the old, by saying: "Man is the image and glory of God: but woman is the glory of the man." For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." Again; "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let wives be to their own husbands in everything." Why, this abject annihilation of woman? Because the myth made her for man—to gratify his passions, and to reproduce his species. Paul and Christ had no higher idea of marriage than this, and thought it no part of a Christian's duty to procreate the race. Yet Paul advised to marry rather than to burn; "to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and every woman have her own husband." Cementing the chains of lust by this decree: "What therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." Marriage must be for life.

Slavery with its damning crimes has not the foothold in the bible, that the bondage of woman possesses. Strip both of their abuses, and their central ideas stand thus: Slavery places one man under the complete control of another, which right of control is a purchaseable commodity. Marriage places woman, under the complete control of the man, denying her identity as an individual during his life, and rendering the tie indissoluble, during that period, except for crime. As the chattel principle is the central principle of slavery, so the absolute denial of individuality to the wife, is the necessary condition and essential idea of the marriage relation. Nor, while the central principles of these two abominations are granted existence, can the wrongs of the slave or of the wife be righted

The master owns the slave; let no man interfere, says the law. The husband owns the wife, her affections, her whole being, EXCLUSIVELY; let no man interfere with his rights, says the law again.

“Woman! She is his slave. She has become  
A thing I weep to speak—the child of scorn,  
The outcast of a desolated home.”

All men admit that slavery is wrong in its fundamental principles, and should cease to exist. Then, why not marriage? Because it is “a social compact”—required “by a recognized social necessity.” “On this ground, for this reason alone, does the state rightfully interfere with it, honor it, prescribe regulations and conditions for it. Nay, if marriage were not a political as well as personal matter—the assumption of a new responsibility to the state as well as of new and endearing relations to the chosen one—it would be hard to say, why there should be any public and formal marriage at all.” So says Greeley. Can he define that responsibility, divide exactly between the politicality and personality of marriage? Tell wherein mere marriage adds to man’s civil relations? Did these political responsibilities of the wedded two, exist before, and call for, the institution of the state, or did the state create them? The union of two for love and offspring existed before the state, and had no need of that to perfect it.

But political economists consider the main duty of government to be the preservation of the rights of property, and as the husband owns the wife, HE becomes legally responsible to the state for HER, just as he would be for the damages done by slaves or live stock. So it would seem, Greeley thinks, for he adds: “Other engagements neither so important nor so delicate are every day made and acted on without allowing any knowledge of their existence, beyond the narrow circle of those specially interested; and so would and should this, if a recognized social necessity did not urgently require for it formality and publicity.” True—love-union between two is entirely a personal matter. But marriage—the perfecting of the title-deed to woman—has necessity for as much care as the transfer of land. The “social necessity” grows out of the ownership principle of marriage, but for which, it might be a personal matter, a private contract, above and beyond the jurisdiction of the state.

Calhoun called slavery the corner-stone of the social compact, as Greeley calls marriage its key-stone. Both consider the protection of property to be the chief end of government, especially the ownership of man or woman. Don’t touch slavery in the states, or the Union will go to pieces! Don’t interfere with marriage as it is, or you will wrench asunder the pillars of the state! But we deny altogether the popular postulate of to-day, that the individual must be robbed of his rights to make society stable. The state comes into being, to maintain rights, not destroy them—to preserve, not to swallow up, the integrity of man. What are human rights worth, if they can be crushed at any moment, for an imagined social necessity? Suppose the tables turned, and man be, by marriage, stripped of his identity and placed in bonds to woman; would he submit with ‘a sweet and holy grace’ to a social necessity which thus defined the sphere and duties of his life? If not, let him cease prating about social necessities and the rights of man.

Call the union of the two sexes a political matter, a civil right, like that of suffrage—what then? Society has the power to permit, prohibit, or regulate, whenever and however it will, for the welfare of the whole, the consummation of the marriage rite. It may compel all, with sound frames and cool heads, to marry for procreation, as their sole end and aim, and yet prohibit sexual contact, oftener than once in five years, or altogether.

Let compulsory moralists look upon society, as it is, see the slaves of rum, tobacco, and lust among men, the victims of fashion, scrofula, and sexual excess among women, and answer, if the good of society does not give it the right to prevent such from procreating

their like? Does not a stern social necessity require such puritanic laws, to keep up the physical vigor and mental soundness of the race? There died in the U. S., annually, from 1840 to 1850, 47,823 inebriates; and for the same period, annually, 20,274 children under ten years of age, died from hereditary inebriety. Thirty eight per cent of the children born in the U. S. do not reach the age of five years. Has not society a right to sunder the unions which produce such fruits? Ah! Says the compulsory moralist, such interference would destroy the indissolubility of the marriage tie, and profane its sacredness! Talk about the holiness of the tie, when it is made a mere cover for the most damning lust, which shows itself in the sodden faces, hopeless air, and downcast spirit of a large majority of married women, and through the brutal, vicious, and degraded character of the offspring! Not many children are born now, because the mother wishes it, but because it cannot be helped. Motherhood is forced upon her. Harriet K. Hunt has well pictured the result: "The child that is accepted as a necessity—nursed and tended grudgingly—has one birthright. But the child loved and cared for in embryo, and received in the fullness of conjugal, paternal and maternal love, has quite another birthright! I put this down here, only as a hint; but is it not a significant one? It is an outline of a truth. You can see the disregard of that truth in the sorrowful perversions all around us."—Thus indissoluble marriage brings into being an unloved and unloving offspring. It makes home cheerless, a mere scene of domestic discord.

Observation gives the lie to the claim, that the present system guaranties the child's right to love and a home of love. "My way of life," says H. K. Hunt, "has led me for many years, both as a teacher and as a physician, to the observation of homes. The view has been a sad, a very sad one. The joy of gratitude I have felt for my own privileges, has been mixed with sorrow for the neglected childhood I have seen around me. I do not care what after delights and alleviations may be in store for the life of a neglected child, there will always be a void—a cheat—a sorrow—a loneliness in its being, which it will feel, though often not understand."

These facts conflict with the idea that the rights of the child are best maintained, by marriage as it is. Let Greeley, Hine and Co., with their greatest-good-of-society principle, "perfect their system" of sacrificing the individual, ere they force it upon others as divine. Let them cease to insult woman by the taunt, that if not compelled by law to be virtuous, she would descend to common prostitution. Even the most degraded of wives, who are forced to unwilling and loathsome embraces by their legal owners, if free, would be purer and chaster than now. Nor do we believe the North-side or South-side view of the gospel according to Legree, has bettered a single character or saved a single soul.

Lewis the novelist, comes to the rescue of compulsory morality, as follows: "That the law transmutes a desire into a crime is very true." So, without the law, free love is no crime. Again: "Marriage is indissoluble! And rightly so, for this one reason—WHATEVER IS INEVITABLE SOON CEASES TO BE A HARDSHIP; the very power which human beings have of adapting themselves to almost any condition, makes them accept their fate with tranquillity, provided that fate be certain and unequivocal." Marriage then, transmutes wrong, outrage, despotism into no hardship at all, by making them "inevitable!" Manhood itself is outraged by such a plea. Marriage pleads it in vain. The tendency of the age is toward the recognition of the supremacy of natural right—the integrity of individual freedom—as above all compacts and constitutions. As light dawns upon woman, she struggles for freedom and will have it. Though her hopes have been crushed, her character blighted, and the very fountains of her being drained of life, by the despotism of marriage, freedom will thrill the pulses of a new existence through her veins.

## ALL IS HARMONY.

BY E. L. CRANE.

MR. EDITOR:—Political matters being about finished and business affairs not very pressing, my mind is turned a little more to your critical journal, than usual. Your writers are getting nearly out of reach of my ken. "Law of Love," "Law of Progression in Harmony," "Freedom of the Affections," "The Harmony of Nature," "Stand Point of View," "Lower Harmonies of Nature," "A Thing may be right from a Lower Plane of Observation, but wrong when viewed from a Higher Plane of Observation." Now all these technicalities may be to your writers as clear as sunbeams, but to me they are most confoundingly foggy. From my "plane of observation," I can see nothing but Harmony throughout the entire workings of nature; in this, I mean to embrace every physical movement, and every mental and moral or immoral action in God's Universe. I hope some philosophical writer for your paper will take some ONE action or thought of the quadrillions which surround him, and show that such ONE action or thought is not in perfect harmony with all that preceded it. Has a man thought a vile thought? Show me that such thought, is not the necessary and legitimate sequence of the billions of things preceding and connected with such "vile thought." As astonishing as it may appear to some, even all the vagaries of the minds of Mr. Patterson, Mr. Hine, Mr. Treat, Mr. Pyburn, Mr. Towner, and my own, are in perfect harmony with every thing surrounding. Storms whether in the physical or in the mental elements, are in harmony with the calms which they have succeeded. "Every state of society is perfectly natural," says Mr. Hine. Mr. Hine shows some signs of sanity, say I. The Harmonies of nature produce a storm which rends every thing before it; the harmonies of nature; from this storm in part, produce calm and sunshine, which heal and soothe the effects of the storm. The harmonies of nature produce a thief. The harmonies of nature punish the thief—heal and soothe the effects of the theft. The harmonies of nature produce a lecherous being who contends for free lust. The harmonies of nature produce more thinking, or deeper thinking beings, who can see, or think they can, that such free lust would cause woes unnumbered to the human family, and accordingly laws are made to keep in check that free lust practitioner. The harmonies of nature make the free lust contender object to such restraint, but the same harmonies push the necessity of such checks, and the weaker thought has to give way. The harmonies of nature produce a cancer on the foot. The harmonies of nature make the head say the foot must be cut off; the foot objects, but the stronger reason triumphs, and the foot according to the combined harmonies of nature has to submit.—Never fear friends, all is harmony, and Dad's at the helm.

CLEAR AS LIGHT.—So a Methodist priest made the subject of miracles the other night, he thought. 'A watchmaker can arrest the motion of a watch he makes; so can God, that of his works. To deny this, makes God an arbitrary creator, who finished his work at the Creation, and has nothing now to do! Why limit him thus? Why not give scope of action forever?' Very well; why limit God's truth by the lids of the bible? Why deny to Him, that there was any need of revelations to man since the apostles wrote? Why not give Him a chance to say, as well as to do? Again: 'What produced an impression that it was a miracle, was such, because nothing else could have produced that impression on the minds of the men of that time.' So the sun must have stood still! The Jews were impressed that it did. 'Twas a fact then, that Jonah was in the whale's belly three days? Rev. Dr. Wisner once said, if the bible had said, Jonah swallowed the whale, he would have believed it! And if so written, by our friend's logic, it must have been equally true!

MY SOUL'S THRALLDOM AND ITS DELIVERANCE.  
AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

BY ANNE DENTON CRIDGE.

CHAPTER VII.

Robert Owen;—"The Great Atonement;"—Perfection of Jesus;—Revelations;—Paul and Women;—Barkerism, Sectism and Quakerism;—The Stern Useful;—The Marriage Question.

The Old Testament after considerable discussion and examination, we regarded as history, and not inspired, but to the New Testament we clung tenaciously. Solomon's Song, however, sometime previously we discarded, as a love song. One prop after another was removed, and though part of the superstructure fell, the main building and towers still stood proudly above the ruins. Their doom was fixed nevertheless; the sentence had gone forth, but from their crumbling fragments have arisen eternal mansions.

Robert Owen came to Darlington to lecture on Socialism. Being there on a visit for a few days, uncle Jacques wished me to go and hear him. In vain he told me he was as good as any Christian he ever knew;—how benevolent he was;—that he had spent a fortune in trying to benefit others;—that he was a good speaker, etc., etc. It was all in vain; he was an infidel, and I would not listen to one.

Socialism I scarcely stopped to consider. Owenites, or Socialists, had been represented to me, as regarding wives as common property as well as land, etc. Uncle often told me it was false; that if I would read their works, I would have better ideas respecting them, but he made so much ridicule and fun of religion, [orthodox religion, of course,] and of all I considered sacred, that he had not the influence over me he otherwise would have had. I looked upon him as a mocker and blasphemer; consequently, one to whose suggestions and advice, like the "great adversary of souls," I ought not to listen.

Now, all connected with orthodoxy appears so absurd and ridiculous, that often, like him, I am disposed to ridicule, but I know well it only does harm. Their opinions to the orthodox are sacred. We should only use, to combat their errors, reason and sound argument.

My brother William was in London finishing his school education. He was zealous and devoted in religion. Had begun to speechify a little on Temperance, and had made, what was considered, an excellent speech on the occasion of our Sabbath School anniversary. How well I remember many of our "brethren" saying: "That young Denton will be an itinerant preacher, some day." To them that seemed the top-stone of aspiration.

Brother and I wrote long letters to each other. We wrote almost wholly on religious subjects. Each gave to the other, truth as it was presented; hence, we went hand in hand together. Barker's tracts I forwarded to him as they came out. When his tracts on the Atonement appeared, we all thought Joseph had gone too "far." Mother said she would not allow me to send them to William; they would unsettle his mind and do him no good.

I felt very anxious for him to read them. I was greatly perplexed and wanted his thoughts on the subject; so I sent them on the sly. William was some time in doubt. Many, many letters passed between us before he could give up the "great Atonement." Christ dying to satisfy an angry, avenging God! Original sin was struck out of our vocabulary. We were thus prepared for another grand step. If no infinite sin was committed, why require an infinite atonement? Why die to bring man to God? Was it not sin that separated us from God? Did he not, in scripture language, die to save us from our sins? Was not God always ready and willing to save when people turned from their sins? Even under the old dispensation (though many believe sacrifices were typi-

cal of Christ's death, and that God was pleased with burnt offerings and sacrifices,) God is supposed to say, I commanded you not in the day I brought you out of Egypt concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices; but this commanded I, obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.—Jer. vii: 22.

In another part (I have forgotten where, now, for my bible is sadly neglected?) God says, cease to do evil; learn to do well; come now and let us reason together, etc., proving that at all times sin was the only barrier between God and man. True, Christ came, as Barker expressed it, to make us AT-ONE-MENT, or at one with God, by teaching us to put away sin; why talk of "Christ's blood," or his blood washing all sin away? "The blood of Christ was shed on the shrubs of Calvary." It was his life, his example, his goodness, and not his blood, that contained virtue. "He came to reconcile us to God," and not God to us.

How much more beautiful appeared the character of God; with how much more confidence and zest we could call him our father. We looked upon him as a God of love, of wisdom, and of unbounded care and tenderness towards us, his children. How much more beautiful the scriptures appeared; they certainly were on our side. Strange that we did not see it before!

Onward we went; one obstacle removed only prepared the way for another, to share the same fate?

Could we live a life as pure as Christ's? Was he a perfect example for us, if he could not or had not the power to sin?

Rather dangerous ground! We felt like taking off our shoes; but everything was being dissected; we had imbibed the idea that what would not bear the light of investigation, had better be thrown overboard. So we took courage and investigated truth—lovingly and prayerfully.

Christ was tempted. The devil had even so much power over him as to set him on a pinnacle of the temple. Some objected that that was only figurative language. Another who believed in the literal interpretation of scripture, then interposed: "Why, then, the account of Christ's being forty days in the wilderness, tempted of the devil, was figurative, too." "Well," said a third, "suppose they are both figurative; that he was tempted in spirit;—that for forty days, he was exercised by a sore temptation to fall down and worship the devil; to forego his mission for the beauties of the world which he is represented as seeing from the temple; does it not prove that he could have sinned; yes, more; that he was inclined to sin. Or take it the other way—literally. It is still the same, or perhaps worse, for he so far yielded to the devil, as to allow him to lift him on the pinnacle of the temple, which proves clearly that he could sin and was greatly tempted or disposed to sin."

Some of "our weak brothers and sisters" were shocked at this discussion; they thought we ought to stop now; that we had gone far enough; that we would be atheists, or infidels, unless we took care; that Christ suffered himself to be tempted, that he might be, as the Testament says, "like unto his brethren." Yes, but it says, "he was IN ALL POINTS like unto his brethren." Now if in ALL points, then was he fallible. He would not have been a perfect example unless he was. We little dreamed that we were taking from the divinity of Christ, and being prepared to reject the miraculous conception as a miraculous abomination. The Trinity, to us, was a triune lie; the Old Testament a historical book. The devil with his "brimstone stoves" was bankrupt. Christ was fallible, for if there was no longer a devil, then was Christ "tempted by his own lusts." We were considerably ahead; we saw not "men as trees walking," but clearly, correctly; it was not yet mid-day, however.

Some of us did not believe in revelations. Henry Palphramand and a few others were

"so daring" as to believe if we would listen to "the spirit" which was given to every man to profit withal," we would be able to discover which parts were the words of God, and which were not.

When the question of women speaking in public was discussed, Henry said he had thought about all the passages bearing on that subject; that he had laid the matter before the Lord, and it was his firm belief that all passages bearing on that subject, derogatory to woman, were interpolations. They found their birth among the prejudices, respecting woman, so prevalent at that time.

Though many differed from this opinion, we all came to the conclusion that it was right for woman to speak in public. "In Christ Jesus there is no difference, neither Jew or Greek, bond or free, male or female;" if so, why should man make any difference?

True, Paul said, I suffer not a woman to speak in the church; yet in another part, he gives directions how she shall speak; yes, with the head covered. Paul said some things of himself, and probably said many of which he does not tell us.

We were not prepared to go so far as Palphramand, and as we were a little puzzled, (one passage contradicting another,) we concluded to "LEAVE IT." "Leave it" is a very convenient phrase, when in a tight corner; we often had occasion to use it, as we journeyed along; the true meaning is this, REJECT IT; for whatever we left, we found struck out of our creed, and common sense substituted in its place.

Every Sunday morning we had a prayer meeting. This was held about a mile from our house. On my way thither, Thomas Smith, a young Quaker, often met me. "Let me persuade thee," he would say, "not to attend these Barkerite meetings; do go with me to Friends' meeting house. I know thee will like our meetings better." I told him that I thought I would like their meetings very well, and would certainly become a Quaker if I thought it right to belong to any sect. "Now, Annie, allow me to say, though you call yourselves Christians, and reject any other name than the name of Christ, you are, nevertheless, a sect." "When I am convinced of that truth, I will leave them—not before," I replied.

Thomas did all he could to bring me to his fold; assured me he would not marry out of the church, and when he found I could not be a Quaker, he bade me good bye.

I said, that we regarded the bible as history, but we retained the commandments as sacred, for this reason; when a young man came to Christ to know what he should do, etc., Christ replied, "Thou knowest the commandments," etc.

One commandment reads, "Thou shalt not make to thyself the likeness of any graven image that is in the heavens above, or the earth beneath," etc.

This was brought forward for discussion at one of our meetings, and the question asked, is it right to make or buy likenesses or pictures of any kind?

Clarkson—the young man who introduced the question—thought it wrong to buy books containing pictures, or to hang pictures up in houses. Many of our "brothers and sisters" agreed with him. They determined to put all their pictures away—to have no more in their houses.

Clarkson had one in the room in which we were holding our meetings. Some one pointed to it and asked if he was going to sell it. He said he could not do that conscientiously; but he intended either to destroy it, or put it out of sight.

"You must not destroy it," said his mother, an old lady. "I think too much of it for that." "An idol," chimed in her son, which was strikingly convincing to some.

At our next meeting I looked for the picture; it was gone.

I did not feel interested in this discussion. I looked calmly on; heard both sides; could not answer and did not feel disposed to answer the objection urged. I could not by any efforts of mine, think the question of any importance, though I thought I ought. I loved

pictures; it was a part of my being. In childhood, pictures and flowers were my idols. No bible or religious dogma could root that divine love from my soul. So it is with any principles which are so intimately connected with the soul, as to seem the soul itself. All the dogmas, anathemas and vile teachings of priests, and fools cannot destroy them. Throw in the sand and pebbles as they may, the waters of life only rise higher. Though it may seem choked up, their crystal drops are hid in its bosom, and occasionally well up to cheer and bless.

We tried to be Christians, but could not. The fact is, "a Christian, indeed," is a ninny, a simple, soft, moaning, dreary, cheerless being. To be a Christian, a man must forego all that is manlike and independent; he must shut his eyes to all that is beautiful, and make to himself a "waste howling wilderness." I am just reminded of Crieg, a good Christian in Bristol, who founded an orphan asylum which was supported by the "Providence of God," or in proper phraseology, chance. In his autobiography, he speaks of sailing on the beautiful Rhine, but remarks, "I thank God I was enabled to shut my eyes, and thus keep my mind stayed upon God."

Beauty among our Christians or Barkerites, became a crime; the stern useful only, was divine. My brother William so far carried out this idea, as to have a coat made without buttons, because the coat did not require to be buttoned; he considered button-holes and buttons useless, therefore wrong.

We laughed at him often, but he wore it on bravely, feeling himself, I suppose, persecuted for righteousness' sake. How far from that groveling pit, I often think, he is now, when I read his "song of beauty," or hear him lecture on beauty. The soul's wings were cut, but they have grown again, and gloriously it soars on high.

The marriage question, for the first time, I heard discussed in one of our meetings; for the first time, I heard marriage denounced. It was argued that God's laws were sufficient for his children; we were the Children of Jehovah; he was our law-giver, and we should recognize none other. Marriage was a personal matter; that love only ought to bind people together; that any other bonds were impure.

This was quite an exciting question. It continued several weeks. I opposed it with all my might while in society. I thought we ought to conform to the rules of society.—For the sake of order and decency, there ought to be some form, or rather it ought to be made public, that such and such had come together, and I considered the then present method quite as good as any other.

Some said, that if not bound by law, the husband could leave the wife. "Very good," was the answer; "then he had better leave; if love will not keep them together, they had better part."

This idea had hundreds of converts—converts who did something more than the theorizing converts of the present day; they practiced their theory. Society disapproved and pointed the finger of scorn, but they lived it down and were recognized as married, though it was not by law.

I. Walker—a believer in what I suppose would be called at this time, FREE LOVE, but I should call it free marriage—was anxious that he and I marry ourselves; draw up a code of laws, our parents be present and witness the signing of them, and if at any time we violated any of these laws, that we consider the contract broken and could separate. He believed God's laws sufficient, and yet he must have his code of laws to govern his wife. I of course objected to this novel marriage.

## FREE LOVE AGAIN.

BY L. A. HINE.

Too much cannot be urged, by way of caution, to the unmarried. The greatest interests of life, this side of our daily bread, are involved in the marriage relation.

Neither can too much be said to the married, by way of caution, against every insidious approach of disaffection. Marriage should be contracted with the greatest prudence, and when its obligations are once assumed, they should be held sacred—too sacred to be desecrated by the wiles of the Free Lover, the craft of the Flirt, or the malice of the envious and the mischief-maker.

Marriage is man's first step from perfect isolation. It is the first form of society and government. Out of it, flow all the beatitudes of general sociality, and at its altar all government is baptized. The most reputable historical philosophers agree that civil government originated in the Family, and whenever Familism shall be perfected, Government itself will be perfect.

What then is the system of human, moral, social, and civil order? It is 1, Man as an individual, solitary and alone. 2, The Family, the first natural, divine, and indispensable co-operation of individuals for the greatest purposes and highest enjoyments of life. 3, The civil union of families for the protection of husband, wife, and children—or government.

The time may come, when each individual will be so fully developed, that civil government will be dispensed with, in respect to all its force and forms. Still, the association of families will continue, for sociality is an intrinsic attribute of human nature. The family can never be dispensed with, for the following reasons. 1, The union of male and female, is a divine ordinance, for the completion of our being, and the perpetuation of the race. 2, The affection of parents for their children, and of children for their parents, renders the union of the father and mother an indispensability. No progress in development can eradicate this affection. No human being ever was, or ever will be, so perfect as to transcend the relation of husband or wife, of father or mother. No community of individuals, ever can be so perfect as to lose all regard for sexual companionships, or for their own children in contradistinction to the offspring of others. The perfection of man, is also the perfection of the family relation, cementing more and more the union of male and female, and more completely unfolding all the relations and blessings of Familism.

If the objector say there are some now, who have outgrown the family relation, let it be replied, that such specimens of perfected humanity should be exhibited at large through the world. There always has been a class of persons above this relation, whose haunts are the thousand houses of ill-fame, in every city of one hundred thousand people. But are there some of the perfectly chaste, who have outgrown the family? Let them stand forth, in their assumption and self-righteousness, that we may look all about them, and observe the harmonies that attune their existence! It is here asserted that every one of you are attempting to eradicate from your being, some of the indispensable attributes of harmonic men and women. Oh man! If thou hast no respect for thy wife, thou wilt have no regard for thy brother, but will probably attempt to disrupt his household, by seducing his companion. Oh woman! Hast thou no love for thy husband, above all other men? Thou wilt have no respect for thy sister, but will be found desecrating her household, by enticing away her husband.

But oh! domestic discord! Family despotism! Enslaved affections!! Uncongenial marriage!! Deliver us from this bondage, and give freedom to our great love!!!

It is asserted here, that nearly all domestic discord, flows from one of the following causes: 1, Deficiency of moral integrity, in respect to family relations and duties—as theft results from a lack of moral perception of the right of property. 2, Fashion, which be-devils small minds, and creates hatred of the husband who can't afford its expense. 3, Instability of character, which induces a dislike of husband or wife, after a brief association, and an attachment to fresh lovers. 4, Vanity, a desire to be the queen, and finding some one that more fully fills her eye as a king, than her husband, she complains of his uncongeniality, and desires a new alliance. 5, The interposition of an outsider, an attractive, fascinating man or woman, as the case may be, who wins affection that belongs to another, and thus renders two others miserable till their union is dissolved, and injures their children afterward. There is nothing more contemptible than this. 6, A disregard of the holiest duties of life, and a disposition to “gad about”, gossip and flirt after marriage. Such are the most trifling persons. 7, A lack of enough to do or think of, to keep the mind above the flatteries of the exquisite and foolish. 8, Lusting after other women: tired of one, attached to another, and call it love. 9, Idleness. 10, A sedentary and so-called genteel life.

These causes cover nearly all the cases of domestic discord; and yet the cry is raised of “enchained affections”!! What! Shall truth and philosophy condescend to root out some of the highest qualities of human nature, to gratify such foolish, whimsical, namby-pamby, wishy-washy, sentimental fops and flirts!! Away then, praters about the miseries of marriage, when such a scampish horde importune for relief. I do not say there are not some who are honorably anxious to be delivered from domestic woe. For such law and public sentiment now provide.

---

#### NOTHING BUT A DREAM.

---

Having read the foregoing article, “Free Love Again,” I put the manuscript in my pocket and went to Methodist meeting. The sermon was dull as usual, and while the preacher preached, I slept, and while I slept, I dreamed. I seemed to see the Author of the article on the road of progress that leads to philosophical consistency. His starting point was the despotism of marriage, and on his way, he embraced one despotism after another, till he became the consistent friend of all: first, the tyranny of marriage, then of chattel slavery, then of superstition and the church, then of absolute monarchy. The acute and comprehensive intellect of our progressive friend was not long in discovering the analogies between marriage slavery and chattel slavery, and the general correspondence of the logic by which these forms of human bondage are sustained and justified; and as he KNEW the absolute necessity for marriage and held to its essential godliness, he was philosopher enough, though it outraged his humanity somewhat, to follow the lead of his sober intellections, and accept of “chattelism” as God-ordained. Having made this progress, he very readily discovered the divine sanctions of priestcraft and kingcraft, and he leapt with enthusiasm, into the arms of both so nearly at the same time, that I could not tell which he embraced first. He made eloquent speeches at the several stages of his progress; and one at the start which was very much like the preceding article, and the others not very unlike it. It would make my report entirely too long to give even a brief summary of all these discourses, and so I will present the more prominent features of but one: and this was delivered in his new capacity of priest, after

he had become the consistent friend of the entire family of despotisms.

"DEARLY BELOVED:—Too much cannot be urged, by way of exhortation, to the unconverted. The greatest interests of life, temporal and eternal, are involved in the ministrations of the church.

"Neither can too much be said to the converted, by way of caution, against every insidious approach of disaffection. Connection with the church should be sought with the greatest seriousness, and when its obligations are once assumed, they should be held sacred—too sacred to be desecrated by the wiles of the Spiritualist, the craft of the infidel, and the malice of the envious and the mischief-maker.

"Above all things does it behoove us to inculcate the sacredness of those principles which maintain the subserviency of inferiors to superiors, and of individuals to institutions. Our relations to the church are sacred, as no one will question: the relations of subjects to their most gracious sovereign are sacred, for kings rule by divine right: the relations of servants to their masters, are sacred, for the holy apostle says: 'Servants, be obedient to your masters;' and the relations of the wife to the husband, are sacred, for it is written in the Book of divine law: 'Wives, submit yourselves to your husbands.'—Blaspheming philosophers may call these relations arbitrary and unnatural, but we who are specially favored of the Lord, know them to be sacred. Bring these relations into discredit, and you have no pledge for the security of virtue and religion; no guaranty for the supremacy of law and order;—break down these consecrated barriers, and as certain as the decrees of Omnipotence would irreligion and anarchy prevail, and God's wrath be upon all the people!

"The church is the means of human perfection. Out of it flows the staple of all beatitudes; and at its altar is all government baptized. All the most reputable Christian philosophers agree that without the beneficent influence of the church, government would be only organized diabolism, as the "reign of terror" in France, unmistakably proves.

"What, then, is the system of human, moral, social and civil order? 1, Man as an individual, solitary and alone. 2, The family, the first natural, divine and indispensable cooperation of individuals, for the greatest purposes and the highest enjoyments of life.—3, The relation of master and servant for the mutual benefit of both, especially of the servant; for all of which we have a divine precedent in the family, where the wife is subject to the husband, and the children to both. 4, The ecclesiastical hierarchy by which man's relations to God and the future, are duly sustained. 5, The civil union of families and their attaches for the protection of husband, wife and children, master, servant, people, priest and king—or government. 6, The divine functionary in which the principle of government concentrates, for the good of all—or the absolute monarch.

"Visionary enthusiasts may dream of a time when each individual will be so completely developed that the state, church, slavery and marriage will be dispensed with; but while such madmen ignore the divine doctrine of total depravity, they are themselves living examples of its truth. Through the paternal solicitude of the Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe, all these institutions will remain in their organized force and forms, till the end of time. The church, of which I now particularly speak, cannot be dispensed with for the following reasons: 1, Religion is a human necessity. 2, The great masses of men must have visible forms to adore; and if they do not find these as intermediates in the living priesthood, they will find them as finalities, in the creations of rank idolatry. 3, Hence, relations of peace and good-will obtain between the people and the clergy, and the organization of the church becomes an indispensability. The perfection of man is to be found in the perfection of the church—cementing more and more the brotherly union of man with his fellow man, and more completely unfolding all the relations and blessings of true religion.

"If the objector say there are some men who have outgrown the church, let it be replied that such specimens of perfected humanity should be exhibited at large through the world. [Rather a shrewd reply.] There always has been a class of persons above religion, whose haunts are free discussion clubs, houses of ill-fame and other dens of riot and debauchery. But are there some of the perfectly religious who have outgrown the church? Let them stand forth in their assumed righteousness, that we may look all about them, and observe the harmonies that attune their existence! It is here asserted that all such are grieving away the spirit, and closing the door of mercy against themselves forever. O, man, if thou hast no regard for the church and its holy ministrations, thou wilt have no regard for thy brother! O, woman, hast thou no regard for the church and its holy orders, as the embodiment of the divine power on earth, and as that which consecrates even government and marriage—institutions so dear to woman; then wilt thou have no respect for thy sister, but wilt be found desecrating her family altar, and dragging her down to hell with thyself.

"But, O, sectarian feuds! Ecclesiastical discord! enslaved religion!! Superstition and ignorance! Deliver us from this bondage, and give freedom to conscience!!

"It is here asserted that nearly all irreligion flows from one of the following causes:—  
 1, Deficiency of moral integrity in respect to the holiness of the church and the nature of religious duty, as theft results from a lack of a moral perception of the right of property.  
 2, The human frailty of fickleness, so great in some, that with all the means of grace, they will not keep on in the straight and narrow road.  
 3, Vanity, which causes many to affect singularity of opinions.  
 4, An unholy ambition, which causes some to seek glorification for themselves, in a coterie of petty admirers.  
 5, The interposition of outsiders, or, in other words, wolves in sheep's clothing who devour the flock.  
 6, A disregard of the holiest duties of life; a disposition to gad about, and talk lightly of sacred things.  
 7, Lusting after new things; tired of an old doctrine; taking to another, and calling it progress.  
 8, Habits of study which lead to philosophy and scepticism. Our common schools are hot-beds of infidelity.  
 9, Heretical vagaries dubbed science, such as Geology, Phrenology, Animal Magnetism, and lastly, but more contemptible than all, Spiritualism, breeding all shapes of irreligion.  
 10, 'Free investigation,' as they call it, the greatest abomination, on earth; and as the culmination of all that is fatal to society and religion, it is more tenderly fostered by the devil than any other scourge of humanity.

"These causes cover nearly all the cases of irreligion; but yet the cry is raised of 'enchained conscience!' What! shall truth and religion condescend to depraved passions, and gratify such foolish, whimsical, namby-pamby, wishy-washy, sentimental philosophers and progressives!! Away, then, praters about the wrongs of the church, when such a scampish horde importune relief from its restraining influence. There are enough sincerely anxious to be delivered from the wholesome restraints of the church; and if these must roll sin as a sweet morsel under their tongues, and we cannot induce them to remain with the Lord, our skirts are clear, and the Prince of Darkness must claim his own. Amen."

During the utterance of the last words, I was half asleep and half awake, partly dreaming and partly listening; and I could not tell certain whether the words were those of the priest in my dream, or of the one actually before me. Suffice it to say that all the senses were soon active enough, and the zealous brother in the pulpit, was storming away at the people in real Methodistical fashion, warning them against Spiritualism, Infidelity and Free Love; threatening them—if they did not heed—with the vengeance of God and the tortures of an eternal hell.

If brother Hine suspects any intention in the foregoing, to cast reflection upon his philosophical consistency, he must remember that it is "nothing but a dream!"

THAT MATHEMATICAL PROBLEM.

BY JOSEPH TREAT.

Something was done? Who did it? That's the problem.

The problem concedes my main position—the grand Axiom, “All Truth Mathematical.” Even if “Spirits” produced the phenomena, yet the very “Spirits” are Mathematics. Then whatever was done, Mathematics did it! Call that one point gained.

But now for the demonstration! All possible Mathematics are embodied in the human organism. That organism is an epitome of the Universe: the whole Universe is in that organism—is that organism, focalized. Human organisms, then, produced those phenomena! How? We haven't got to that.

But the human Spirit, and the human organism, are two distinct things—the Spirit is in the organism. That's the very point in dispute, whether there is anything *but* the organism? You assume that. But my “Mathematics” will not let you assume it; and presently will demonstrate, that it positively is not true!

But must there not be something in the human organism, and back of it, to build it up—make it what it is? No, right the other way. Organization is not the product of Mental Manifestation; but on the other hand: Mental Manifestation is the product of Organization. Once for all: Organization is the parent of Life, Intelligence, Spirit, everything!

Whence comes the organization, then? That is self-existent: that's the Universe!—Might as well ask, whence comes Nature—whence comes any thing? And if you do ask that, as if some grand Spirit-of-all must certainly have been at work—a great, infinite Spirit—then, Whence came that infinite Spirit? Cornered at last?

But how when a man climbs a ladder 50 feet, with twice his own weight on his back? Must there not be a Spirit in his body, to overcome Gravity? And mustn't there be in a Tree? That overcomes Gravity a full thousand years! And the human organism, is as much higher, and more potential than that of a Tree as you can think. Depend upon it, I mean something, when I say that Organization is the parent of all things! I mean that the higher the organism, the greater and more wonderful its products. May be we shall yet find the human organism, equal to all these astounding and infinite phenomena!

But what, when the man dies? Why, his organism dies, and of course its fruits die with it—that's all! It dies; and so its resulting Mind, Power, and Action, all die. Instead of DISSOLUTION—of a connection subsisting between it and something within it—there is simply DESTRUCTION—of the organism itself—and that tells the whole story: explains every thing. Don't it?

But the organism still exists, after the man is dead. No, it don't: something exists, but it's not the same; it's dead, now. It is no more the same, than a dead tree is a live one. The tree may still stand; but it has already begun to decompose, and will not stop till it falls: so a man's dead organism, commences disorganizing the very instant he dies; and it won't stop, till it's all nothing! So the moment you killed it, that moment you killed all its products; even though you could preserve it, a thousand years!

But human beings can't produce such phenomena without intending it—can't produce them and yet be all the time unconscious of it! How do you know that? Do you know it? Come be modest! Have you ever spent five whole minutes in your life in asking whether they perhaps could not? No; but you jumped the conclusion! Just as you jump every thing else, on this subject! Time you should begin to think!

But the problem. What produced those phenomena? Power! But all Power, too, is in the human organism. There is not a Force in the infinite Universe, but is concentrated

in the live body of a man: that body, is literally the coming-together-and-union of all Forces! And then, human organisms, again, produced the phenomena!

But still again: A Principle produced them. No matter what, but yet some Principle. But now, that Principle is represented in man's organization. The Microcosm contains all that is to be found in the Macrocosm, and more too. So, even again, human organisms produced the phenomena!

But yet once more; Spirits produced them. But I am a Spirit, nor will own in all Dream-land a peer! WE are Spirits; and we are the Spirits! Matter ascends to higher and yet higher organisms, each organism respectively developing a higher and yet higher manifestation of Life; until at last we arrive at Man's organism, which ultimates that full and perfect Intelligence, Power, and Moral Unfolding, which we call a Soul—a true and absolute Spirit! And then, even yet once more, human organisms wrought the phenomena. But there are other Spirits, besides us—Spirits who have left the human organism. Prove it, then—for that is the very thing to be proved—and I challenge that you can't prove it! And look you "Mathematics" will soon prove the reverse! For it is not, my "bare assertion," as the problem says. It was not, before. "J. H." should have been just!

HAS a man a Spirit, then—or, is he a Spirit? Just which you please. But wont it make a difference? Give us your rationale. No, it wont make any; only so you do not imply that he has a Spirit distinct from his body—a Spirit, which after all is no part of his body. Mind, Soul and Spirit are all one: and Man, and a Human Organism are one: and then either of the first terms, equals each of the last and vice versa. Or, you may speak of the Brain as more particularly the Soul, or Spirit; and then you will distinguish between the Man and his body: though, yet, when the man dies, I guess his SOUL will be about as Immortal as any other part of the carcass! [Pardon me, blessed reader! for the very tears are in my eyes, for love! and I can not seek to wound your holiest feelings, on a subject so sacred to you as this! But I must write my truth: I must give forth all my inspiration. And yourself be brave; and willing to look whatever record in the face!] And then he will be a DEAD Soul, as before he was a live one: and when the organism has returned to its original elements, then it will be no Soul at all; but only there was such a Soul. A Spirit DID exist, but it exists now, no longer. There is no more any HE.

A four-fold demonstration of what produced those phenomena—Mathematics, Power, a Principle, Spirits: and in either case, living, human beings! Now for a demonstration of what did not produce them—disembodied Spirits. But that is demonstrated already. That first point gained—"all Truth mathematical"—as soon gains this other, also—no departed Spirits! Once grant "Mathematics," and you give up all! But still you must grant; and then you shall be compelled to give up! You will begin to see pretty soon, that Mathematics is a "great science?"

For, your "Spirit" is a nothing! It don't weigh anything, when it leaves the body: and it don't weigh two hairs of your head, after it has left; nor then on, forever! There is not enough of it to be a Spirit! It's got to be "Mathematical?" but there absolutely is not Matter enough in six feet by two of air, (still less, what floats in six feet by two of air,) to make a "Mathematical" Spirit! The fact stares you in the face! I defy you to dilute MY Spirit to that thinner—than—gas? But in very deed the name of every Spirit is Lightning! and eternal Lightning! and even a true and infinite Omnipotence! and then to talk of such a Spirit in six feet by two of air, which I could dissipate with one puff, and which I almost have to turn away my nose every time I breathe, to keep from doing—nonsense! it's all stuff! there isn't a syllable of truth in it! I deny not impossibilities; but I do deny any such impossibility! For myself, I absolutely know the thing can not be!

But Electricity exists, and Magnetism. Yes, and I grant they are Mathematical, too. But they don't exist "Spirits;" they are not individualized in six feet by two of air; they are either soon wasted and gone, or they are supplied from the granite ribs of the great globe itself. But your eternal and omnipotent "Spirits" living in six feet by two of air; everlastingly lying around loose, hitting nobody, and nobody hitting them? ah, that perfectly gets me! I scout it; and submit that here is an actual Mathematical demonstration of its non-possibility! To be a Spirit, there must be first an Organism; and then matter sufficient to render that organism compact, so as to be self-protective, self-perpetuating; and still after that, matter sufficient to develop power; (for all power in the Universe is the product of matter!) but in the case of these "Spirits" in six feet by two of air, there is neither of all these. There is no Organism; for there are not particles enough to stretch across from one to his neighbor? so they can possibly be organized: (and it's only another of your sheer assumptions that anything of this kind is true!) but even if there were an Organism, yet its substance is so dissolute and incoherent, that a whiff can blow it away, or a Fly fly right through it: but yet, even if that were not so, nevertheless, self-evidently there is not that volume or body of matter in it, that can constitute it a great, propelling, ever-æctive, never-wasting Force—such a mighty, omnipotent Force, as we know every Spirit actually to be! And then it is no Spirit, but a magnificent, got-up-with-infinite-ado, Nothing! [Shakspeare, you were not far out of the way in "Much ado about Nothing?"]

But mediums SEE Organisms in the air. Yes, for they believe in them, and so are self-magnetized to see them. But they see everything else, too—things which nobody believes to exist; or, at least, has any reason to. So their sight proves nothing: certainly, you cannot feel that it is at all conclusive. And in the face of an actual demonstration, I rule it out altogether.

But the phenomena PROFESS to be produced by "Spirits." Of course, they do; and for the same reason assigned before—"Spirits" are the universal belief. You couldn't expect any other result, so long as men are on their present plane. But when the world begins to think, and to believe in reason and matter, and the inevitable Mathematics of matter—believe in actual Nature, and not in old superstition—then look for a different rationale.

And by this time we have reached the end of the argument; only that now it remains to say a word as to that How—precisely in what way those phenomena were produced, by living human minds. Frankly—I do not certainly know. Now, be as modest as myself, and admit that you do not therefore know that they were not produced by such minds. But if, on the other hand, you snatch at my ignorance, and claim that as decisive, and begin to take on airs; and set up as if you knew! and make a fool of yourself generally? why, I shall only laugh at you! Psychology! transcendently the greatest Science in the world; the Science of all other sciences, since literally the infinite Science of the integral Universe; and none of us progressed enough yet to stand within even the very Vestibule of that Science—and yet you (!) taking it upon yourself to say that you know all about the Soul's mysterious workings; and that if it does not do things in the precise way which you have marked out for it, then it can not do them at all! And all this when you can't begin to tell how even your own apochryphal "Spirits" produce the very same results! As if it was not infinitely harder for six feet by two of air to produce them? than for a living, potential, human Soul! As if nothing could produce them? better than all-creating Man!

But let us see if there is any difficulty in finding enough ways, in which it is rational to conceive that those phenomena might have been produced by human beings. Remember, every Principle in Nature exists in still higher perfection in Man. Magnetism is a principle in Nature; but though the earth has innumerable magnets; and even its pole

are but grand magnets of attraction; and at last itself is nothing but one mighty Odyle—yet nowhere has it any such loadstone of power—such a subtle but omnipotent influence—as the organized substance of a human brain! Electricity is a principle in Nature; but not on the earth, nor under it, nor yet in the sky above, is there any such Lightning to telegraph, and flash, and thunder, as the eternal, infinite Energy of a human Soul—that convoluted brain is more than all galvanic batteries! Radiation is a principle in Nature; and all things give themselves off in spheres—sun, tree, clod, even the insensate rock; but no sphere of aught beside, is so absolute, penetrative, diffusive—so a real THING, and then the betokening of the greater thing behind it—as the enveloping aura of a human Spirit; the atmosphere of its own self, and the visible dwelling of its ever—Presence! Elective Affinity is a principle in Nature; and atom seeks atom in obedience to its law; and the solid earth is but the creature of its working—built up by its sure instinct; but nowhere else can there be any such flowing together, as the sympathy which fuses human minds into oneness; nor then as the sympathy which brings those minds into spontaneous rapport with things around them, and gives up all Nature to their quick sensing and clairvoyance! And Repulsion is as well a principle in Nature; for that is the creator and continent-base of all Individuality; but there is no repulsion so strong, (none so moving!) as that of a human organism; both antagonizing other organisms, and also antagonizing Nature.—And now Sixthly, Man is even MORE than all this of Nature—he not only equals the entire virtue of the Universe, but he has even new powers superadded: and Seventhly, Mediums are still higher yet; and, as more impressible, possess even new powers on the top of the last: and Eighthly, the very, Mediums are more and higher still, in their abnormal or influenced states, and can do things then, they cannot at any other times—just as a Somnambule, during the trance, is frequently infinitely superior to himself when awake: Ninthly, the Mediums immediately present, may by no means, be the only individuals exerting an influence in the evolution of phenomena; but on the contrary, they may be in such rapport and sympathy with others, that a very multitude may be subsidized to the production of the results, and even some of them when hundreds of miles away: and Tenthly, Unconsciousness on the part of any of those thus aiding to work the marvels, whether present or absent, is no proof that they do not so aid, but even may be the very condition of their aiding better, or at last, at all—just as in the case of that Somnambule: and Eleventhly, all these human beings so conspiring to one result, are not compelled to work ALONE to bring it, but Nature herself helps together with them; the Elements are at their service—instruments to effect their bidding, or obey even their very thought; so that at last, to their own power, they literally superadd all the amazing forces of the Universe: and Twelfthly, there is a need that Man should be developed into all this power of his own, and then that Nature should thus help him with hers; that so by a union of both, advancing beyond all this that is yet, he may still ascend in the scale of Progression, even till he is born into the utter perfection of existence! Are not here enough ways in which the phenomena of the problem MIGHT have been produced—the “raps;” “the piano moved away from its usual place, and several times up-ended;” the “sounds produced within the piano,” though its “keys were covered by the lid,” and the instrument was “locked;” the “accompaniment (to an air) played by an unperceived agency;” and all? I do not know that all of them WERE produced in any of these ways; (for I don’t know but human beings might have produced them in still some other manner,) but I challenge that you don’t know that they were not! At least, can you equal this rationale? Can you tell a twelfth part as many ways in which six feet by two of air could have produced them?

But if human beings do all these things, why have’nt they done them before? Progress, good brother, progress! But if “Spirits” produce them, why have’nt they done them

before? For you know they must have known how, thousands of years ago! All this talk of its being a late invention, is mere moonshine—stuff! I ain't such a fool, as all that comes to?

But I can not do justice to this whole subject in this article; and even now I have monopolized more space than rightfully belonged to me. But the next Vol. will thoroughly discuss the whole question; and I have already published an elaborate Argument on it, in my Card to the World, advertised in the May No.

---

#### MATHEMATICS BRIEFLY REVIEWED.

---

Being something of a mathematical genius myself, it may not be out of place for me to look a bit into this great mathematical problem. In the foregoing article, I find so little of what is commonly known as mathematics, that I conclude our friend's science is a sublimation of the old—a development, perhaps, into higher forms. formulas, vagaries, or generalities. The stretch of this science is infinite; it goes away back to the beginning of everything, and forward to the end of everything, and outward to the boundless comprehension of the universal sum of all things; and in that it does so, it is a most excellent field to rollick in all the luxuries of a delicious rhetoric; but rather a poor one, it is to be feared, for anything like a definite application of the old science of mathematics.

The kind of mathematical science that most of us have been used to, begins with simple definitions and axioms, and proceeds step by step to the perfect and satisfactory demonstration of the most difficult and abstruse propositions. But the new mathematics dispenses with the starting points entirely, and its assumptions begin where its conclusions should end. This is no doubt an "improvement", as it saves the wear and tear of brain. It corresponds in mathematics, to labor-saving machinery in mechanics. One of these assumptions in our friend's mathematical dissertation, is that intelligence does not precede organization, but is the result of organization; another that organization is self-existent, is the universe, and so eternal; another that a man and a human organism are one, and that the organized man does die; and this is mathematics!

We are favored, moreover, with just a dozen shrewd conjectures, as to the manner, in which "the phenomena of the problem MIGHT take place," otherwise, than through the agency of immortal spirits; and after all this, it is furthermore conjectured, that human beings in the flesh might have unconsciously produced these results, in still some other manner; and this is mathematics! Suppose I were to venture a dozen guesses as to the manner, in which our friend gave his article tangible form; and then conclude with the more comprehensive and overwhelming sweep of conjecture, that possibly he did not work it off in any of these ways, but some other still, YET CERTAINLY NOT AT THE POINT OF A GOOSE QUILL;—would I not be making progress in this new science, and would not its originator have to acknowledge me a promising disciple? Our friend's article may look for all the world, as if the quill had done it, and our friend may vindicate the work of the cloven-tongued instrument in his hand, but what does that amount to? hadn't I proved mathematically by a dozen definite conjectures, and an infinite number of indefinite ones, that it could have been done just as well some other way? And so of course, this idea of writing with a sharpened goose quill is an absurdity of the past, which we mathematicians should discard scientifically!

Our friend's demonstration, though, is not the first of the kind, nor will it be the last. Did not some one—a mathematician certainly—demonstrate that steamships could not plow the ocean; and somebody else, that locomotives could not walk the iron rail? Yet

old ocean's bosom swelled for joy, and crested billows leapt exultingly and gamboled o'er the deep, to cheer the triumph of the living palace, as it hastened by; and the iron rail does ring to the conquering tread of the iron horse;—and when brother Joseph has made the transit of Jordan, and awakes from the everlasting sleep he has sealed with the seal of science to make it secure, a song will burst from his glad spirit sweeter and richer by far than any he ever sung over the glorious achievements of mathematics!

When our brother succeeds to his own satisfaction in running his mathematical bodkin through the hope of immortality, I expect so fully to have mastered his science as to be able to demonstrate that, so far from existing hereafter, we don't exist even now!

Our friend is going to TREAT this entire question more thoroughly in the next Vol. of the S. R. This journal was set on foot for the "free discussion of general principles and practical measures pertaining to human progress and general well-being;" and it may be that if we can only get rid of this superstitious idea of a life hereafter, an Elysium of bliss will at once flow into this. If our friend persist in taking up his room in this way, we shall not object. He must be permitted to choose his own work. But there is a preliminary proposition which, as a private individual, I would like to have mathematically demonstrated first. It is this: The naked idea of immortality is essentially pernicious to human progress and general well-being, and the batteries of mathematics should be opened against it, till it be riddled.

Mathematical demonstrations used to be very brief and very conclusive, and we trust our friend's will be. In this science, we look for precision of thought and coherence of reason, rather than for the grace of eloquence or the flash of poetry.

---

## MATERIAL UNION.

BY J. D. GAGE.

In the October number of the Social Revolutionist, are two articles, written to show the falsity of the law, that "Material union is only to be had when the wisdom of the harmony demands a child." The substance of friend Towner's remarks, as to the "spirit with which reformers should treat each other," is commendable. The true reformer's first work is individual; to reform himself. Second, to unite as far as possible with his brethren, in the mutual work of reforming each other; and third, to labor for the general elevation of the race.

This law of the material union I first received from my idea of the fitness of things, before I had heard of Dr. and Mrs. Nichols, and long before they announced it as the "law of progression in harmony," as soon, in fact, as I was old enough to understand anything of the true relation of the sexes. With regard to the spiritual origin of the law, I do not wish to quarrel with either party, but will allow at once, that from whatever source it may have been revealed, it should be subjected to the test of science, analogy and observation, before being admitted to be of general application. The statement that some diseased conditions are bettered by intercourse with the other sex, I am not willing to admit, nor prepared to deny. It is a fact that old people may be much strengthened by sleeping with the young; yet this is directly disastrous to the young person, and I believe it to be indirectly so to the aged also. It is drawing a vitality which does not belong to them, and they had better let this world go and pass to another, without the stain of murder on their souls. It may be possible for a person with diseased genital organs,

to find relief in sexual intercourse, but any one must see the folly and crime of a healthy person submitting to such pollution, and if both are diseased, their diseases will be most likely to intensify each other. The idea of prescribing sexual intercourse for a remedial agent, as one might prescribe a douche or a pack, is extremely revolting. I would prefer to consider the subject as it relates to healthy and harmonious men and women, and to consider diseased conditions as exceptional.

I can fully endorse friend Towner's remarks upon expediency. It is not so much matter what the world thinks of us, as what we with the aid of an enlightened reason, and elevated conscience, think of ourselves. If our acts are such as to meet with our own full approval, we need not fear that "the cause" will suffer from them; still, I hold it to be imperatively necessary, that we obtain the best light possible, and govern ourselves accordingly.

"The greater the freedom of the affections, the wider the range of their activities, the more various the objects to whom they are directed, and upon whom they are lavished, the less the demand, or perhaps it should be said, the less the temptation to indulge in material union, until a certain limit is reached, where it is demanded."

Where is that limit? Where is it even in our present slavery of the affections, with truly healthy persons?

Train up a child to the idea that it is dangerous and immoral to be alone with one of the other sex; teach it that the sexual union must not be indulged in, because it may bring lasting infamy to one or both parties; that coition without marriage, is a deadly sin, but that after the ceremony has been performed, it may be freely indulged in; let habits of solitary vice be formed before the age of puberty has arrived, and you lay the foundation and insure the erection of the superstructure of a morbid condition of body and mind, which will be filled with lecherous longings, whenever any approach is made to one of the opposite sex.

Our friend denies that "in the harmony of nature, supply and demand are in equilibrium." Let us examine his illustrations. With regard to the vegetable kingdom, a case in point might be found in the Lombardy poplar. It is said that the staminate plant has never been imported, and that, consequently, it has never borne seed in this country. Will any one contend that it is in the harmony of nature that all the germs of this species, which are produced in a continent, should perish without impregnation?

Nature is everywhere profuse; many seeds are ripened every year which do not vegetate. By far the greater share are consumed by animals for food, or wasted for want of the necessary circumstances of growth, yet enough are produced to continue the existence of the species. So of the pollen. It is gathered by the bees; it is shed abroad on the air, and falls unused to the ground; it is produced by the staminate plant, though no pistillate is near to receive it; yet the obvious intention of nature, is to produce enough to insure the impregnation of a sufficient number of germs, and whenever a union is effected between the masculine and feminine elements of the plant, the natural consequence is the production of a seed. True, the pollen may fall upon the stigma before the latter is ready to receive it, or after the germ is impregnated. Such cases in the economy of the plant, amount to no more than if the pollen had fallen on a leaf. The union can only be effected during a limited period of time.

Among the domestic animals and other mammalia, and even among the lower forms, a similar analogy may be observed. There is in the females a periodical formation of ova, at which time they are capable of becoming mothers, and it is during this period only that the female desires coition, and excites the desire for it in the male. Can anything be more evident than that the natural consequence of the act, is the production of offspring, and that every failure is to be regarded as exceptional and unnatural?

Our friend's logic seems to be, that because during a great portion of each month impregnation is not the natural sequence of material union, but an exceptional result; therefore, during this time, it is not a violation of natural law to have such union without desiring a child. I would judge from analogy that persons who were truly healthy, would not desire such union during this period, whether they desired a child or not, and we have the authority of good physiologists that coition when indulged in this manner, has a direct tendency to produce disease, so that the analogy seems to hold good. It seems to me a much more unnatural act to seek indulgence at an unnatural time, than to use checks during the natural period, and either of them is so repugnant to my sense of right, that it seems impossible for any one not under the influence of civilized abominations, to defend them.

I have read friend Towner's "thirdly," as far as the quotation from George Pyburn, several times, and must acknowledge my inability to see its bearing on the case in point, neither can I see why every woman, and every man, too, may not judge of the circumstances under which they desire to parent a child, without being necessitated to indulge in coition when they do not desire such a result.

"Now, first, 'in the harmony of nature, supply and demand are in equilibrio.' Therefore, the demand for impregnation ought to have its corresponding supply; viz: impregnation." Certainly, whenever the demand for impregnation exists. That is whenever the woman has the capacity and desire to become a mother, she should choose a father to furnish the corresponding supply.

"Second. 'By inference, then,' the existence of the demand for impregnation without its corresponding supply, is evidence of an inharmonious or unnatural condition."

Yes, but it would be difficult to show that a demand for impregnation exists whenever that result is possible. It may be the very thing most to be dreaded.

"Love certainly has a tendency to ultimate itself in the physical sexual embrace."

It does when offspring are desired as the fruit of love, or when from a morbid condition of the sexual organs and inflamed amativeness, the passions assert the same supremacy, as in the drunkard or glutton. We might assert that the sight of agreeable food produced desire to eat, but it would not follow that we should gratify the palate when the system does not need nutrition.

The argument of the "influences of mutual love, leading step by step," etc., is good if correctly followed. The natural result of ardent love, is the desire to embody that love in a loved and loving child, and any desire for the act which naturally produces a child when its sequence is not desired, is as false and unnatural as the desire for food when the system requires no nourishment.

I think that it will be seen that the charge of advocating sensuality applies against friend Towner, with more force than he is willing to admit. The pleasure which comes from kisses, caresses and the like, is in a certain sense, sensual, and in the same sense, the pleasure to be derived from roaming among flowers and fruits, is also sensual; but as it would be used when applied to this idea, it would be like the man who habitually indulged in the use of food and drink at times when they were not required for the use of the body, and were taken for the mere pleasure of the palate. Yet the Bacchanalian can sing of the merry cheer produced by the social glass, and will contend that the feelings and sympathies are aroused and much higher ends served than the mere gustatory pleasure derived from the act of drinking. His logic, however, will not prevent the seeds of disease from taking root.

"Whatever action of this element contributes to the happiness of such beings, taking into consideration remote as well as immediate results, cannot be inconsistent with propriety or purity." True, but the very point at issue is whether this act, the uses of

which we are discussing, will thus contribute to happiness. "As to what will thus contribute, observation and experience alone can enable us to decide." "Experience keeps a dear school," but we are told of a certain large class who will not learn in any other.—Those who do not belong to this class, can make use of observation, analogy, comparison, reason and consciousness.

The idea of a number of sexual unions for the sake of their "harmonizing and love-intensifying results," taking into account the unnatural and, therefore, disease-producing means which must be used to prevent conception at each union, appears to me revolting, and to use an improper adjective, for which I would beg pardon of the lower animals, bestial! By way of opinion, I would also say that it appears to me that the result of such exercise is inevitably to produce discord and disgust.

I will take leave of friend Towner, by endorsing fully and earnestly, the last paragraph of his article.

As to "Peter," I would ask him where he found the doctrine that "we should subdue the amative desire, and then beget children from a sense of duty?" also, who advocates it? It may find advocates somewhere, but I have not understood anything in the Social Revolutionist to be so intended. The amative desire should act in connection with the desire for offspring, neither subduing nor itself subdued, but adapted to its legitimate use. One might as well talk of subduing alimentiveness and eating from a sense of duty.

The illustration of the "dear, sweet girl" amounts to just as much as that of an interesting dyspeptic desiring food which neither reason nor physical necessity demands. The result which is pictured forth is the natural sequence of sexual unions repeated till there is nothing but animality left.

"Had the law of sexual love and the physiological condition of the parental function been observed in a temperate indulgence, before this crisis, the natural vigor of the procreative faculty, without irritability, would have obtained, fitting it for its functional activity at the proper time, according to the real, and not the mock 'highest wisdom of the harmony.'"

The absurdity of this idea has already been shown. It does not need any such "temperate indulgence," to obtain the natural vigor of this faculty.

"The sexual demand in a healthy woman is as great, in the early stages of pregnancy, as at any other time." This statement is opposed to authority and analogy. The cases where healthy animals manifest such a desire, are very rare, and in fact such a manifestation may be safely regarded as a symptom of disease. In the human species, they are the result of temperate, or more frequently of intemperate indulgence. Children are often born "the animalized victims of parental folly" from the mother being forced during pregnancy to submit to the embraces of a CIVILIZED father, who has become so habituated to "temperate indulgence," that he still demands this exercise of amativeness, regardless of the repugnance of the mother.

"Peter" seems to think that if this law were observed, the distinctions of sex would be in a measure lost. Are not those children which are born under circumstances which render it probable that their parents have had but one union, generally well developed?

The repetition of the idea of animality in the offspring, hardly needs notice, since it has been shown to be the result of indulgence.

"But we are told that the union unaccompanied by a desire for offspring, is incomplete, inharmonious and unnatural. This assumes the essential oneness of the amative impulse and the desire for offspring; but this assumption cannot be maintained for a moment."—Let us try the validity of this argument. I assert that the eating of food unaccompanied by the necessity of nutrition, is incomplete, inharmonious and unnatural. It may be replied that this presumes the essential oneness of the desire for food and the love of life; that alimentiveness and vitativeness are very different functions of the mind, etc. The

demand for the harmonious action of the faculties does not suppose their identity.

With regard to the "four conditions," the first I deny, asserting that the amative impulse is as strong in the Australian who knocks down a woman, ravishes her and is considered respectable in his own society, as it is in the city swell perfumed with cologne and tobacco, who visits the house of ill-fame for a similar purpose. The second has already been replied to. "3, A plurality of sexual loves at the same time." Here I make a direct issue. I "admit the plurality of loves which makes freedom possible," and I deny "the superabundant amative desire which requires the superabundance of coition." I am unable to see the necessity of a woman's lying with every man she loves, or with any of them. "4, Desire in sexual conditions when conception cannot take place." This may safely be considered as an unnatural and diseased action, as much so, as the desire for food which cannot be digested.

The disastrous results to the pitiful lover, seem to belong to the present state of exclusive duality in the love relations, and also to show an excessively morbid and diseased state of body and mind. The argument which they contain, if it amounts to anything, has already been answered.

If, as has been shown, the necessary result of the physical ultimatum in natural conditions, is the production of offspring, it follows, that admitting the right of variety, it is absurd to assert that "the physical ultimatum is the right of every matured sexual love."

What kind of an idea has "Peter" of freedom when he holds that a woman must grant to every man whose love she enjoys, all the favors which are yielded to any? He would thus form a despotism worse than any which now exists among Christian, Mahomedan, or Pagan; for admitting the right to coition for the mere gratification of the animal passion, which he claims, it would result in requiring every woman to submit to the embrace of every man who demanded it, lest he should be "outraged." The right of exclusion, is as inherently essential to freedom, as that of attraction. Again; how much lower than the brute would that man be who should feel himself to be outraged, because he could not dictate to every woman how much she must accord to him.

I think I have shown that it is you, instead of we, who are advocating despotism. We unite freedom for love with freedom for exclusion; freedom in the consummation of its integral character, with freedom for self-preservation from the evils of licentiousness and sensuality.

I am unable to see the bearing which the age of this law has upon the case, except that as all truth is eternal, it would be foolish to claim novelty in proof of reality. With regard to its being practicable only in duality, you have already admitted that "in variety there might be partial relief in diffusion," and I claim that adding to this, health and other harmonic conditions, would make the relief entire.

I am not willing to make the concession which friend Pyburn has, but I do not see that he either weaves a "loop-hole," or "concedes the whole ground." It does not follow that because men at present exist in diseased conditions, that those who are striving to reform themselves and others, should make no effort to escape. "The whole man will assert its rights in the actualities of life, in spite of the monopolizing tendency of any part." You could not have defined my position more concisely, yet your argument has been in favor of the monopolizing tendency of one part, because it was a faculty distinct from any other.

If "it is folly to impose a rule which only the few can observe," what a dreadful fool it must have been, who commanded to "do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you."

## TO PETER SOCIALIST.

I have a few words to say, in reply to your article on the rights of sexual love.

May it not be that the antagonism and disgust to the sexual act, of which you speak, has grown out of its prevalent abuse? and might not a return to its natural use, make it as respectable with man, as with the lower animals?

Do you not assume, without any proof, that there is excess of amative power in a healthy, well-balanced organism?

What is your authority for asserting that there is a demand for amative indulgence, by woman, during pregnancy, when the analogy of the whole animal races and the instincts and habits of savage and barbarous nations testify the reverse?

How do you know that "brutes cohabit without intending offspring?" Does the bird build her nest with no care for the young which are to inhabit it?

Is not the doctrine that there is no love, no desire, no yearning of the heart, but that which leads to material union, a very coarse, sensual, and false one, and contrary to the experience of all refined persons?

Is there much reason to apprehend that the race will be injured by too general a conformity to the "Law of Progression?"

Having put these questions, let me state a few facts or principles, which seem to me to bear on the question at issue.

I see no reason to believe that man is naturally more amative than all other animals, or that there are, in this respect, wide physiological differences.

The amative flux is the apparent necessity of arrested development, and false habits and conditions.

In true conditions, and with the progressive and harmonic development of all faculties, not only is there no such necessity, but the amative power is used to the last particle in mental and physical development.

My observation and experience approve these principles; and I see no hope of a radical and integral improvement and harmonization, until men and women can save their lives, in the consecration of chastity.

T. L. N.

## A NUT FOR "PETER" TO CRACK.

[We have received the following in a private letter from a lady of Buffalo. We are after the FACTS, and want to know the truth.]

FRIEND PATTERSON:—I think Mr. P. Socialist has had his way about long enough concerning the women. It is time they spoke for themselves. He says, "the sexual demand in a healthy woman is as great in the early stages of pregnancy as at any other time;" but I was especially blest with health during pregnancy, and yet had not the least desire for the sexual embrace, nor yet during the period of lactation, which I believe would be the case with nine women out of ten, if the men would keep their own passions in check; or in case they could not, seek their indulgence elsewhere. The "animalized victims," he speaks of, would be fewer by thousands, if women would consult their feelings at such times, instead of the DUTY they owe their husbands.—I am happy in the belief that my child will always be purer, because I was true to my own instincts.

Yours without fastidiousness,

## MERCY FOR FRIEND HINE.

FRIEND PATTERSON:—

I crave mercy for friend Hine. I don't want to see him demolished at once. I cannot complain of injustice on your part, or that of friends, Treat and Gage; but the battle is unequal. Here are three against one; and (as friend Hine says,) "my sympathies are with the weak," or the weaker party. Therefore, I call upon the lovers of "Law and Order," to come out and help him defend the rights of parents and children and the sacred institution which guaranties them. It is not fair to let him battle alone, if he is brave enough to wage war single-handed with these ruthless invaders of our social rights and institutions; therefore I say to that party, "come up to the help of the weak against the mighty." And to you and to Free Lovers, I offer an apology for friend Hine's recent forays against Free

Love. His "sympathies" have been recently excited by a "victim of Free Love," and as a consequence, his ire toward Free Lovers waxes warm.

This victim is a woman who came into that vicinity some two years since, with a man, who, she says, left a living wife (and children) in the place they came from; and now he has left her (with a child,) to shift for herself, and gone to loving another woman; and this, she says, is the result of the Free Love doctrines. Very bad results, truly! and where's the remedy, except in abolishing the doctrines? I hold that every man, married, or unmarried, ought to help provide for his children—all his children, till they are old enough to provide for themselves. I therefore move that we petition the Legislature for a law requiring married men to provide for the children they have by their wives—so many neglect this duty.

I also hold that every woman ought to be capable of providing for herself; and, therefore, I propose that we petition for a law requiring all girls, whether daughters of rich or poor, to be properly educated and qualified for the most remunerative employments, (and these surely are not those in which most physical strength is needed.)

Let the property in every community educate the children therein—male and female. Let's straighten out our laws regarding marriage, women and children; then these "abominable Free Lovers" will not have so much chance to find fault with them.

I would further move that this scamp (alluded to above) be arrested in his "progress, until he can do business" at his "own cost," and "steer" a little nearer the proper course

Yours for "Law and Order,"

POLLY PEPPER.

---

#### INJUSTICE TO L. A. HINE.

---

A friend in Cincinnati, who is designing to start a FREE PAPER, writes:—

"I think you and others snubbed Hine considerable more than was just or expedient. He was the only one who defended the opposite view, and should have been, therefore, handled delicately. I think there was a deal of truth and some fallacy in his remarks. The fallacies were exposed in the first reply to him, and three or four more after it were rather supererogatory."

This presumes that an encounter in a free paper is something like a fisticuff, in which it would be unfair for more than one to set upon another. If I write an article on a vital question of the age, for our friend's free paper when he gets it started—said article not being too unpopular to be admitted—and its editor makes a general reply which is afterward followed by three, four, or a half dozen particular replies from others, COVERING DIFFERENT GROUND, and these be rejected out of a delicate regard for my pugilistic sensibilities, I shall claim that truth is sacrificed to a VERY considerate urbanity, which is cursing the world abundantly already, without taking it into a free paper, to cheat my article out of the consequence it deserves. Let our friend remember that in such an emergency, if I am master of my subject, the more antagonists I have, and the abler they are, the better for truth's sake. As I take it, friend Hine has been complimented by the attention his articles have received. If the S. R. has pursued a wrong course in this respect, the error has been publishing replies to friend Hine, which covered the same ground; but this is not the charge our friend makes. Let it be understood that the object of investigation or discussion in a free journal should be, not the prowess of the ring, but the elaboration of truth; then, when a question of vital interest is mooted, the editor is bound by his obligations to truth and free discussion, to give place as he has room in his columns, to every distinct point definitely made on the question, however unequally such a course may range the contending parties. It is a false benevolence, a mock justice, a rotten etiquette that would sacrifice the evolution of truth under such circumstances, to petty considerations of this kind.—In conclusion, I will say that in managing the S. R., I have seriously desired to make it free, and do justice to all parties and principles concerned; and in every case, I have acted up to MY "highest wisdom." How much dissatisfaction

there may be, I don't know—but little has come to my knowledge; and perhaps we should not have heard from our friend as above, but that our course seemed to him a questionable one, when tried by the perfect standard he has set up for himself in the management of his "free weekly?" and he no doubt felt that by virtue of what he had already achieved in the ideal for the freedom and justice of journalism, he was fully authorized to sit in judgment on the actual course of the S. R.? In the event that our friend comes to ACTUALIZING, I bid him, in advance, a brother's hearty God-speed.

---

A TALK ABOUT THE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONIST;—ITS PAST,  
PRESENT AND FUTURE.

---

When we commenced the Social Revolutionist, we pledged its continuance for one year, and that pledge is now redeemed. So many liberal papers have been started, only to fail and cheat subscribers of their money, that, notwithstanding our guaranty for the S. R., we have found scepticism as to its continuance even for one year, and this has operated to some extent against its circulation. But in the face of this difficulty, and despite the ultra and offensive character of the subjects discussed in its pages, the S. R. has reached a circulation (for vol. 2,) of nearly 400 paying subscribers. To some this may appear to be a very small result, and prophetic of future failure rather than of success; but to those who know the amount of vigilant action which has been requisite to attain this much, and who see the prospective tendencies of the work, it does not seem to be small as a present attainment, or as a basis of greater success hereafter. Some are surprised that we have done so well; and when we consider the slow beginnings of some other liberal papers which have achieved the desired success, we feel abundant reason to hope for the future. By a letter received nearly a year since from H. Hacker, of the Portland Pleasure Boat, we learn the following particulars: Had received five dollars from a friend, borrowed three, and pawned his overcoat for five more, with which to get out the first No. of his paper; sold copies enough in the city of Portland to redeem his garment and pay the three dollars borrowed; went through fifty towns in a canvassing tour, and obtained the names of 250 persons who promised to forward the pay upon the reception of the second No.; but though the paper was sent to them a year, only twenty dollars were realized from all; the indomitable journalist hired a room at twenty dollars a year, slept on a bag of straw with his coat for a pillow, lived upon bread, potatoes, apples and water, without salt; wrote at nights to get time to sell papers during the day, and with the proceeds of this labor and small donations from friends, he kept up his paper for the first year.—The S. R. has done better than this, so far as success is a measure of good; but certainly not better as it respects an inspired zeal which overcomes all obstacles, and is usually crowned with a brilliant success. In its eleventh year, the Portland Pleasure Boat has attained a circulation of 2300. With such an example before us, we could hardly falter; and it is proper here to say, that, although the Publishers have embraced every opportunity, as it seemed to them, they well could, to extend the circulation of the Social Revolutionist, yet without the cooperation of lecturers, friends and local agents, the amount of present success would have been less than it is.

The Social Revolutionist is guarantied for another year; and while our efforts to put it on a sustaining basis will not flag in the least, we have reason to hope from the indications of the present, that cooperation on the part of others will be more general and effective next year than it has been the present. The response to the circular which accompanied the October No., though not general, has been cordial and encouraging, and the prospects

of the S. R. have improved materially since that circular was written. Several additional subscribers for the year have been received; a few have sent an additional dollar for the year; several have advanced two dollars for the coming year; one good friend in Iowa, has donated ten dollars, another five, and a third (of New York city,) has written us to draw on him for ten in case we conclude to go on with the publication. A friend in Boston, [not our publisher there,] to whose order we now send twenty-one copies, says it shall be thirty next year; another who has procured about fifteen subscribers for this year, promises twenty additional ones for next year; two others become responsible for ten copies each; six for five copies each; some have promised two, three, and four additional subscribers in their respective neighborhoods; quite a number have agreed to pay two dollars, and some three, for the journal next year, rather than do without it.—Since the above was written, a friend here has donated twenty dollars.

We know that the S. R. has given particular satisfaction in many cases; and we are not yet aware but it has given "general satisfaction." Only one subscriber has ordered his paper stopped, and he resides in Alabama, where, as he previously informed us, it would be dangerous for him to have his sentiments known. We have heard but little complaint, and this little has been gentle and brotherly, coming from those mostly who want free speech on religious, but not on all social questions. We should regret for any of these to drop off from the S. R. because it is brave and free; but still, we shall not be surprised if a few do. Yet, as we expect—indeed, as we actually know there will be considerable gain in other quarters, we can hardly doubt that the journal will hold its own, at least; and may even hope that it will gain somewhat. Although it will be got out with a cover and on a better quality of paper next year, still we expect that its cost will be something less than it has been this, as we shall get out no extra or reprint, and send no specimens without pay. So that if there be no falling off of the old subscribers, the accession of new ones already guaranteed, would place the journal on a paying basis.—We state here that the labor we have expended on the S. R. we cheerfully donate to the work; and whatever labor in editing, reading proof, folding, stitching, mailing, etc., we may bestow on it next year, will be given in like manner. We feel determined that by the cooperation of our good friends, this journal shall live and become one of the permanent, or rather progressive institutions of the age. As we have other means wherewithall to live, we make no bread-and-butter calculations in connection with the S. R., and so we dare make it free. All we ask of its patrons, is enough to meet the cash expenses; and if anything beyond this should be received, it will be used on the journal itself. We had thought to announce that the S. R. would be guaranteed at its present size with the addition of a cover for the next volume of six numbers; and for the next six, either retain it at that size, or enlarge or diminish it, as the receipts might warrant; but we trust there will be no need for the latter expedient; and should there be a surplus of receipts, it will be held in trust until there be sufficient to warrant the enlargement of the journal—an improvement much to be desired.

That the Social Revolutionist has been free according to its capacity to receive, we think no one will question. We have always had a surplus of articles on hand to choose from, and we have selected what seemed to us, the best—the freshest and ablest, without reference to the nature of the doctrines advocated; except that preference has been given to such articles as contained sentiments in opposition to those of the Resident Editor. Several articles have been rejected, for what seemed to us, a want of point and originality; and some for bad chirography. Well written articles on theology from contributors, have been laid aside: First, because the Corresponding Editor furnishes as much of that kind of matter as it seems to us profitable to publish in so small a monthly as this, that has so many other questions to discuss. Secondly, because there are now many papers sufficiently free to

publish anything in the shape of theological reform. Thirdly, because so much has already been written on this subject which is accessible to most readers. Still, articles on this subject, of marked originality and power, would be very acceptable. As a general thing, we must investigate in the S. R., subjects which no other "free(?) paper" is brave enough to meet fairly. The Spiritual and other liberal papers are preparing many to appreciate such a journal as this, which in some respects, takes the work where they leave it; and thus supplies a need which no other journal in existence can. Some readers progress beyond their favorite paper, and they crave something else. For obvious reasons, it is not in the nature of a journal to become freer and braver—the tendency is usually the other way. A liberal paper and a free one, are different things. Most that claim to be free, are only liberal. Freedom in a journal, implies bravery enough to face any question of interest, however unpopular; and such a journal may be,—necessarily must be, progressive. We trust that the S. R. has attained to this point of freedom—though such a journal cannot be popular till there are more free people.

No one can foresee just what will be the course of a free paper, and so we cannot say what will be the course of the S. R. for the next year, only that it will be as free and useful as we know how to make it. We had thought to keep the different volumes as distinct as possible, not allowing serials or discussions to run through from one to another, but this is impossible. The serials and discussions now on hand, however, will, no doubt, soon terminate, and others equally interesting, take their place. The specific character of the journal may be very different next year from what it has been this.—There is a variety and freshness in a free paper which cannot obtain in any other. The articles on sexual law may be thought by some to be somewhat premature, but we believe they have been appreciated by most of our readers. More of fact showing the wrongs of society as it is—especially of its central institution, marriage, will probably be given in the coming volume than heretofore; and whether we find room for it or not, it seems to some of us that there is need for a more thorough investigation of the CONDITIONS OF SOCIAL FREEDOM. If anything from the Resident Editor may be worthy of expectancy, he will mention that he proposes a series of articles under the general head of "The Entire Front of Reform," in which he will attempt to trace the pathway of human progress and show the relations, dependencies, significance, connecting principles and converging points of the various reforms which bear more directly on human happiness.—Contributors will pursue their own course; and doctrines opposed to those we advocate, or arguments opposed to our positions, if ably put, will always receive their share of room. The S. R. is a free medium for the investigation of principles, the discussion of practical measures, and the record of actual doings for the advancement of freedom, truth and brotherhood amongst men. We are inclined to claim for this monthly that it is leading off in the inauguration of free journalism, which, though like freedom of conscience, much talked of, is one of the last forms of freedom to be actualized. We have an "instinct" that the S. R. will live, supporting itself, not by popular opinion, but against it, the pioneer of a new era in journalism, bravely carving out a pathway of its own—a great original making its mark upon the age, and becoming a thing of history. Shall it be so?

The braver a journal, the less likely to succeed; and it might overtop all others in the wealth of its truth and the directness and force of its English, yet without the special endeavor of such as appreciate it, it could not reach a paying circulation. There is need that all the friends of the S. R. work for its success in such way as they can. We put the terms next year at one or two dollars per copy; but when two dollars are sent, we should prefer to give the two copies in return to one address or two, provided the extra copy can be set to work. If clubs of five wish it for four dollars as heretofore, it will be so furnished. Could not almost every present subscriber take two copies next year, and in some way make the extra copy useful?

The circular addressed to our readers, called not for words of cheer, but for material aid; but with the one has often come the spontaneous outgushing of the other; and these assurances of trust and cooperation have strengthened our trust in humanity and enabled

us to realize more than heretofore the present worthfulness of the work in hand. A fraternal impulse has prompted a response to each friendly favor, but we had other work for all our energies, and our good friends will have to accept this general acknowledgment and the assurance of faithful service in this work of "revolution" as the best pledges of fraternity we can now give.

From a friend in Boston, we received the following:—

"I am satisfied that our movement must be carried on, by means of books and magazines, rather than by public meetings, discussions, etc. The arguments and facts for freedom must be patiently studied and examined in all their phases, by that frequent reference and calm attention to the subject which a journal favors. The S. R. has been the means of helping many in this region, and we would almost as soon see the sun darkened, as to give up the anxiously looked for visits of this journal. It is the only medium of free thought in the country, and must not die for want of bread."

The following, is from another of the Boston readers:—

"I know that as a general thing, in business matters, reformers are shiftless—very shiftless; but to read a paper that contains more nutrition for starving souls than anything the world has yet seen, and then not pay the trifling sum required, seems to me to be degenerating from shiftlessness into a species of meanness. To me the S. R. is the boldest, freest, dearest, best journal in the world, and I would do my utmost for its preservation, and this I think is the general sentiment of the Boston group. I hope the end of the year will see OUR PAPER in good condition and ready for a fresh start."

From a lady of Ohio:—"Friend P.; I met with the first and second Nos. of the S. R., at L. A. Hine's, last spring, and I thought it was just the thing for us in these times—I think so still; and I feel that it must continue the same brave pioneer it is. And I want J. P. to be its editor until he becomes sufficiently "respectable" to be spoiled, and then I shall want some one who has not been spoiled to take his place. May that time be far hence—so far we shall never see it. I cannot tell you how much I prize and appreciate our organ of free thought, nor your own discrimination and justice, etc."

From a reader in N. Y. State:—"It seems to me that, as social reformers, we ought to sustain a paper that will spread the best thoughts of the best thinkers, wherever there are minds prepared to investigate. Such an one the S. R. has proved itself to be, etc."

A pioneer in reform and one who has suffered much for its sake, writes:—

"I don't see that there's any need that the S. R. stop. I am weak and wounded, sick and sore, and lame, and poor, and homeless, but I will give two dollars for one copy, and get subscribers as I have opportunity."

Two letters hailing from Texas have just come to hand. One is from a lady, and reads in part as follows:—

"We have but lately enjoyed the pleasure of perusing your valuable journal, and consider it of far more worth than any other now in existence. Here, we are partially excluded from the reformation which is going on, but we hail with joy your free journal. We cannot endure the idea of its having to stop, and are using our humble endeavors to get subscribers. O, that I myself could visit every part of the state for this purpose! Do not be discouraged; your efforts will be repaid a hundred fold. May all good influences surround you."

The other is from a judge of the court, who is member of an orthodox church as we learn, and he writes like a sensible man:—

"If you continue the paper next year, then I will send the three dollars on the receipt of three copies of the first No. I do this to sustain the paper, I stitch the Nos. together substantially for future use; and I wish that my children may read them."

Bless our friends for their cheer and their aid; and may we all be blessed in the triumph of a free journal, and still more in the freedom, harmony, and happiness it is seeking to establish in actual life!

## THE PEOPLE'S PAPER.

L. A. HINE

Has commenced a neat quarto monthly paper devoted to Land Reform and Democratic Education. Its object is to combine as much public sentiment as possible against the infernal monopoly and aristocracy of the age. Just men should feel indignant at the continuance of the Land System that robs every poor young man of one thousand dollars worth of land at the beginning of life, and of two hundred dollars every year he toils! It is abominable to put a price upon one's natural right. The money thus plundered of the poor, sustains the Aristocracy and Fashionable Education of the age, and produces the poverty, vice and crime of society.

Terms of "The People's Paper," 50 cents per year, or to clubs of five for two dollars; twelve for four dollars; twenty for six dollars. Address Cincinnati, Ohio.