

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

VOL. II.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1850.

No. 9.

WM. H. CHANNING, EDITOR.

OFFICE, CLINTON HALL.

FOWLERS & WELLS, PUBLISHERS.

A CHANT FOR ELLIOTT.\*

BY JOHN G. WHITTIER.

Hands off, thou tith-fat plunderer! play  
No trick of priestcraft here;  
Back, puny lordling! dar'st thou lay  
A hand on Elliott's bier?  
Alive, your rank and pomp as dust  
Beneath his feet he trod;  
He knew the locust swarm that cursed  
The harvest field of God.

On these pale lips the smothered thought  
Which England's millions feel,  
A fierce and fearful splendor caught,  
As from his forge, the steel,  
Strong armed as Thor! a shower of fire  
His smitten anvil flung;  
God's curse, Earth's wrong, dumb Hunger's ire—  
He gave them all a tongue!

Then let the poor man's horny hands  
Bear up the mighty dead,  
And Labor's swart and stalwart bands  
Behind, as mourners, tread.  
Leave an't and craft their baptized bounds  
Leave rank its minster floor;  
Give England's green and daisied grounds  
The Poet of her poor!

Lay down upon his Sheaf's green verge  
That brave old heart of oak,  
With fitting dirge from sounding forge,  
And pall of furnace-smoke!  
Where whirls the stone its dizzy rounds,  
And axe and sledge are swung,  
And, timing to their stormy sounds,  
His stormy lays are sung.

There let the peasant's step be heard,  
The grinder chant his rhyme:  
Nor patron'd praise nor dainty word  
Befit the man or time.  
No soft lament nor dreamer's sigh  
For him whose words were bread—  
The Runic rhyme and spell whereby  
The foodless poor were fed!

Pile up thy tombs of rank and pride,  
Oh, England! as thou wilt;  
With pomp to nameless worth denied,  
Emblazoned titled guilt!

No part nor lot in this we claim,  
But, o'er the sounding wave,  
A common right to Elliott's name,  
A freehold in his grave.

\*Ebenezer Elliott, the intelligence of whose death lately reached us, was to the artisans of England what Burns was to the peasantry of Scotland. His "Corn-Law Rhymes" contributed not a little to that overwhelming tide of popular opinion and feeling which has resulted in the repeal of the tax on bread. Well has the eloquent author of the "Reforms and Reformers of Great Britain" said of him: "Not Corn-Law repealers alone, but all Britons who moisten their scanty bread with the sweat of the brow, are largely indebted to his inspiring lays for the mighty bounty which the laboring mind of England has taken in our day."—*National Era*.

From the London Weekly Tribune.

THE CONFESSIONS OF A REVOLUTIONIST.

BY P. J. PROUDHON.

CHAPTER XVIII

21ST MARCH: LAW CONCERNING THE CLUBS.

Reaction made another step, from the republicans of the morrow to the doctrinaires; but one more false move of the democrats, and we fell into the hands of the jesuits. Step by step we advanced towards the completion of the revolution, the annihilation of authority. It was necessary first that government should show itself incapable of existing either with the constitution, with free institutions, with principles or classes; the first was attacked by Odilon Barrot, the second by Leon Faucher, in his bill against the clubs, the others would come afterwards, under the government of Louis Bonaparte, who was destined to lead governmental authority to the final act of its suicidal course; and this was done with a consistency and strictness that belong to no other country; for the French are the most logical people in the world.

The attack upon the clubs was an attack upon all the institutions established and confirmed by the revolution; it was, as M. Cremieux loudly declared on the 21st March, a direct violation of the constitution. Henceforth there were two classes in the country; a majority and a minority, the oppressors and the oppressed; for everywhere the socialists were hunted down, and those who were only suspected of opinions then looked upon as aggravating circumstances, were treated as common malefactors.

The right of insurrection can only exist under an absolute government, where the people have no voice in the constitution; but in the present case, universal suffrage remaining to us, our only legitimate mode of defeating our adversaries was by *legal resistance*; and the plan proposed by *Le Peuple*, namely, an organized refusal to pay the taxes all over the country, would have been a most effectual

instrument. Since the 13th June, however, this is no longer practicable or necessary; my proposition was received with distrust by the radicals: if the people refuse to pay taxes once, said these slavish advocates of government, they will refuse them altogether, and then government will be impossible: and my reward was a fine of 10,000 francs and ten years' imprisonment.

But to my shame, I must confess, we were all blind to our own real interest, and the event has proved that radicalism was better served by its own incapacity than it could have been by the means I proposed. Since the 13th June, we have done with parties and governments; and that is much better than to have established the mountain in the room of the doctrinaires and jesuits. The revolution has left us nothing further to do. *Il mondo va da se!* The world moves of itself.

## CHAPTER XIX.

## 16TH APRIL: EXPEDITION TO ROME.

The coincidence of the revolutionary dates in 1848 and 1849 almost to the very day, is rendered still more remarkable by the similarity of the events at each date; those in 1849 being in each case the counterparts of the same date in 1848. This analogy must lead us to the conclusion that the collective human thought has a greater influence in the government of the world than those two powers that have hitherto shared the worship of man—Providence and Chance. The war against the Roman republic was the death-blow given to the principle of authority by the hand of Louis Bonaparte. Wonderful coincidence! At the beginning of the century a Bonaparte is the mightiest personification of authority; fifty years afterwards the most powerful instrument of its destruction is a Bonaparte. Is this chance or mystery?

We have already shown how the constitution established the separation of powers as the necessary condition of government, and the deductions to be drawn from this principle—we shall now put these in a logical formula; for as in physical science, so in history, all the grand phenomena may be translated by a simple algebraical or logical formula.

The events following the revolution of February completed the experiments necessary to establish the following syllogism respecting government:—

MAJOR.—Government must be either a despotism or dualism.

MINOR.—Now despotism is impossible, and dualism is also impossible.

CONCLUSION.—Therefore government is impossible.

The Rateau proposition was the practical representation of this syllogism.

The next step was to show that free institutions were incompatible with government; this was done on the 21st March, by the mouth of Leon Faucher, who, by his law against the clubs, declared republican institutions, the liberty of the press, the right of association and meeting, inconsistent with power and authority. The dilemma now becomes more contracted, the formula more expressive.

*No liberty,*

*Or no government.*

The Government now plainly said to Liberty—"Slay me, or I slay thee."

The next step was the final blow, it was directed against the church, the sole legitimate source of authority. From the beginning the temporal had endeavored to render itself independent of the spiritual. When royalty first took up the sword to free itself from the thralldom of the church, it set the example of insurrection to its own slaves. Royalty, in rising against the pope, made the first step toward its own ruin. From this schism of the temporal and

spiritual, the people continued to derive fresh strength. In the 16th century the company of Jesus was established for the purpose of reducing the temporal once more under the spiritual power. The puritanic school of Jansen exposed their secret intentions, and royalty overthrew the Jesuits and confirmed the separation of the Gallican church. Then came the charter of 1830, which, by declaring catholicism only the religion of a majority, humiliated the church, and thus destroyed the principle of authority in its very source; power was now but a shadow, and the state a fiction. The people could now say to the government—Who are you that we should obey you? The European powers must now abjure themselves or restore Jesuitism. The last hour has struck; the tempest that is destined to sweep away the throne and the holy see is already heard in the distance. The dilemma is contracted to its narrowest bounds, the formula appears in its inexorable conciseness.

*No papacy,*

*Or no liberty.*

The vote of the 16th April, sanctioning the expedition to Rome, was an inevitable event; but after the taking of Rome by the French army, the fall of the papacy was no longer doubtful.

The doctrinaires wished to form a sort of constitutional papacy, and wrote a book called, *Reason in harmony with Faith*, which only tended to show that the two were incompatible; just as the revolution had for the last fifty years shown that the co-existence of liberty and authority were impossible, and are both very similar to perpetual motion and the quadrature of the circle.

What eclecticism attempts to discover in philosophy, the *juste-milieu* attempts in politics.

Ask the eclectic—Are you a materialist?

He replies—No.

A spiritualist?—Certainly not.

What then? a realist?—God forbid!

An idealist?—I differ from him.

A pantheist?—I know not what it is.

An atheist?—I know not the meaning of it.

A sceptic?—That is impossible.

Out of my sight then; you're a humbug or a stupid!

We shall see that the doctrinaire's politics are the counterpart of this.

What do you think of the republic?—A great fact.

The monarchy?—I stick to legality.

The president?—He is elected by six millions of votes.

The constitution?—The sum total of our political ideas.

Socialism?—A beautiful utopia.

Property?—a necessary evil.

Do you believe in religion?—I respect it.

Do you believe in equality?—I wish for it.

Do you believe in progress?—I do not oppose it.

The eclectic and the doctrinaire, (the utilitarian, or Benthamite,) and above them both, the Jesuit, such are the three elements that now govern France, I had almost said that have ever governed the world.

At present, the Jesuit seems to reign unopposed in Europe; and yet the attack on Rome was the commencement of their ruin. For whether successful or not, the ruin of the papacy must be the result; for, either it must disappear under the reforms of Mazzini, by which the Pope, simply Bishop of Rome, having no authority in the church, his power as Pope would be gone; or, restored by foreign bayonets, established in the blood of its revolted subjects, the papacy must become an object of horror to the Christian world, and perish by its own victory: a Pope the vicar of Christ, reigning by the sword, is a blasphemy of the tiara: it is Antichrist.

The alliance of the doctrinaires with the Jesuits has

overthrown every obstacle—religion, papacy, monarchy, and government. Bishops of France take care! The war against the Roman Republic, rousing the people against the Church, and disgracing Catholicism, corrupts the revolution, disturbs men's consciences, and compromises the peace of Europe. Socialism, whose mission was to convert you, is your destroyer. Take care! Separate yourselves from the Jesuits while there is yet time, warn your chief, Pius IX., or you are ruined.

[To be Continued.]

From the London Morning Chronicle.

## LABOR AND THE POOR.

### THE RURAL DISTRICTS.

[Concluded.]

The next subject immediately in connection with the dwellings of the laborer is that of rent. It is impossible to arrive at anything like a fair average of the rent paid for the cottages, as it varies so much, not only in different districts of the county, but, in some cases, actually within the same parish. At Buxhall, the cottages built by the Rev. Mr. Hill let for £3 3s., while close by him, and in the same parish, there are others, not containing a greater amount of accommodation, which let for £6 and even £7 per annum. At Woodbridge there are a number of wretched one-roomed cottages, the property of the Rev. Mr. Taylor, a dissenting minister, the rent of which is 1s. 4d. per week, while in many other places cottages of a similar character can be had for 9d. and 1s. Upon the estate of Sir E. Kerrison a comfortable four-roomed cottage, with a rood of land, lets for £3 10s.; while there are several cottages close by his estate which, without any garden, let for £4. As a general rule it may, perhaps, be stated that in the neighborhood of towns the rent of the cottages is higher than in places further removed from them; and it will also be generally found that the cottages built by gentlemen of property upon their own estates let for a considerable less sum than those built by private speculators. One great cause of the enormously high rents which are paid by the poor people is, that in a great many cases the cottages are built by persons of very small capital. A tradesman in a country town, as soon as he is able to scrape together a little money, forthwith begins to look about for a piece of land upon which he can build one or more cottages; but through his not having fully counted the cost, he finds that before the building is completed his small capital has run out, and he is compelled to borrow money at a high rate of interest upon the mortgage of the cottages—and thus, having interest to pay upon the borrowed money, as well as to obtain a return for his own investment, he is forced to obtain the largest amount of rent he can from the unfortunate tenants. The number of cottages which are either in this situation, or which have fallen into the hands of those who had advanced money upon them, is very great.

Generally speaking, there appear to be no universally recognized conditions upon which the tenant holds the cottage. In some, but comparatively few, cases the repairs are done at the expense of the landlords. In the majority of cases the tenant bears the cost of repair, or puts up with the want of it. Upon the estates of Sir E. Kerrison and other gentlemen, the landlord charges himself with the repairs. Upon the Culford estate, the property of the Rev. E. Benyon, very strict rules are adopted with respect to the tenantry. The following is a copy of the regulations to be observed by the tenants on his estate:—

“REGULATIONS TO BE OBSERVED BY THE COTTAGE TENANTRY, AND THOSE RENTING GARDEN ALLOTMENTS ON THE CULFORD ESTATE:—

“1. Each occupier is to keep his cottage, with the buildings belonging to the same, clean and in good order.

“2. Any injury committed to the walls, doors, oven, or windows, or upon other fixtures, as locks, grates, cupboards, shelves, &c., to be made good by the tenant; reasonable use and wear thereof being allowed.

“3. All fixtures that are actually the property of the tenant are, on his leaving the cottage, to be offered to the Rev. E. R. Benyon, at a fair valuation, and should he decline the purchase, they must be removed before the tenant's quitting the premises, and without injury to the walls, or any part of the buildings.

“4. No person, in addition to the immediate family of the tenant, is permitted to reside in any cottage, without a written authority from the steward of the estate.

“5. No gleaning-corn is allowed to be threshed in any cottage.

“6. The gardens are to be cultivated with the spade, and on no account to be plowed.

“7. No occupier is to underlet his garden, or any part of it.

“8. All fences, gates, posts, rails, &c., are to be kept in repair, and the hedges neatly trimmed, by the tenant.

“9. No horse, poney, or donkey is to be kept without a written authority, as aforesaid.

“10. Should the Rev. E. R. Benyon, or his steward, notice any tenant neglecting to conform to these regulations, they will be compelled to remove him from possession of his cottage and garden, by notice, according to the covenant in the agreement under which he holds possession.

“As the principal object desired by the Rev. E. R. Benyon is the welfare and comfort of his tenantry, it is hoped they will see the advantage that must arise from conducting themselves respectfully and orderly, and keeping their cottages and gardens as directed; a proper attention to which will alone secure to them their respective occupations.”

The observance of these regulations is enforced by a written agreement signed by each tenant. If the tenant refuses to leave when called upon to do so, the landlord has the power, under the Small Tenements Act, of forcibly removing him, upon application to the County Court. I was informed, however, by his steward, that it was very rarely that this power was called into requisition, the tenants, generally speaking, being very careful to fulfil the terms of the agreement.

One of the great evils of which, perhaps more than anything else, the poor people complain, is that of their being compelled to pay the parish-rates, in addition to the sum they pay for the rent of their cottages. Speaking to a poor woman, who resided in a cottage of her own near Woolpit, and whose husband was in almost constant work, she said:—“One of the most cruellest things as I know is to make the poor dear people pay the rates. I'm better off than some of 'em, because I don't have no rent to pay, but there's a *haps* of people that can't afford to pay it nohow. There's my poor daughter has to pay 2s 9d. or 2s 3d. every time they call for a rate, and I'm sure they're often obliged to go without wittles to pay it. It's a cruel thing—it makes the poor dear people run in debt for things they ought to pay for, and puts things in their minds that they never thought or dreamt on, and I hope and pray that some good gentleman will take the matter up, and write to the Government and let 'em know how the poor laborer is put upon. Everything comes from them—if they war'nt to work what could the rich folks do? They'd starve, and yet they makes him pay the rates. Oh, it is a cruel thing, indeed it is. The poor dear laborer has to go a *throsing*, tearing his poor inside out, and can't get nothing when he's out but his bit of bread and a drop of water from the ditch, without even a crum' o' pork, and then when he comes home, why all

that's for him is to go to the pail for a *scop* o' water, or have perhaps a little *wake* tea, or boiled water with a crum' o' sugar in it—perhaps not that."

The wages of the laborer vary rather considerably in different portions of Suffolk. Previously to the harvest, the maximum paid to field laborers was 9s. a week. In many other parts, principally in the western division, the wages were not more than 8s. Since the harvest, however, there has been a very general reduction of 1s. per week, and in the neighborhood of Clare and Cavendish the farmers had very generally come to a resolution to reduce the wages to 6s. for married men, with a proportionate reduction in the wages of the women and unmarried men. But although 8s. or 9s. per week is the nominal amount of wages paid to the laborers, it is in fact somewhat more than that. During "hay time" and harvest an increased rate of wages is paid. During the hay-making season the laborers get in some cases double wages, in others about 50 per cent more; that is to say, a laborer who may have previously been receiving 8s., will then make 12s. per week. In addition to the money increase, they also have what they call "fours," which consists in having bread and cheese and beer at four o'clock. During the harvest month, too, the men generally get double wages, or in case where it is done by piecework, a number of men join together and take so many acres, which they undertake to reap at a certain price. In such cases the men will earn, upon an average, from £3 to £5 during the month. A custom prevails in many parts of the county of giving the men three bushels of malt at the close of the harvest. During the harvest, in addition to their wages, the men are allowed what is called "a taking supper," which is a supper given to the men at the time of making the agreement; the "half-way supper," when the work is about half completed; and the final supper, called the "harvest home," when the grain is carted and stacked.

The appropriation among the laborers generally of their earnings is usually that the amount earned in harvest pays the rent—the hay-making wages go for clothes—and the produce of the gleaming pays the shoemaker. In too many cases, unfortunately, this mode of distribution cannot be adhered to. The majority of the laborers have nothing to do during the winter, and where they can, they are compelled to run in debt for the necessaries of life, and the extra money earned in harvest too frequently goes to pay off "the old score." A few extra weeks of wet weather, or sickness in the family, is quite sufficient to destroy all their nicely-adjusted financial schemes. If you ask the laborer how he manages to pay his rent, live, and clothe himself upon his wages, the usual answer given to you will be something of this sort, "Why, zur, I don't know how we manages; if you wur a laboring man yourself you would know, I *zur* say." There can be no doubt as to the truth contained in the latter portion of the answer; but as to any information you can get upon the subject it is almost out of the question. It is, in fact, a mystery to themselves, and it is no wonder that they are unable to explain it to you.

But the wages as given above include only those paid to married men; a custom very generally prevails of giving the unmarried considerably less than the married men. Few of the unmarried men get more than 6s., the majority but 5s. per week; but, so far as the value of the labor obtained by the farmer is concerned, there can be no doubt that they are able to get a much larger amount of work from the young unmarried men than from the married and older ones. And in this point of view it is manifestly unjust to make a difference in the wages of the two classes. Besides the injustice of the proceeding, the policy is of the most doubtful character; by giving a young man of 20 years of age and upwards, a lower rate of wages

than they would give to one who was probably his junior, but who could call himself a married man, they almost compel them in self-defence to marry early, and, in the great majority of cases, additional burdens are, in consequence, thrown upon the parishes. Accustomed up to the period of his marriage to live under the roof of his parents, allowing them a portion of his earnings for his food and lodging, and when thrown out of work having his parents to fall back upon—which in a great many instances is the case—he knows nothing of the extreme privations which others less favorably situated than himself have to endure. He is married however; he is entered upon the farmer's list as a married man, and forthwith his wages are raised from 5s. or 6s. to 8s., or perhaps 9s. His wife may or may not possess those peculiar qualities which are indispensably necessary to the laborer who desires to make both ends meet. For the first five or six years of their married life they are subject to the greatest privations. The expenses of a family of four or five children have come upon them, and the earnings of the husband, even if in constant work, are inefficient for their support. The children are too young to earn anything wherewith to assist the general stock; the wife is unable to earn anything, because the family is too young to be left. Sickness, perhaps, comes upon them; the husband is unable to work; and finally the union receives the whole of them; and the farmer who grudgingly paid him his paltry pittance of five or six shillings a week as an unmarried laborer, has to reap the fruits of his injudicious economy, by supporting the laborer, with his family, in a state of idleness. Many instances of this have come under my own knowledge.

The wages paid to boys under 16 seldom exceed 3s. per week, and the women seldom earn more than 5s. I have not met with any case in which a higher rate than that has been paid, and for one who is paid so much there are hundreds who receive less.

The diet of the laborer may be summed up in two words—bread and potatoes. Meat is comparatively unknown to them. "I can assure you solemnly," said a laborer to me, who was in pretty constant work, "I don't get a bit of meat from one month's end to another." "Last Sunday," said a poor woman whose cottage I visited, "we had a bit of pork that I gave 9d. for; it was the first bit that we'd had for many a long week. What we didn't eat for dinner on Sunday my husband took with him when he went to work on Monday." "Lor, bless you," said another, "we shouldn't know ourselves if we got meat." "My son," said the poor woman whose residence I have described at Barrow, "sometimes buys a pig to sell again, and then he has his head." A poor woman residing in Hare-court, Bury, whose husband earned 8s. a week at a malster's at Fornham, and who was necessarily absent all the week in consequence of the distance from his home at which he was compelled to work, gave me the following as their weekly expenditure:—

Rent	1s. 6d.
One stone of flour	1 8
Baking	0 3
A piece of pork on Sundays	0 9
Potatoes	0 1½
½oz. tea	0 3½
¼lb. sugar	0 3½
¼lb. butter	0 3
Total	4 9½

leaving 3s. 3½d. for the support of her husband during the week, out of which he had to pay 1s. a week for his own lodging. They had no family, had lived twenty-seven years in the same house, and owed only one week's rent.

"We never gets pork, except on Sundays, and then my husband is at home. I don't think about none all the week; and it is no use a thinking about it, if you can't get it," said the sharp little woman, resuming her work at making flour sacks, at which she informed me she could "arne," if she got up before daylight, and worked all day, the remunerating sum of 6d. When she was mending sacks "she only got a halfpenny a-piece," and they took her almost as long to mend as a new one did to make. She "couldn't mend more than four dozen in a week."

### "BANKRUPTCY—BANKING."

FREEMAN HUNT, Esq., *Editor of the Merchants Magazine, &c.*

In discussion upon "the great subjects of currency and finance," we too often lose sight of the distinction between real capital, possessing intrinsic value, and money, which is but a legal representative of value, and a medium of exchange. According to the definition, which has never been disputed, anything which, without exchange, can contribute to the well-being of man, possesses real value—is capital; while money, constituted by law or agreement, a representative of capital, is useful only as a means by which articles possessing real value can be exchanged. The position that money is merely a representative of value, can be demonstrated by instituting a comparison between a dollar and any article fitted for the use of man—a bushel of wheat, for example. We see that the dollar is useless, except as it will procure the wheat, or other corresponding article, and that its value is entirely dependent upon the existence of the latter; while the value of the wheat would be the same were there no dollar in the world. At the time when all currency consisted of the precious metals, some argument in favor of the intrinsic value of money might have been drawn from the uses to which its component materials could be applied. That time has long since passed, and money must now be regarded solely in its capacities of a representative of value and a medium of exchange. That money, as currency, is valuable only in proportion to what it will procure, is, to me, a self-evident truth, which must ultimately take the place of its opposing falsity, now so prevalent, that any given thing is worth only so much as it will fetch in money.

As before said, the distinction above referred to is too often lost sight of in discussions respecting currency and finance, and your correspondent, G. B., though evidently conscious of it, has not always kept it in mind in the course of his argument, or he would not have cavilled at the proposition, that "the burden of interest on our debts must be borne by production," with reference to the counter statement that "money does not produce;" nor have gratuitously maintained, in this connection, that "capital contributes its share to production;" a position which no one disputes, and which has no bearing upon the question of interest on money.

That the rent of lands must correspond to the rent of money, is true; and there can be no doubt that "the income derived from all capital is too great;" and that "the tendency to bankruptcy is general, in all classes who use property not their own, and not peculiar to the mercantile community;" but, as this class is preëminent in that respect, the burden falls most heavily upon it, and the legitimate effects are here most clearly manifested. This tendency to bankruptcy prevails wherever excessive, though legal interest is paid upon a portion, if a large one, of the capital employed. Frequent instances are not wanting of farms being sacrificed to meet the payment of mortgage notes representing one-half the amount of the original purchase money; and G. B.'s experience differs from that

of most men if such instances, or similar ones in other pursuits, have not fallen under his own observation. That the payment of excessive interest upon a small portion of any man's active capital should not consume the whole is by no means remarkable, and it may be for his advantage to pay it; but such interest is none the less unjust.

It is not true, however, that the price of the use of money, though corresponding to that of the use of productive capital, *should*, under any circumstances, be more than the latter, as is now the case, or even equal to it. Productive capital pre-supposes the continued exercise of useful activity, of mind or body, on the part of the proprietor, and thus contains an important element, of which money is devoid. Nor is the amount of money borrowed on interest so small, in proportion to productive capital, as G. B. would indicate in his argument. The loans of the banks alone in the state of New York amount to nearly, if not quite, \$100,000,000, as seen by the Controller's statement of 22d September, 1849, while the interest-bearing debts due to individuals, and not included in those loans, must amount to many times this sum. To the excessive interest paid on this immense money loan is owing the enhancement of rents, of the price of produce to consumers, and the inadequate remuneration of producers, manufacturers, and merchants, upon whom the burden ultimately falls.

The fact that excessive interest is paid, in a measure, to our own citizens, and not entirely to foreign countries, does, indeed, make a difference in the aggregate wealth of the country, but none whatever as regards the abstraction from the pockets of those who pay it. It tends, moreover, to divide our people more and more into opposing classes; to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer; to accumulate the property of the country in a few hands. But for the wisdom of our laws, preventing long-continued accumulation by inheritance, and the extent of our public lands, affording a refuge to the impoverished, we should soon see the bulk of our citizens reduced to the condition of the masses of Europe, with nothing that they could absolutely call their own.

G. B. depreciates the statistical tables of New York and Massachusetts, and asserts that they prove nothing. At any rate, they are the only data we have to rely upon in determining the yearly increase of value in those States. If they are faulty in one year, they are probably so in another, and one error must be allowed to balance the other. If, in fact, the wealth, per inhabitant, of the State of New York has diminished during the past, or any ten years, notwithstanding the energy and industry of her people, what a lesson does this teach us respecting the effect of the enormous amount of interest now paid by this country to Europe? I notice, by the last returns, that the increase of property in the city of New York, during 1849 is less than 1 per cent on the value of her capital. Does not this low rate of increase show that an undue proportion of the earnings of her citizens has been withdrawn in the shape of interest, rent, &c.?

That "capital is civilization" I do not dispute; but that "to encourage its accumulation 'in a few hands' is the method to reduce its price," I deny; and such is the tendency of our present monetary system. If capital be civilization, the vices of civilization may be traced to any vice shown to be inherent in our system with regard to capital. If, as I hold, the inherent vice of that system be proved to be an excessive rate of interest on money, by removing this we may hope to remove those vices of civilization which correspond to it; among others, bankruptcy and pauperism.

On reading what I have written, I find that I have sometimes departed from the strict mercantile point of view. I was compelled to this by the course of argument

pursued by your correspondent, G. B., and hope that you will not, on that account, consider this paper unfitted for the pages of your Magazine. The subject under consideration is, in truth, of the deepest importance to every one, whether engaged in mercantile pursuits, or not; whether rich or poor. We all wish to accumulate; to secure the means of future comfort; not for ourselves alone, but especially for our children, our posterity. Now there can be no man among us so rich as to warrant the hope, on his part, that any more than a very small proportion of his descendants will, after a few generations, be in what are considered comfortable circumstances. All experience shows us, that by far the greater number must, under our present monetary system, belong to those classes who are dependent upon their daily earnings for their support. What is the fate of not a few of these is shown by the recent report of the Chief of Police to the Mayor of the city of New York; a report which it is not necessary to characterize, but which must excite feelings of horror and commiseration in all who read it.

Believing, as I do, that the excessive rate of interest is the cause of the progressive accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few; of bankruptcy, pauperism, and their attendant evils—consequently, the radical vice of our system—I hope that this subject will be treated with the attention which its importance demands, and discussed with the frankness of men who recognize the existence of a great evil, and earnestly desire a remedy.

I remain yours truly, F. G. S.

From the London Weekly Tribune.

### MRS. JAMESON.

In that band of noble women who sedulously strive to make England worthy to be, like old Greece, "the thinking head and throbbing heart of the universe," Mrs. Jameson occupies a conspicuous place. She has traveled much, both in the kingdoms of earth and the realms of mind, and she has given the results to the world in right eloquent language, colored with the rich hues of an elevated poetic fancy.

A stranger to her writings cannot read half a dozen consecutive pages of any of her works without guessing the "manner of spirit she is of," and he will not be disappointed if he expects to find in her a genuine woman. Mrs. Jameson is no mere utterer of stereotyped prettinesses—none of your female dealers in that species of sentiment which glitters very showily to be sure, but is about as natural as a Berlin wool rosebud.

The "whited sepulchre" is, alas! in many respects, the appropriate symbol of our vaunted civilization. The purple robe with which this civilization has covered over the festering corruptions of society Mrs. Jameson has courageously lifted up, and looked beneath through eyes blinded with tears. Nay more, she has dared to reveal the "secrets of the prison-house." She has boldly stepped beyond the circle of false decorum, which a tyrannous public opinion has drawn around woman, and, in a voice that has brought the burning blush of shame into the face of every son of Adam possessed of a heart, has pleaded the cause of her sisters.

Mrs. Jameson's last published work ("Essays and Memoirs Illustrative of Art, Literature, and Social Morals,") contains an excellent paper on "The Social Position of Mothers and Governesses," as also one on "Woman's Mission," full of sad truths.

Here is her appeal for the universal solemn recognition of the passion of Love; that passion implanted in us by the great God, to ripen into excellence the nobler faculties of our being, which would else remain undeveloped—almost unknown even to ourselves:—

"Strange, and passing strange, that the relation between the two sexes, the passion of love in short, should not be taken into deeper consideration by our teachers and our legislators. Must love be always discussed in blank verse, as if it were a thing to be played in tragedies or sung in song—a subject for pretty poems and wicked novels, and had nothing to do with the prosaic current of our everyday existence, our moral welfare and eternal salvation? Must love be ever treated with profaneness, as a mere illusion? or with fear, as a mere disease? or with shame, as a mere weakness? or with levity, as a mere accident? Whereas, it is a great mystery and a great necessity, lying at the foundation of human existence, morality and happiness—mysterious, universal, inevitable as death. Why then should love be treated less seriously than death? It is as serious a thing. Love and death, the alpha and omega of human life, the author and finisher of existence, the two poles on which God's universe turns; which He, our Father and Creator, has placed beyond our arbitration—beyond the reach of that election and free will which He has left us in all other things."

And how finely does she take those to task who, by cruel repressive measures, commenced in the very infancy of feeling, treat the finest affections of the heart as though they were noxious weeds—women who, their souls possessed by the GOLDEN IDEA, preach uncessantly to fair girlhood the abominable doctrine that Happiness fixes her throne only on a bag of yellow guineas or a roll of bank-notes.

### HUMBOLDT.

Humboldt is the great attraction wherever he goes. In spite of his four-score years he looks as hale and hearty and is as cheerful as a youth of eighteen. He has the kindest, most benevolent countenance, the mildest blue eyes and most gentle manners imaginable; and as to his conversation, it is eloquence distilled, flowing smoothly and uncessantly, charming all to whom he addresses himself, causing them to wonder how the mind of one man could grasp and retain such universal knowledge. I was surprised to learn that it was not until he was thirty years of age that he really commenced his travels; but he had been preparing himself since boyhood, and started forth a geologist, mineralogist, botanist, anatomist and linguist. He traveled under the most favorable circumstances, being personally very easy in money matters, and being aided wherever he went by the different governments and scientific men. Without this he could not have acquired all the knowledge he possesses. Many of your readers are familiar with his travels, but do they know how he has toiled and labored to give his fellow men the benefit of those travels? We talk of prolific writers, but none will bear mentioning by the side of Humboldt. Some idea of what he has done may be obtained by the fact that one set (I do not mean one edition) alone of his works costs *ten thousand dollars!* A space of two yards long in his library is occupied by his works on Botany—all folios, and written in Latin. He speaks, understands and writes perfectly the English, French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Sanscrit and German, besides having a partial knowledge of nearly all other languages. He never sleeps more than four hours, and says that from boyhood he never required more. All the work he has done, all that ten thousand dollars' worth of writing has been done at night, between the hours of eleven and three; he never works at any other time. He is the intimate and beloved friend of the King, and for several years past has resided in the palace. At Potsdam and in Berlin his handsome suite of apartments are near the King.

As I before said, he goes to bed at three o'clock in the morning in winter and at two in summer, rises at six or seven, takes a perfectly cold bath, then his coffee, and employs the remainder of the day; until dinner time in reading and answering the letters he receives. I say the remainder of the day, but he always reserves two hours, from

twelve to two, to receiving his friends; but with that exception he does nothing but attend to his correspondence. He says he receives on an average between *two and three hundred thousand letters a year!* and to nearly all of them he sends replies. He gets letters from all parts of the globe, and from the most remote corners. His evenings are always spent with the King, in his Majesty's private apartments; and thus his life passes, calmly and peaceably: and while he is engaged in the purest and most elevated of all enjoyments, that of imparting to others portions of the great stock of knowledge he possesses, he patiently waits for the time when he shall be called from the earth he has studied so deeply.

A scientific society never holds a meeting here without receiving some valuable communication from Humboldt; and it is always something new, something which he seems to have reserved for that especial occasion, and never to have given to world before. He says he still studies as diligently as he did fifty years ago, and he does not feel his thirst for knowledge at all diminished.—*St. Louis Republican.*

### RIGHTS OF WOMAN.

Extracts from a "Discourse on Woman, by LUCRETIA MOTT," delivered at the Assembly Buildings, Philadelphia, December 17, 1849.

This age is notable for its works of mercy and benevolence—for the efforts that are made to reform the inebriate and degraded, to relieve the oppressed and suffering. Women as well as men are interested in these works of justice and mercy. They are efficient co-workers, their talents are called into profitable exercise, their labors are effective in each department of reform. The blessing to the merciful, to the peacemaker, is equal to man and woman. It is greatly to be deplored, now that she is increasingly qualified for usefulness, that any view should be presented calculated to retard her labors of love.

Why should not a woman seek to be a reformer? If she is to shrink from being such an iconoclast as shall "break the image of man's lower worship," as so long held up to view; if she is to fear to exercise her reason, and her noble powers, lest she should be thought to "attempt to act the man," and not "acknowledge his supremacy;" if she is to be satisfied with the narrow sphere assigned her by man, nor aspire to a higher, lest she should transcend the bounds of female delicacy, truly it is a mournful prospect for a woman. We would admit all the difference that our great and beneficent Creator has made in the relation of man and woman, nor would we seek to disturb this relation; but we deny that the present position of woman is her true sphere of usefulness, until the disabilities and disadvantages, religious, civil, and social, which impede her progress are removed out of her way. These restrictions have enervated her mind and paralyzed her powers. While man assumes that the present is the original state designed for woman, that the *existing* "differences are not arbitrary nor the result of accident," but grounded in nature, she will not make the necessary effort to obtain her just rights, lest it should subject her to the kind of scorn and contemptuous manner in which she has been spoken of.

So far from her "ambition leading her to attempt to act the man," she needs all the encouragement she can receive, by the removal of obstacles from her path, in order that she may become a "true woman." As it is desirable that man should act a manly and generous part, not "manish," so let woman be urged to exercise a dignified and womanly bearing, not womanish. Let her cultivate all the graces and proper accomplishments of her sex, but let not these degenerate into a kind of effeminacy, in which she is satisfied to be the mere plaything or toy of society, content

with her outward adornings, and with the tone of flattery and fulsome adulation too often addressed to her. True, nature has made a difference in her configuration, her physical strength, her voice, &c.—and we ask no change—we are satisfied with nature. But how have neglect and mismanagement increased this difference! It is our duty to develop these natural powers by suitable exercise, so that they may be strengthened "by reason of use." In the ruder state of society, woman is made to bear heavy burdens, while her "lord and master" walks idly by her side. In the civilization to which we have attained, if cultivated and refined woman would bring all her powers into use, she might engage in pursuits which she now shrinks from as beneath her proper vocation. The energies of men need not then be wholly devoted to the counting-house and common business of life, in order that women in fashionable society may be supported in their daily promenades and nightly visits to the theater and ball-room. \* \* \*

The question is often asked, "What does woman want more than she enjoys? What is she seeking to obtain? Of what rights is she deprived? What privileges are withheld from her? I answer, she asks nothing as favor, but as right: she wants to be acknowledged as a moral, responsible being. She is seeking not to be governed by laws, in the making of which she has no voice. She is deprived of almost every right in civil society, and is a cypher in the nation, except in the right of presenting a petition. In religious society her disabilities, as already pointed out, have greatly retarded her progress. Her exclusion from the pulpit or ministry—her duties marked out for her by her equal brother man, subject to creeds, rules, and disciplines made for her by him—this is unworthy her true dignity. In marriage, there is assumed superiority, on the part of the husband, and admitted inferiority, with the promise of obedience, on the part of the wife. This subject calls loudly for examination, in order that the wrong may be redressed. Customs, suited to darker ages in Eastern countries, are not binding upon enlightened society. The solemn covenant of marriage may be entered into without these lordly assumptions, and humiliating concessions and promises. \* \* \*

It is with reluctance that I make the demand for the political rights of woman; because this claim is so distasteful to the age. Woman shrinks, in the present state of society, from taking any interest in politics. The events of the French Revolution, and the claim for woman's rights, are held up to her as a warning. But let us not look at the excesses of woman alone, at that period; but remember that the age was marked with extravagances and wickedness in men as well as women. Indeed, political life abounds with these excesses, and with shameful outrage. Who knows but that if woman acted her part in governmental affairs there might be an entire change in the turmoil of political life! It becomes man to speak modestly of his ability to act without her. If woman's judgment were exercised, why might she not aid in making the laws by which she is governed! Lord Brougham remarked that the works of Harriet Martineau upon Political Economy were not excelled by those of any political writer of the present time. The first few chapters of her "Society in America," her views of a Republic, and of Government generally, furnish evidence of woman's capacity to embrace subjects of universal interest.

Far be it from me to encourage woman to vote, or to take an active part in politics, in the present state of our government. Her right to the elective franchise, however, is the same, and should be yielded to her, whether she exercise that right or not. Would that men, too, would have no participation in a government based upon the life-taking principle—upon retaliation and the sword. It is unworthy a Christian nation. But when, in the diffusion of light

and intelligence, a convention shall be called to make regulations for self-government, on Christian, non-resistant principles, I see no good reason why woman should not participate in such an assemblage, taking part equally with man.

Walker, of Cincinnati, in his introduction to American law, says: "With regard to political rights, females form a positive exception to the general doctrine of equality. They have no part or lot in the formation or administration of government. They cannot vote or hold office. We require them to contribute their share in the way of taxes, to the support of government, but allow them no voice in its direction. We hold them amenable to the laws when made, but allow them no share in making them. This language, applied to males, would be the exact definition of political slavery; applied to females, custom does not teach us so to regard it." Woman, however, is beginning so to regard it.

## THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1850.

### LESSONS OF THE HAGUE-STREET TRAGEDY.

We have purposely waited till the shock of this terrible catastrophe has partially subsided, before calling attention to some lessons of universal duty which it suggests, and which the very earnestness of personal feeling may make us overlook. Mournful pity for the dead and respect for their remains, commiseration for the families of the killed, and for wounded sufferers, admiration of the heroism of firemen, and indignant horror at the carelessness which directly or indirectly caused such accumulated miseries, above all, efficient benevolence in supplying the wants of the bereaved, were the first rightful promptings of sympathy. And the sincere compassion poured out by tens of thousands upon that mangled heap of fellow men beneath that burning ruin, has showed how rich are all hearts with hidden kindness, which would make social life glorious with magnanimity, if existing conditions of industry and wealth did not imprison us in treadmills of selfishness. But now it seems timely to say that this tragedy should be instrumental for higher ends than to teach improvements in the construction of steam engines, and to quicken a sense of responsibility in machinists and engineers, important as these ends undeniably are. Such a massacre should cut to the quick the conscience of this great community.

1. The verdict of the coroner's jury brings home with appalling directness their criminal neglect to the authors of this wholesale homicide. But let all employers look into their own establishments before expending the whole of their conscientiousness upon their neighbors. Why is there such absolutely universal indifference not only to the physical life, health, symmetry, comfort, of our fellows, but yet more to their culture and character, their progress, purity and peace—in workshops and stores, fields and factories, ships and steamboats? Not because man is "totally depraved," as theology, lazily dreaming of general theories, and blind to specific facts, asserts—not because "man's natural state is that of war," as utilitarian politi-

cians, belying our best instincts, and intent on partial experience, declare; but because our present social relations array men's productive energies and physical wants in antagonism.

The whole atmosphere of society instils into young and old torpid neglect of the welfare of others, and keen sensibility to our own concerns. Practically, communities, like mothers, made unnatural by vice and want, drive their children from the door at break of day, to beg or steal, fill baskets with broken meat, and earn coppers by street-sweeping, with a curse and a threat not to return at night empty-handed. "Fight your way through the jostling crowd in life's thoroughfare, seize the best morsel at the world's scrambling feast, stake your all in the lottery of success," is the lesson taught in the nursery, at school, on 'change, in legislative halls, aye! in churches. "Competition" is the method whereby commercial civilization repeats the old barbarous rule of killing off the weaklings by casting them out to starve in thickets of care, or to fall a prey to brutalizing necessity. In our haste to wealth's eldorados, we have not time to pick up unfortunates who tumble overboard from swift steamboats and rushing cars. Dwellers in cities cannot afford the wear and tear of heart which pity for countless craving sufferers demands, and learn to case themselves in an armor of sternness, impervious to appeal, which seems to the countryman like heartless cruelty. Self-dependance, individuality, are of course indispensable as a native stock, whereon to graft choicest fruits of charity; but competitive isolation rears only the crabbed trunk, and kills the finer shoot.

But to come to details:—the owner of that manufactory in Hague-street never would have dreamed of subjecting fellow men to the frightful risk he confessedly did had it not been for the maddening influence of competition with rivals in trade, and a seeming necessity to combine excessive economy with swift execution. And, but for a similar corrupting effect of feverish lust for large gains by rapid production, the makers of that engine would have destroyed it a thousand-fold, sooner than to have allowed to pass from their hands with misgivings of its security an instrument of such tremendous power. These men did only what millions throughout the civilized world are doing, under pressure of the same motive, every day of the year. Adulterations of breadstuffs, sugars, drugs, and every conceivable article of diet, flimsy fabrics for apparel, comfort and elegant uses, rickety furniture made for show only, toppling houses, unfit to stand before a gale, and leaking in every storm; these and innumerable like abuses are proofs of the all-pervading, all-poisoning influence of competition. And juries and judges would do well, if instead of condemning individuals, they should trace home all little frauds and infidelities to the grand mother-wine of modern society, DISUNITED INTERESTS.

2. But, again, let employers, before pouring out all the vials of their wrath upon the owners of the Hague-street workshop, consider their own injustice to their "hands." There are other modes of killing apprentices and journeymen than by steam explosions; other modes of making cripples and inflicting wounds than by crushed walls and

blazing timbers; other modes of robbing dependant parents, wives, children, of sons, husbands, fathers, than by such an unprecedented enacting of the horrors of bombardment amidst a peaceful community. Foul air, darkness, drudgery, irregular hours, hope deferred, anxiety, despondency, poor diet, scanty clothing, make thousands of victims to every one destroyed by violence. Our senses delude conscience. Backs bent, and limbs contracted by rheumatism, eyes bleared with ophthalmia, tuberculous lungs, ulcerated stomachs and bowels, fevered or flaccid brains, unstrung nerves, frames exhausted by stimulants; we falsely refer to providential infliction, instead of seeking their source in prevalent inhumanities.

Now it becomes us to ask, why it is that the average duration of life is but two-thirds as long among the working as among the professional classes; and why, generation after generation, workmen so passively submit to wearing and wasting serfdom—while, on the other hand, capital with such fatal slowness clips the laborer's thread of life. There is but one answer to this question. The explanation of these unfraternal wrongs is to be found in the **WAGES-SYSTEM**. Talk of economy as we may, and dwell on exceptional cases of the few who, amid particular communities or in favorable seasons, raise themselves by energy and thrift into the class of employers; yet, no fact can be more clearly proved by statistics, than that viewed on the large scale, the Wages-System throughout the civilized world results in pauperism and the concomitant, physical, mental and moral deterioration of the proletariat. Great manufacturing and commercial centers are the inevitable outgrowth of competitive civilization; toward these centers gravitate, by material necessities, social attractions, excitements to enterprise, and intellectual stimulants, a surplus population; want makes these rivals the willing prey of wealthy speculators; and by a tendency as steady and pervading as that of fluids to find their level, remuneration for labor is forever falling to the minimum or starvation point. Then, again, fluctuations in trade and production, bankruptcies, vicissitudes of climate, conflagrations, epidemics, bereavements, &c., continually plunge multitudes into want, swelling yet more the class of dependants upon the chance for daily toil. Thus, Labor becomes the pensioner on Wealth.

The cure and prevention of this abject dependance can be found only in the substitution of *Co-partnership* in labor, risks and profits for the Wages-System. Had all the workmen in that Hague-street purgatory been sharers in the property, with a voice in its management, does any one, for an instant, dream that such a crowd of human beings would have been herded together story above story in the first place, or that secondly to save a few dollars or hurry on work, they would have exposed themselves, or one another, to such sudden and utter ruin? The mere supposition is preposterous. A slaveholder, *owning those men*, would have treated them with incalculably more care for their safety in life and limb. But, *owning themselves*, there was no insurance even on their bones and muscles, not to speak of their energy and skill, their minds and hearts, to the value of a copper—while bricks and mortar,

timbers and iron, were doubtless insured at their utmost worth. The employer knew that he could get as many more such living tools, at any moment when they were needed: let them insure themselves. Do not these obvious considerations bring home to us the mockery of all social affection incident to the practice of Work for Wages,

3. The sum raised for the benefit of the sufferers' families will, probably, amount to some thirty thousand-dollars. This is well. A population larger than that of several States of the Union is gathered together within four miles square, around the scene of this hideous catastrophe, and the contribution of *sixpence a head* would have swelled to about the sum indicated. Yet, even such uncommon liberality is praise-worthy as the world goes. Uncommon! and why? Obviously, because under our customs of isolated households we are habituated to think only, or chiefly of those immediately dependant on our sympathies by consanguinity and friendship. Universal brotherly-kindness still seems like vague sentimentality and utopianism to the most.

The questions which instantly suggest themselves are such as these: "Why, if these poor men were so worthy of reverential, tender regard when killed, were they not much more so while living among us; should not city authorities be as careful for the healthy preservation of able-bodied workmen as for the recovery of their charred and mutilated corpses?" Or again, "why, if the families, aged parents, helpless wives and children of these unfortunates have a just claim to support, education, comfort *now*, have they not always had an equal claim; and if the claim holds good at all, why is it to be limited to such a paltry pittance as has been raised for them: were these our blood relatives should we be content with a sixpenny contribution?" And once more, "are there not hundreds of families, in our midst, quite as much in need of our guardianship as these bereaved ones? Fathers, brothers, sons, blasted by the outburst and fires of intemperance and lust, though corrupting in slow agonies, work a far wider woe on all within the sphere of their influence than did those writhing sufferers. Do not the families of the vicious demand our commiserating protection above all others?" "*These ye should have done, but not have left the other undone,*" is the text that thunders in our ears from such an awakening of latent charity. Habitual, permanent, universal, fully developed, should be the active brotherly love which now transiently, spasmodically, partially is bestowed upon these few.

How plainly does this tearing open of the conventional surface of one of our great cities expose the wasting plague that works at the core of modern civilization!

When shall united families of God's children live as becomes the co-heirs of an all benignant Father?

W. H. C.

There is but one God, and thou shalt love him with all thy heart, all thy soul, all thy mind, and all thy strength. This is the first commandment; the second is, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: greater there is none.

## DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION.

## ITS DISTINGUISHING CHARACTER AND METHODS OF FORMATION.

Two principal methods exist of founding agricultural and domestic associations, opposite in their origins, and whose characters it is of great importance that we should not confound. We are the more in danger of so doing, especially in our practical institutions, because Fourier has only described that form which it has been hitherto entirely out of our power to attempt. Association, as described by Fourier, originates and pivots in a Prince, or great Capitalist, combining science with pecuniary means and social influence, constructing, as a preliminary movement, the buildings adapted to phalansterian residence, preparing the grounds for serial cultures, and, as a last step, calling in the associates he has selected and agreed with, to come and begin to live as Phalansterians, laboring in short and varied sessions, in the functions of their choice, and everywhere combining to form Groups and Series, according to the double accord of affinity of character with affinity of industry. These Phalansterians would enter the new order, for which all should have been pre-arranged, from a perception of superior advantages afforded them, and begin at once the life of organized attractive labor, under the guiding supervision of the founder.

LIBERTY would here be secured, as a *Result* from ORDER. It need hardly be said that we have had nothing in the slightest degree analogous to this as yet. Our tendencies have been exclusively democratic.—The forms of association hitherto attempted: (we do not now speak of communities nor of religious bodies—Monastic, Jansenist or Shaker.) Associations have commenced, and are likely to be repeated, among the working people themselves—persons for the most part not overburdened with any sort of knowledge, and certainly not with social science—with good-will, earnestness and considerable toughness for their principal means to begin with, and, as there is but little clear sightedness or unitary conception of a purpose among them, it is perhaps as well that their interest at stake is not a larger one.

ORDER, in this case, instead of being the starting-point, will be the last result of successfully conciliating individual and family interests, gradually enlightened upon the advantages of coöperative association by practical contact.

The point to be reached is the same in every case, namely, the organization of attractive labor. Now, attractive labor is, as a general rule, impossible by any other method than that of the *Passional Series* or *Series of Groups* described by Fourier.

This method, as well as its result, attraction, or charm, imparted to every kind of work, is, then, whether they know it or not, the aim and desire of all those who work for a better social future.

But this method cannot be at once adopted by them, because it pre-supposes capital and material, adaptation of grounds, dwellings and workshops—which is to poor workmen impossible.

The imperious necessities of the hour and the day ab-

sorb nearly the whole force of the laborer, under the present iniquitous systems of interest to capital, six times above the actual increase of values, and even more than this, besides the indirect taxation by commercial fraud, and the support of legions of parasitical supernumerary agents.

Workingmen, then, unaided by Capitalists, can only associate with safety so fast and so far as their individual interests can be drawn into contact and blend harmoniously, without giving up any of that liberty of action, or of those industrial positions which now enable them individually to make ends meet.

They cannot leave their isolated dwellings for want of money to construct a unitary edifice. They cannot leave the business to which they are accustomed, to earn lower wages as novices in some other.

The first legitimate, safe and natural points of harmonious contact which their interests admit of are those of the *Protective Unions*, *Public Bakery—Restaurant*, *Unitary Laundry*, &c.

If they leave their present industrial position to unite more intimately, and to labor in association, they necessarily compromise a part of their present efficiency, and are obliged to incur a debt in the beginning of their career, which has crippled all the small associations hitherto started.

The Parisian workmen have carried association as far as has hitherto been safely practicable. Each branch of trade has organized separately, by using a commodious workshop, a unitary dépôt for sales, and employing its own factors.

The next step in order for them, is the removal of their families to a country site, more salubrious, and cheaper in rents, and the organization of unitary Bakeries, Restaurants, Laundries, &c., already effected or in agitation by some of the Parisian crafts.

By prematurely imposing an associative unity, not attained through the methodical combinations of *Series of Groups*, manifold lessons of justice and economy occur. The Association should be, properly speaking, only the last term, produced by the synthetic arrangements of the *Groups of Series*, whose combinations should be made in proportion and adaptation to their particular interests.

Civilization has not been so many thousand years separating functions for nothing.

The *Man* is first. He becomes the pivot of the group. The group is the primordial element of the Phalanx as the Phalanx is of the humanity. Commencing from our present civilized position, with no great prince or capitalist to head the movement, but a democracy of workingmen, uniting on equal terms, each group or department of business must be considered as entitled to its own profits, dividing them among its members, by its internal law, paying other groups for services rendered, and *combining or fusing with them by the interchange of its members, just so far and so fast as these members choose to move, impelled by industrial attraction towards other branches, or by considerations of health, or by social affinities.*

To do more than this is to create a new sphere of limitations, and of vexatious duties. There are, for instance,

few persons, out of a large range of acquaintances, with whom we find the charm of friendship. How much our passional minimum must be still farther narrowed, if by a premature retirement to some country spot, our choice has to be made out of 30, 40, or 100 persons, instead of the more numerous chances now enjoyed.

There will be little harmony found, even in opinions, and if all unite on certain essential principles, they will find little connection between intellectual and social sympathies. Then, in regard to the management of business, the manhood of individuals hitherto standing on their own ground, acting on their own hook, running their own risks, profiting by their own skill, as well as labor, suffers sensibly by according to a few individuals the control of all business, by becoming merely passive, going where they are sent, and doing as they are bid, with a simple estimation of the time spent in labor, and no adequate compensation to superior skill or intelligence.

There is, it is true, a careless responsibility farther than one's daily duties, and those who are not competent to take any other than subordinate positions may gain something by the exchange. But, on the other hand, it must be observed that a great many vocations, which now find their place and profits, have to be given up by those who join small associations. Their exigencies, with ordinary farm and market garden-work, with their chief branches of mechanic labor, are very pressing, and unless one brings capital sufficient to reorganize his branch of industry completely in the new sphere he is absorbed by the above mentioned, and his services required in subordinate functions.

Even if he has capital enough to organize his branch independently, he may not succeed in persuading the association to undertake it, as must be the method under the present notions of association, where the society is from the first to act collectively on each question, to organize each industrial branch, and then entrust or reintrust it to the management of its natural head.

How, besides, previous to the organization of attractive labor by Series of Groups, rivalized, contrasted and interlocked, can we expect the same degree of interest and energy to be displayed by men who do not personally lose or gain in proportion to the failure or success of the branch allotted to them?

I should be sorry to utter a word that sounds like discouragement. I only want men to see clearly what they go about, and not be rushing any more into what they call associations, like crazy fellows, without any means of organization, as has been done in so many past failures.

There is enough of sound practical associative work open to all in our towns and cities, in the Protective Unions, the mechanics' combinations, the club-houses, the scientific indoctrination, and the culture of social relations with those in the same great faith. These germs of unity and affinity must ripen before we shall be generally prepared for a larger or closer system of relations, and the necessary capital must be acquired through some of these methods. Finally, we cannot dispense with those levers of efficiency which are furnished by the instinct of self-preservation and

development to the industrial enterprises of our day until we have the means of organizing those motives furnished by the Passional Series, its industrial attractions and social affinities.

Every step towards the compromise of individual liberties, and characters, and tastes, by Communism, is a step downwards and backwards into passional calm—into annihilation. The motives furnished by intellectual excitement soon die out. Nothing can render association permanent short of Organized Attraction. EDGEWORTH.

### DR. PRIESTLEY.

#### A PSYCHOMETRIC OBSERVATION.

(From a Letter dated Northumberland, Penn., April, 1808.)

Is he interested in animals, in farming operations? Does he live in the country, in an agricultural district? Now I am getting interested in poultry. I see a ship setting sail; not as if it were in reality, but as if it were in imagination; then I see quiet flowing water—as if that were more of a reality. I get the impression of sailing, and yet it does not seem as if the person were sailing.

Is it not some one who is in the habit of quiet contemplation? ("Yes.")—He likes to dwell in memories of the past.—Not inactive, though quiet. Is it one of philosophic mind—a good deal of concentrativeness and patience—patient investigation? Does it convey to you any idea of the person to say that he is a philosophical, scientific man? Do you know if he is fond of experiments?—I feel as if he loved best to theorize—but was not satisfied without witnessing results—testing the value of his theory?

("Is he living?")—I don't get any impression of that. I think he was cold when he wrote this letter. It seems chilly. I don't think it came from the person's character. I think he was affectionate, warm—though perhaps without much outness to his manner. I was getting into a contemplation on science and poetry—the poetry of science—and I forgot to speak. You must ask me some questions. I wonder why it gives me such a sensation of coldness. It was an intellectual person.

("Was it a spiritual person?")

At the time this letter was written more intellectual than spiritual. He is more spiritual now than he was then. Had he children? I get an impression of him as being a very affectionate father.

("Had he a religious nature?")

I think so. It seems to me he was a person of religion, rather than piety, at the time this letter was written. Did he go through a good deal of trouble after the time this letter was written? I think he was courteous. Does it convey any idea to say he was a slow, impulsive person? Was it not one of an analytic mind? I was just going into an analysis of the different kinds of impulsiveness. It may seem to contradict what I have said before, but it seems a person of more faith than belief; of a naturally religious nature. He chills his piety by too much analysis; "he murders to dissect." I wish he would let himself have more sway. Do you think it was one who thought much of the opinions of others?

("Do you mean that he was not independent?")

No; I mean he weighed—had respect for the opinions of others.—I think he was capable of taking a course not in accordance with the opinion of others. I think he enjoyed a little coming into opposition with others, when he was sure of coming out right.—This was a slight weakness.—I think he was a playful person,—fond of children,—courteous, polite, affable.

("Do you get an idea of his age?")

Do you take that question from my mind! I have been trying to find out whether he was youthful with a mature mind, or old with a youthful mind. I think he was youthful with a mature mind. I think he did not allow himself as much relaxation as would have been useful. He was fond of poetry and natural sciences.

("Go on.")

Do you know that is the way to make me stop! I think this person had some obstinacy as well as myself.

Was he fond of mythology? I cannot get hold of it, but it seems so. I think he was fond of the past—fond of it as bearing on the science of the future. Was he interested in physiology? I wonder what his idea of progress was, if he looked to see the past reproduced. I should like to get hold of his idea of mythology, it seems so peculiar.

("Was he a progressive person?")

Yes; he has progressed a good deal since this letter was written. Those mythological and half mythological characters keep coming before me, as objects at which he was looking to find the secret of life. I think he was capable of becoming two or three things—a scientific man, an artist, a poet. He had a great deal of enthusiasm. Was he a student?—He had a good deal of humor, wit, or love of wit.—His kind-heartedness and courtesy kept him from —; he has power of sarcasm, but it is not cutting; it is tempered by his kind-heartedness and courtesy. He is cautious and impulsive, keen, clear-sighted.

("Was he metaphysical?")

I should say he was philosophical.

("Was he fond of the discussions of the schoolmen?")

Don't you think he loved to see results?—Does it convey any idea to you to say that he was fond of many of the *subjects* of metaphysics, but that he discussed them philosophically rather than metaphysically.—He was not dreamy, but clear-minded. He looks to the use of a thing very much. He is fond of children, I feel quite sure. Do you know any thing of his family relations?—I have had several times the impression of a daughter. He seemed fond of her—proud of her. I think she loved music and dancing.—I don't know, but think she died young.

I don't think he would be satisfied with this analysis—would say I had not gone to the root of the matter. He had love of order—hadn't he? He would say that unless things were in their right places they would not have their true value.

("Is the person living?")

I am just now in the order of the human body; its compactness; every thing being made to tell; economy of means, physically and mentally. How much more

power we should have if we only knew how to use our minds—make the most of them. Is the person living!

("No.")

This struck me singularly; the strong and instant conviction of his death which the thought of the serial law gave me. I had no idea of him (in this connection) until just now, when I thought of his having been initiated since his death, in the serial law; a source of great delight to him. I don't think he would have accepted the serial law, if stated to him here, as made by Fourier. Do you think he had any great love for the French?—I have been troubled since I used the expression—serial law. I think the spirit's mode of speaking is much easier than ours. I mean to say that his want of fondness for the French would have prevented his accepting that statement.

A man of a good deal of justice. His prejudices prevented his being always just. Is he a writer?—A moralist and theologian.—Since I have seen him in the other sphere I am more drawn to him, though I have liked him from the first. He seems to be younger now than when this letter was written. I should like to understand all the vagaries which pass through one's brain.—"Timon of Athens" just then came into my mind.—He was a very truthful person; he was a respectable person.

("What seem to you the objects of his mind?")

I was just going to say—not in answer to your question—Socrates and Plato; he esteemed Socrates more than Plato.—I don't get hold of any one object more than others.—I think I get hold of his mind more than of his life. I think he had a great love of nature. Nature was a study to him—a book; but I don't think the tendency to analysis ever cramped the real love in his mind; there was too much poetry—too much religion in him. Was there anything in the style of his writing which reminds you of Dr. Channing? I have been reminded of him several times.—I know not why.—I think there is a great deal of fun in the other world. Do you think he is one Dr. C. would be likely to meet? Just before I spoke they seemed to meet, and — cracked a joke—shall I say! I don't know how to put it into words that would convey the idea. What lots of time there will be in the other world!

("Time! for what?")

I was thinking how these spirits met, and how much they conveyed to each other in the moment of meeting. What seemed to be the joke was their recognition of the truth, and of the false estimate of others. There was so much courtesy and fun, and so much of real meeting in an instant, and then they shot off!—There is a great deal of love of fun in this person.

Had he an active pursuit in life besides writing? I want to know, for I do not see what it was. Had he a profession?—I think he had a good deal of impatience where he got part of an idea.—He would wish to grasp the truth wholly.—He had fondness for the fine arts.—I think he made his profession, whatever it was, subservient to his own ends.

("Had he much reach of mind?")

He was a very observing person. There was a little quiet romance about him. I think he has now a much

larger idea of order than he had when he was here.—He might have been cramped by his idea of order then.—It was not fluent enough.—I mean that he has now taken in more of the idea that liberty and order are one. Was not he conservative? I got the idea of true conservatism from him. He was conservative by taste; but I don't mean by that that he was opposed to reform.—It is a great deal of trouble to say things.—I think I see about that conservatism, but it would be trouble to say it. Hadn't he a good deal of love of the old?—I think he was conservative by taste, but intellectually progressive. He was not a slave to circumstances. He was a person of a good deal of compact; solid forever; but not ungraceful in the exercise of that power. I think he had, occasionally, fits of depression. I cannot get over the feeling of my disorderly statement of him. I want to see the central point, and then arrange things around it to feel at all satisfied. Was he a man in stirring scenes of outward action? I think he was very clear-headed—very just only when his prejudices warped him. I think he was a man of strong; rather than of many prejudices. He had great love of the beautiful—I think. You asked about his reach of mind. I hardly know to answer that question.—I don't think I should ever have thought of using that expression.—He is a person of great concentration—very compact.

("Should you say his love of science or religious nature gave the tone to his life?")

I get a notion of science, poetry and religion. There is a great deal of poetry in science.—I think he had quite a tender feeling for animals.—He was a man of large interests; interested in a variety of subjects; interested in those about him, in their real progress. Do you know if he lived in an agricultural district? Do you know anything of his character as a speaker? He gives me the impression of one whose taste inclined him more to writing than speaking; but, in speaking, I think there would have been a graceful, calm eloquence, arising from conviction of the truth he utters. He may not be a dead man by any means—alive to what was going on. That gave him his power—his meditative mind—and yet his interest in what was passing around him. There was not much waste power in him.

How do you think he would feel about this experiment. It seems to me he would think it a good joke—good guessing—some of it; but that it was not correct because I did not say something that I have not said, and that I don't know whether I shall get at all.

Some things have made me think two or three times, from the character of his mind, that he might have been a physician. He is interested in details as well as general. I think he had a great deal of interest in many individuals. Was he a preacher?

("Yes.")

Do you know anything of his relation to his parishioners?

("No.")

I wonder why I have hesitated so long to say that. I think he would have a great deal to do about the outward affairs of his parishioners. What strikes me as most re-

markable about him, is his capacity of meditation and his love of action. Don't you think his keen sense of the ridiculous would make him afraid of being placed in a ludicrous position. Not that he was a coward. By no means; he could do very easily what all his friends would oppose, but he did not like to be laughed at.

## Reform Movements.

THE TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION AND THE VAGRANT CHILDREN OF OUR CITY.—The Teachers of the City held a special meeting on Saturday evening for the purpose of devising and recommending some plan by which an increasing evil, one which is now agitating the public mind, could in a great measure be obviated or controlled. It was contended that some separate provision should be made for the care and education, or training for future usefulness, of those who still are found as youthful vagrants in our streets, whose sole occupation seems to be begging, pilfering or stealing. Those children the circumstances of whose parents actually demand their strongest efforts, in connection with their own, to aid in the support of the family to which they belonged, were, of course, not reckoned as belonging to this class, whether they were engaged in vending fruit, matches, or newspapers, or in lawyers' offices, mercantile or other establishments. It was thought by some that our worthy Chief of Police had not, in his late Report, sufficiently discriminated between those of honest though humble employment, and the pilfering or stealing vagrant. Others, however, thought that there was a just discrimination, and that the estimate given was far below the mark. Be this as it may, one thing was considered certain, that there is a class, of greater or less extent, which all the means hitherto employed have failed to reach and benefit. It was said, we have established schools, and thrown the doors invitingly open, and yet they refuse to enter them. We have also a House of Refuge, and a Pauper School, or Home, on Randall's Island; but notwithstanding our noble School System and the other establishments have accomplished much, yet they have, so far, failed to eradicate the evil. Our laws take cognizance only of overt acts, and those that administer them seem to think that even such acts, when trifling, are unworthy of notice. Hence, most of the pilfering by the class alluded to is passed over, while the pilferer is continually progressing in crime until he becomes a full grown thief or burglar—a pest to Society.

Joseph Curtis, Esq., was present, and contributed to the interest of the occasion the results of his tried experience and observation. He urged that this class should be dealt with by the *law of kindness*:—that they should not be dragged as criminals from their parents, destitute though their homes may be. Others, however, thought that after some provision was made, it might require the force of a legal enactment, placing *power somewhere to compel* this class, when other means failed, to avail themselves of the proffered benefits.

The "Model Lodging-Houses" of Edinburg were spoken of, where a company had met with considerable success in furnishing clean and well-ventilated sleeping apartments for the homeless and the friendless for a slight compensation.

It was strongly urged that there should be a "home" for these children, located say on some island contiguous to the City; perhaps the Corporation might see proper to assign Randall's Island, with all its buildings, for that purpose, to the care of some twenty-four Directors or Governors. That in such training, and with this view, a small island was considered by some as not sufficient, but that a large tract of

land out of the neighborhood of the City would be preferable, so that each might turn his or her attention to some favorite occupation, and be paid for their services. For instance, let such as desire it have their particular plot of ground, &c., to improve and cultivate, and thus be trained up to habits of useful industry.

It was suggested that perhaps it might prove a good plan for each of the different Christian denominations to establish a "Home,"—perhaps in the City—and thus vie with each other in their acts of benevolence in this respect.

It was also suggested that *Sunday-Schools* might be made powerful toward abating this evil. Instances were cited of whole families being raised from vice and degradation to respect themselves, and become cleanly and industrious, by means of one of their ragged little ones being persuaded to join a Sunday-School, where Christianity was active in feeding the mind and clothing the body of the destitute child. If all Sunday-Schools were imbued with such a spirit what might they not accomplish in this matter.

In substance it seemed to be generally conceded that it was time to act in the matter; that all action should be based upon the principles of Christianity; that it was not enough merely to supply their present wants, to feed and clothe them, but that you must give them some useful employment to develop and strengthen their physical powers, and train their minds for earth and heaven.

On account, however, of the extreme unpleasantness of the evening, which probably prevented many who were deeply interested in the subject from being present, the whole subject was laid over for further consideration at the next regular meeting, to be held next Saturday evening, in the Supreme Court Room, new City Hall.

**HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION.**—During the last few months Homestead Exemption bills have been passed as follows:

*Maine*—Exempts a Homestead to the value of \$500, and, in the absence of a Homestead, personal property to that amount, besides the exemptions before provided for.

*Vermont*—Exempts a Homestead to the value of \$500.

*Iowa*—Exempts 40 acres of agricultural land, or a lot.

*Minnesota*—The same.

*California*—Exempts 320 acres of farm land, or a lot worth \$2,000.

*Deseret*, it is said, secures a Home to every family.

These are in addition to the States previously mentioned in *Young America*, namely, Georgia, Texas, Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Connecticut. In the last named State, however, the monopolists have managed temporarily to repeal the exemption law, the consequence of which will be the early adoption of a better one.

In *Illinois* a special session of the Legislature has just been held, one of the objects of which, as stated in the Governor's Proclamation, was to meet the wishes of the people of that State for a Homestead Exemption law. The Senate passed a bill, similar to the best above named, and it was lost in the House, through the juggling of the monopolists, "for want of a quorum."

The Governor of *Indiana*, in his message to the legislature now in session, recommends a Homestead Exemption law.

In *Louisiana* and several other States, papers are urging such a law.

In *Wisconsin*, the Democratic Candidates, just elected, from Governor down, were pledged to all the measures of Land Reform, and as that State has done all it could, so far, for Homestead Exemption and Freedom of the Public Lands, it is

confidently expected that a State Limitation bill will be passed the present winter.

All this, or nearly all, is the work of the National Reform organization, and it is saying as little as can be said to assert, that all the laws of all the legislatures, since the Union was formed, have not done as much towards protecting the rights of the people as the National Reformers have thus accomplished in less than six years. The good thus done consists not so much in the fact that hundreds of thousands are thus secured in their Homesteads against almost every contingency, as that these Homesteads are thus kept out of the hands of monopolists, who would use them to increase their powers of oppression, politically and financially.

But let it be understood, not one of these Homestead Exemption laws is a perfect measure, as proposed by the National Reformers, because not one of them, while securing homes to those who have them, performs the far more essential duty of providing places for homes to those who have them not. The National Reform measure, let it not be forgotten, is to provide for Homestead Exemption and Land Limitation by one act, so that the landless may not, by their destitution, be compelled to trust their labor and property to the exempted landholders, and so that in one generation all may have homes to be emptied.—*Young America*.

**AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.**—The committee appointed by the New York Legislature, last year, to consider the subject of an Agricultural College, have reported the plan of such an institution to be established in this State. It is to be connected with an experimental farm of 600 acres, to be cultivated by the scholars, who are to be required to labor four hours each day in practical farming, in all its branches.

The scholars are to be about sixteen years of age, and apportioned among different counties, say two for each Assembly (representative) district, and the expenses of their tuition to be \$100 per annum, which is to include board, washing, fuel and lights. Besides these scholars, others are to be admitted at \$25 per annum, who will board in the vicinity at their own expense, but who will be required to submit to all the college rules, and to labor with the other pupils.

To carry out the plan of instruction as laid down by the committee, the following professors are required: a Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Manipulation; of Natural History and Mineralogy; of Mathematical Engineering and Practical Surveying; of Botany and Horticulture; of History, Law, and General Science; and of Veterinary, Art, and Anatomy. A farmer is to have charge of the farm and stock—a gardener, carpenter, mason, and blacksmith, constantly employed, with a view of giving practical knowledge of arts so essential in the management of a farm. The course of instruction will occupy three years.

It is a matter of rejoicing that the importance of bringing the light of science to the aid of the noble pursuit of agriculture, is now deeply and extensively felt, and we presume there is no doubt the plan above mentioned will be adopted. If carried into effect with zeal and judgment, the benefits to this State will be incalculable, and the example will no doubt be generally followed.—*N. Y. Organ*.

**THE QUESTION OF LABOR.**—"The Rights, Wrongs and Hopes of Labor" was the theme of an evening's eloquent discourse by Dr. William Elder, of Philadelphia, last week, at Washington Hall, in this city. The great question of Labor in its relation to Capital—of which it has been said, "the studious everywhere are pondering it—the philanthropic every-

where, unintentionally often, and indirectly are strengthening it—it reminds one of the fabled sphinx: sitting by the wayside, it demands of the politician, the philanthropist, and the Christian, 'Unriddle me this riddle, or I will devour thee: How to employ and pay people?'—was discussed by a man who combines the most genial humor with a profound and far-reaching philosophy, and consecrates both to the cause of humanity, and great was the satisfaction all present experienced.

Dr. Elder beautifully portrayed the identity of labor and capital, the advantages of co-operative industry, the fatality of "strikes," and organized antagonisms generally, and the tendency of the age to associative enterprise. Nothing is gained, he remarked, by the laborer in combinations against wealth. The spirit which prompts fraternity to break down the power of capital equally impels an unity among capitalists to maintain its power. The former pursues its object without the aid which the latter, in its own defence, can so readily command. Hence, all combinations against capital, save in a very limited and partial degree, had been unsuccessful, and would always be. The true philosophy was for labor to court, to coax, or solicit capital—to form an alliance with it—to make use of its power for right purposes—in a word, to render identical labor and capital, and by co-operative industry and associative action accomplish that which the two, in independent positions, in opposition to each other, never could hope to effect.

This was the *idea* of the discourse. We pretend to present only that. For the rich imagery, the touching illustrations, the eloquent language of the speaker, our readers should have listened. We hope yet to present passages from a *verbatim* report, if any phonographer was fortunate enough to make one. In lieu of that, at this time, we may remark that the suggestions which the lecturer threw out were not merely the fanciful conceptions of a warm-hearted enthusiast, glowing with thoughts which the impracticability of our present civilization will not allow of realization, but the calm, carefully-conceived, prudently-digested, deliberately-adopted philosophy of an earnest, whole-souled man, who has made the evils of society his study, and offers plans for their remedy, with heaven-inspiring confidence in their efficacy.—*Washingtonian*

**THE JOURNEYMEN TAILORS.**—It is now some weeks since the Tailors' Association applied, by petition, for an Act of Incorporation, and the matter has, we are informed, been several times discussed in committee, and is again postponed for further consideration. What the final result of this first application for the incorporation of a labor-association will be, it is at present difficult to anticipate, and it would perhaps be well for the interest of labor generally if the capitalists who compose the present House would show their contempt for the industrial classes by refusing to comply with the Tailors' petition.

We are waiting with considerable anxiety the decision of the committee; and whatever that may be, we trust there will be found at least one member to test the House upon the matter by motion and debate, and that the "ayes" and "nays" will be taken, so that we may know who is entitled to the vote of the workingman at the next election. In the mean time let our readers watch this matter closely, as it is of considerable importance to every man who lives by his own industry.

It is high time that "Labor" was represented in the Legislature, and we trust in November next to see a "Labor Ticket" in every town and district in the State. We will have more to say on this matter when the decision of the House is known.—*Protective Union.*

**THE RUSSIAN LOAN.—MEETING OF THE PEACE SOCIETY.**—The following letter appeared in the *Daily News* on Tuesday:—

103 Westbourne-terrace, Monday Evening, January 14.

My Dear Sir:—Another outrage is to be offered to the moral sense of the civilized world. It is said that a Russian loan is to be raised in the city of London. The Cossack hordes have fulfilled their mission in Hungary: witness her wasted fields, her smoking villages, and her scaffolds flowing with the blood of her noblest patriots; and now the savage instruments of all this devastation and slaughter are clamorous for their wages.

Englishmen—aye, the capitalists of London—are, it seems, to furnish the blood-money! If so, for the credit of the age, and the character of our Christian country, let an indignant protest be heard in reprobation of this unholy and infamous transaction. The Peace-Congress Committee, to whom we entrusted the carrying out of the resolution passed at Paris, condemnatory of these loans, will I hope call a public meeting in the city, at which I will most gladly attend. Let it be at the earliest possible moment—Friday or Saturday, at the latest.

And believe me, faithfully yours,

RICHARD COBDEN.

Rev. Henry Richard, *Peace Congress Committee.*

A public meeting on the subject was held yesterday, and resolutions passed deprecating the loan.

**THE RUSSIAN LOAN.**—We are glad to perceive that the proposed loan of five millions for the service of Russia—a power which has uniformly opposed itself to the advancement of liberal opinions and enlightened government, and has lately crushed, for a time, by the most treacherous and tyrannical proceedings, the rising liberties of the Continent—has not been taken by the great Jewish capitalists.

Some short time ago, a leading journal published most grievous daily Jeremiads about the impropriety of raising large sums in the London money-market for railroad purposes, even though the outlay was expended at home; and to that cause ascribed the panics we have just survived. Now, however, it suits the policy of that journal to advocate the propriety of the new Russian loan of five millions, ostensibly brought forward to complete a Russian railway.

Whether that be the real purpose of the loan or not, it is not our business to inquire; but we may be permitted to rejoice that a Jewish house has not had the negotiation of a loan for a power so adverse to every principle of civil and religious liberty. Further, we have to say, that if our own railroads "absorbed our capital, to the destruction of so many eminent houses, it is to be hoped that it will not be really 'absorbed' in a Russian railroad, and tend to bring about a fresh disturbance of our money market, so leading the unwary trader to endure another excruciating process for the 'correction of the exchanges,' and the especial enrichment of those who are denounced by the prophet Ezekiel as having 'taken usury and increase, and greedily gained of their neighbors by extortion.'" (Ezek. xxii. 12.)

Whatever may be the issue of the meeting called for this morning in the city, as suggested by Mr. Cobden, it will have one good result, being an open proof of the increasing influence of higher principles than the mere sordid love of gain.—*Jewish Chronicle.*

It is estimated that there are in London 28,577 needlewomen under twenty years of age, the average earning of each being four pence halfpenny a day.

**MAN'S LAST FRIEND IS THE TAXGATHERER.**—His wife may leave him, his family disown him, his children run away from him, his best friends and worst acquaintances avoid him, but the taxgatherer follows him wherever he goes, even to the grave. It must be most flattering to an Englishman's pride that, poor as he may be, he has always one friend that takes care of him, and who will call without the smallest ceremony and share his last penny loaf. Solitude and selfishness cannot exist in England, for no man can live independent of the taxgatherer. His existence is a partnership drawn up for life between the Government and himself, in which the former takes what it likes, and the latter gives more than he likes. In short, every Englishman may be said to possess two shadows—his own genuine trueborn shadow, and the Government presentation shadow; but there is this difference between the two, that, whereas his own shadow merely walks after him, the Government shadow walks into him if it is not paid the moment it runs after him.—*Punch's Almanac.*

**CRYSTALLIZATION OF SUGAR FROM THE JUICE.**—The process of Dr. Scoffern (remarks the *New York Literary World*) employs a salt of lead, and afterwards sulphurous acid; and the current of opinion in the British Association was decidedly against his suggested improvement, on account of the poisonous nature of the material, the difficulty of separating it, and the probable effect of sulphurous acid on the taste and grain of the sugar. The method of Melsens, Professor in the Agricultural School of the State, at Brussels, claims serious attention. The material he employs is bisulphate of lime. The advantages claimed for this process may be briefly stated as follows:—The material is perfectly innocuous. It is an antiseptic, separating and neutralizing all fermentatives, and preparing the juice for evaporation without loss. At the heat of 100 deg. Cent. it separates the albumen, caseine, and other nitrogenized elements, without loss or change of character in the sugar. The bisulphate of lime extracts the coloring matter of the juice, both that existing originally in it and that formed by the action of the oxygen of the air on some of the constituents. It also prevents the formation of coloring matter during the process of evaporation, and that resulting from the application of heat. The experiments of M. Melsens, on the juice extracted from fresh canes brought from Murcia, in Spain, led to the production of crystals of great size, and not more deeply coloured than common candy. But it is not alone applicable to the purification of the juice extracted by the mechanical means of crushing. The large percentage of saccharine matter retained by the spongy pith of the cane may be washed out by water containing a small quantity of the bisulphate of lime, without fear of loss by fermentation, and may then be concentrated and elaborated at the leisure of the planter. If the improvements attending the use of this salt are as great as they are represented, this discovery will produce as great a saving in the article of sugar as the mechanical ingenuity of Whitney effected with the other great staple of the Southern States.

**THE MORTAL REMAINS OF GUSTAVUS VASA OF SWEDEN.**—A letter from Upsala of the 24th ult, states that the Dukes of East Gotha and Dalecarlia, now students at the University of Upsala, being desirous of seeing the mortal remains of Gustavus I. (Gustavus Vasa), which are deposited in one of the vaults of the cathedral of that city, the marble sarcophagus containing the body was opened by virtue of a special authorization of the King. Of the body of the great monarch nothing remains but the skeleton; but all the clothes (of the ancient Spanish costume) are intact, and preserve a certain freshness.

## CONTENTS.

Confessions of a Revolutionist . . . . .	129	Lessons on the Hague-street Tragedy . . . . .	134
Labor and the Poor . . . . .	181	Democratic Association . . . . .	138
Bankruptcy—Banking . . . . .	133	Dr. Priestley . . . . .	139
Mrs. Jameson . . . . .	134	Reform Movements . . . . .	141
Humboldt . . . . .	134	Miscellany . . . . .	144
Rights of Woman . . . . .	185	POETRY.	
		A Chant for Elliott . . . . .	149

## THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

## PROSPECTUS FOR VOLUME SECOND.

THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE is designed to be a medium for that *Life of DIVINE HUMANITY*, which, amidst the crimes, doubts, conflicts, of Revolution and Reaction, inspires the hope of a Social Reorganization, whereby the Ideal of Christendom may be fulfilled in a Confederacy of Commonwealths, and MAN become united in Universal Brotherhood.

Among the special ends, to whose promotion the Spirit of the Age is pledged, the following may be named:—

I. *Transitional Reforms*—such as Abolition of the Death Penalty, and degrading punishments, Prison Discipline, Purity, Temperance, Anti-Slavery, Prevention of Pauperism, Justice to Labor, Land Limitation, Homestead Exemption, Protective Unions, Equitable Exchange and Currency, Mutual Insurance, Universal Education, Peace.

II. *Organized Society*—or the Combined Order of Confederated Communities, regulated and united by the Law of Series.

III. *The One, True, Holy, Universal Church of Humanity*, reconciled on earth and in heaven—glorifying their planet by consummate art—and communing with God in perfect Love.

IV. *Psychology and Physiology*—such views of Man, collective and individual, as are intuitively recognized, justified by tradition, and confirmed by science, proving him to be the culmination of the Natural Universe, and a living member of the Spiritual Universe, at once a microcosm, a heaven in least form, and an image of the Divine Being.

By notices of Books and Works of Art—records of Scientific discoveries and Mechanical inventions—and summaries of News, especially as illustrating Reform movements at home and abroad—the Spirit of the Age will endeavor to be a faithful mirror of human progress.

EDITOR

WILLIAM HENRY CHANNING.

PUBLISHERS,

FOWLERS &amp; WELLS,

CLINTON HALL, 129 AND 131 NASSAU-STREET, NEW YORK.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY:

TERMS—\$2.00 A YEAR: INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

☞ All communications and remittances for *The Spirit of the Age* should be directed to Messrs. Fowlers & Wells, Clinton Hall, 129 and 131 Nassau-street, N. Y.

## LOCAL AGENTS.

BOSTON, Bela Marsh.  
PHILADELPHIA, J. P. Fraser.  
BALTIMORE, Wm. Taylor & Co.  
WASHINGTON, John Hitz.  
CINCINNATI, J. W. Ryland.

BUFFALO, T. S. Hawke.  
ROCHESTER, D. M. Dewey.  
ALBANY, Peter Cook.  
PROVIDENCE, P. W. Ferris.

LONDON.

CHARLES LANE.

JOHN CHAPMAN, 142 STRAND.

GEO. W. WOOD, PRINTER, 15 SPRUCE STREET, N. Y.