

EUGENICS



Vol. III, Nos. 1-2 MARCH-APRIL, 1909 Whole Nos. 1112-13

The Most Important of All Rights is the Right to
Be Born Well.

Sex Contains All.

—Whitman.

Here's Freedom for him that wad read
Here's Freedom for him that wad write;
There's nane ever feared that the truth should be heard
Save them the truth wad indict.

—Robert Burns.

The very Hopes of Man, the Thoughts of his Heart,
the Religion of Nations, the Manners and Morals of
Mankind are All at the Mercy of a New Generalization.

—R. W. Emerson.

EUGENICS—The Doctrine of Progress or Evolu-
tion, Especially in the Human Race Through Improved
Conditions in the Relations of the Sexes.

—Century Dictionary.

PRICE
10
CENTS

649 S. Main St., Los Angeles, Calif., U. S. A.

M. HARMAN, Editor and Publisher

London Agents: Miller & Gill, Cambridge Cir-
cus, Charing Cross Roads

BY MAIL
\$1.25
A YEAR.

Contents of This Number

Editorials: What Eugenics Stands For.

“Protests Too Much.”

Need of Concentration.

Unitary Homes—A Symposium.

Autobiographical

Outlook for Eugenics.

Book Reviews—Government Analyzed, Etc.

A Plea for Variety in Love, No. 2,—R. B. Kerr.

“Relief” for Boys and Girls,—Albina L. Washburn.

Women’s Privileges,—Geo. Bedborough.

“Holy Matrimony,”—Hulda L. Potter-Loomis.

Desirable Husbands,—Mabel Herbert Urner.

Is the Human Race Degenerating,—C. H. Wessler.

When Priests the Selling Do,—John Lomax.

Sustaining Fund.

Why Was it Wrong,—John Wirt.

Various Voices.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

SUCCESSOR TO LUCIFER THE LIGHT-BEARER

Published Monthly at 649 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, Cal.

Subscription Rates—One year, \$1.00. Postage, 24 Cents. 10 Cents a Copy.

M. HARMAN, Editor and Publisher

Vol. III No. 1-2 MARCH-APRIL, 1909 Whole Nos. 1112-13

WHAT "EUGENICS" STANDS FOR

On page 247 of Jan.-Feb. EUGENICS, under the head, "The English Eugenic Movement," appears this language: "Of course I need not say that the fundamental principle of Eugenics is the abolition of monogamy."

This sentence, together with the entire letter, also the article, "A Plea for Variety in Love," in the same issue, appear to have given serious offense to more than one reader of the magazine.

What our good friend and contributor, Robert B. Kerr, probably meant is "enforced monogamy," or "compulsory monogamy."

It is scarcely needed at this late date that we should tell our readers that the editor of EUGENICS is not responsible for the opinions of those who write for its columns. To give all a fair hearing, without fear or favor, is the cardinal principle for which EUGENICS stands committed, and this has been the cardinal or bedrock contention of its editor ever since his entrance into the journalistic field.

"Let truth and error grapple," says brave old John Milton. "Only by hearing all sides of all questions can we expect to arrive at truth," said Wendell Philipps, one of the noblest champions of the cause of the enslaved African.

When EUGENICS ceases to be an arena for the free and fearless discussion of questions most vital to human happiness and welfare, then it will cease to interest its present editor and publisher.

If our friendly critics will read the article of Harold Bolce in the May number of the "Cosmopolitan," entitled "Blasting at the Rock of Ages," they will see that R. B. Kerr is by no means alone in his revolutionary utterances in regard to monogamy and ethics of the home and family. They will see that, from Boston to California, girls and boys in our leading colleges and universities are being taught very nearly the same doctrines for which they so severely condemn our radical contributor—a part of which condemnation is, of course, shared by the editor of EUGENICS for giving hospitality to such revolutionary ideas.

M. H.

"PROTEST TOO MUCH"

"I see no practical proposition, in your magazine, for the cure of existing evils, economic, marital, political, or what not. Where or what is your remedy?"

Such, in substance, if not in exact words, is the complaint of more than one reader of and subscriber to *The Journal of Eugenics*. Others say we protest too much, tear down too much, and build up too little.

Is this a true indictment? Is this "impeachment"—whether "soft" or **hard**—borne out by the facts in the case?

Let us see. Let the investigation proceed. *EUGENICS* challenges investigation, impartial and unsparing investigation, and agrees to stand or fall by the result of such ordeal.

The gist, or core, of the aforesaid indictment, or indictments, would seem to be that the editor and writers for *EUGENICS* "protest too much"—that they would tear down the old, the established, the respectable, the revered, the conventional, the conservative, and yet have little or nothing to offer as substitute for what they would destroy.

Again I ask, what say the facts in the case?

It has often been said that every negation contains an affirmation; every denial an assertion. To affirm the falsity of any proposition is to affirm the truth of the opposite proposition. While this may not be a correct statement in every instance, it is near enough to entitle it to be called an **axiom**, or self-evident truth.

Applying this axiom to the common affairs of life, we say that to deny the right of any man, or men, to monopolize the land, the water, the coal, the oil, the forests, the iron, the gold, the silver, is tantamount to affirming the right of all men (including, of course, all women) to an equal share in the land, the water, the coal, the forests, and other resources of nature.

To protest against monopoly is to proclaim equality of right.

To protest against the rule of one man over another man; to protest against the rule of one man or of a few men combined, over the majority of men; or to protest against the rule of a majority of men over the minority, is to protest against all rule of man over his fellow man, which is tantamount to affirming the right of all men—and, of course, of all women—to **self-rule**, to **self-control**, to **self-ownership**.

Now for a few illustrations or applications: Los Angeles has just passed through one of the most hotly contested municipal campaigns in its history, or in the history of any city of which I have any knowledge. This campaign was begun and fought to a finish for the purpose of "recalling" Mayor Harper and electing a successor for his unexpired term. If we are to believe the language freely used by the promoters of the recall, and of their opponents, then we must conclude that this city has long been ruled and robbed by the most corrupt and vicious of its population, and that a certain railroad monopoly known as the Southern Pacific—otherwise called "the machine"—has been

for many years the chief factor, or controlling influence, in the ruling and robbing of this city, including, of course, the management of such "institutions" as its saloons, gambling houses, and houses of "ill-fame," otherwise called the "red-light district".

If the leading actors in this municipal fight had been as sensitive to charges of moral dishonesty and corruption,—such charges as "lying", "grafting", gambling, and of promoting the worst forms of vice, including what is technically called "white slavery", or the "trapping" of white girls and holding them in sexual bondage for the money received from such traffic—if these highly "respectable" editors, city officials and leading politicians, had been as sensitive in regard to charges against their own personal honor and official integrity as were Aaron Burr and Alexander Hamilton, or as the average Tennessean or Kentuckian of the present day, the streets of this city would have witnessed many a bloody encounter within the last two or three months, from the aforesaid causes.

Instead of spending all our time in protesting against evils such as these—against corruption and dishonesty of the leaders in political and civil affairs, in economic affairs, marital affairs, etc., the writers for EUGENICS prefer to dig down deep for the underlying causes of these evils; and, using enough of concrete facts and examples for our purpose we try to reason inductively from effect to cause and also deductively from cause to effect—every cause an effect and every effect a cause—in order to show the better way of living. For instance:

One of these concrete examples occurred a few evenings since, within a few doors of the office of EUGENICS. Quitting work for the day, the writer of these lines found the corner blocked by a dense crowd of people. Inquiring the cause I could get no satisfactory answer. Everyone seemed as ignorant as myself, but next morning's papers told the story—the old, old story of the attempted murder of a woman by her "liege lord", and the attempted suicide of that lord himself, but not until he was satisfied that his three shots, fired while standing over her body, had killed his wife. Here is the Los Angeles Herald's statement in part:

In the presence of hundreds of people, either passing by or waiting for cars, Edward G. Martin, a cook, 28 years of age, shot his wife, Georgietta Martin, aged 27 years, at the corner of Sixth and Main streets. He then shot himself. The shooting took place at 6:30 p. m. and was the result of jealousy on the part of Martin, who alleges that his wife had been with other men. This statement she denied at the receiving hospital.

The shooting occurred on the evening of Sunday, March 28th. At last account both wife and husband were still alive, but in a very precarious condition. Reasoning from the effect to cause, let us ask who or what is chiefly to blame for this tragedy, and for the hundreds like it that are constantly occurring in all lands called Christian. Two main causes of crime and misery were stated in previous paragraphs of this article. One the monopoly of natural sources of wealth, and the other the denial of the right of self-ownership, self-control, or self-

rule. The first of these causes may have had something to do with the Martin tragedy, but from the detailed account thereof the underlying cause was the denial of the right of self-ownership to the woman victim. The account states that there had been trouble between the two for months; that five months ago they had separated because of alleged "infidelity" on the part of the wife, but that they became "reconciled and lived together until Saturday last, when Mrs. Martin left her home, taking her baby girl with her." At the hospital the wife said Martin "shot her because he was jealous and because she refused to return to him."

When asked why he shot his wife and himself, Martin at first answered "incoherently", but "later gave a clear and concise statement of the reason why she ought to have been shot, accusing her of infidelity."

Here, then, is the bed-rock cause of this marital tragedy, and of thousands more like it, in all important particulars. Evidently this man believed in the old-time doctrine that a wife is the husband's property, as scheduled in the Jewish Decalogue, and as concisely stated by Shakespeare in the "Taming of the Shrew"—that when she escapes from him and goes with another man it is his right to kill her, and to kill the man she prefers to live with.

Here again, I repeat, as often before in these columns, the only cure, the only rational prevention for tragedies such as this is in denial of the right of ownership of man over woman, as well as of woman over man, or of one human being over other human beings. Against the laws and customs that "give the woman away", as in the marriage ceremony of some Protestant churches, it is impossible to "protest too much."

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL

As already stated, more than once in previous issues, and in compliance with, or in response to, the oft expressed wishes of many personal friends, the writer of these lines has been preparing for publication, during the past ten or twelve years, something in the shape of an autobiography. More than enough has been written to fill an ordinary octavo volume, but as in the case of the poet Percival, who was employed by the legislature of Connecticut to write a book on the geologic formations found in that state, I have never been able to get my own consent to put into book form what I have written. It is said that Percival could easily have made very good wages out of his job as an employe of the "Nutmeg State", if his desire for perfection and his critical taste had not been so exacting, so hard to satisfy; and that so long delayed was the geologic report to his employers that his pay did not exceed fifty cents per day.

I have accepted in advance, some money for the promised autobiography, and therefore feel, to that extent, under financial obligation to hasten the work to completion, but of all the tasks I ever undertook, this seems most difficult.

One cause of delay is the fact that much of the promised life history concerns my defensive fight with the Federal Government at Washington, and its officials in Kansas and Illinois, including, necessarily, an account of my experiences in the Joliet State Prison, the Lansing State Prison, and Federal penitentiaries at Leavenworth and Fort Leavenworth. I do not need to tell my readers that the story of such conflict must necessarily be a one-sided affair—what a lawyer would call an *ex parte* narration. The judicial faculty, the power of doing justice to the “other fellow,” when we ourselves constitute one of the parties immediately concerned, is a very rare faculty, and hence arises the old adage, “Every man’s story is good until you hear the other side.” Hence I hesitate to tell to the world the exact truth, as I see it, of my treatment at these prisons lest I be accused of exaggeration—lest the average reader will say,

“Oh, he’s a **sore-head**! Naturally enough he feels sore, feels revengeful towards the prison officials, and would like to have the wardens, deputy wardens, cell-bosses and surgeons severely punished for the way in which he himself was treated by them while an inmate of their ‘Houses of Correction.’”

This is one of the chief reasons for delay in giving a detailed account of what I saw, heard and felt while confined in the above named prisons. It is not a pleasant subject to think about or talk about. The Methodist chaplain in the Kansas state prison advised the prisoners—soon to be released—not to talk about or write about their prison experience, but to forget it as soon as possible. The farther away in years and miles from these scenes of privation, of hardship and suffering, the less open will I be to the imputation of exaggeration or of revengeful feelings, when telling of my experiences at Joliet, or at any other of four state and federal prisons in which, between the years 1890 and 1906 I was incarcerated.

There are other causes of delay. One of these is lack of health, lack of energy, mental and physical. It is only a small part of the time that I am really able to write anything fit to be read by partial friend or critical foe. How much my successive incarcerations have had to do with my chronic ill health I will not venture to say. That their combined influence has not been favorable to “life, health or longevity” will doubtless be conceded by all who know anything of what prison life usually is, whether in “Christian” or in so-called Heathen lands.

And still another reason for the prolonged delay may here be stated, namely, the psychologic suggestion of a finished autobiography. By hereditary endowment I possess a strong love of life, an abiding desire to live for the sake of living, apart from whatever desire I may have to help others. Never yet have I known what it is to be tired of life, and therefore have hesitated to do anything that would suggest, even remotely, the idea that my work on earth is done, that my life-work is ended. The finishing and sending to press of my life history would be such a suggestion, as I think.

When Horace Greeley finished and published his greatest work, "History of the American Conflict", some of his friends said, "Now, Horace, your life work is done; you can go fishing for the rest of your days." About this time, at one of the periodic wood-cuttings on his farm, one of Greeley's friends shouted to a careless ax-man, "What do you mean, sir! do you want to kill me?"—Greeley was heard to remark in all earnestness, "I wish somebody would **kill me!**"

I am not a Greeley—have done nothing to justify such comparison, and only introduce this little story by way of contrast, to illustrate why I hesitate to put the finishing touches to a book that might suggest a state of mind similar to that indulged by the great founder, and for so many years editor, of the New York Tribune.

As already said, there is more than enough written to fill a good-sized volume, but, as in the case of the Panama canal, the more work done the farther away seems the completion thereof. It is now officially reported that the estimates of the number of cubic yards yet to be excavated at Panama are now a third larger—after several years of hard work by some thousands of men, and after the expenditure of many millions of money—than they were when the work first began. Hence it would seem that in order to complete the autobiography in a way that will be at all satisfactory to the writer thereof, not one octavo volume but a half dozen or more will be necessary.

Health and strength permitting there will appear in the next issue of **Eugenics** a specimen chapter of the long delayed life history of
M. HARMAN.

A PLEA FOR VARIETY IN LOVE.

2.—The Psychology of Variety.

In his book on "Sex and Society" Professor W. I. Thomas of Chicago University says:

"Speaking from the biological standpoint, monogamy does not, as a rule, answer to the conditions of highest stimulation, since here the problematical and elusive elements disappear to some extent, and the object of attention has grown so familiar in consciousness that the emotional reactions are qualified. This is the fundamental explanation of the fact that married men and women frequently become interested in others than their partners in matrimony."

What does this passage of jaw-breaking words really mean? When reduced to plain English, it is one of the most revolutionary utterances in the English language. To say that monogamy does not "answer to the conditions of highest stimulation" is merely a learned way of saying that monogamy is a dull affair which cannot arouse the full intensity of feeling. It comes to the same thing as the saying of La Rochefoucauld that "there are good marriages, but there are no delicious marriages."

Why, then, can monogamy not arouse the full intensity of feeling? Thomas gives two reasons. First, says he, "the problematical and

elusive elements disappear to some extent." In other words, the pleasure of the chase is over. Once you are married, you have the other party sure, and there is no more excitement. This is simply an example of the well-known psychological truth that "plot interest," as Bain calls it, constitutes a very large part of the pleasure of all pursuits. You will sit up half the night to finish a detective story by Gaboriau or Du Boisgobey, but it would be a cruel punishment to have to read it all through a second time. Life is intensely interesting, but who would begin at the beginning and live it all over again, if he knew all that was coming beforehand? The whole delight of life lies in the uncertainty of what is coming. Love is a particularly good illustration of this. As La Rochefoucauld says, "Love, like fire, cannot subsist without continual movement, and it ceases to live as soon as it ceases to hope or to fear." When a man and woman are definitely apportioned to one another, and handed over to one another to be owned henceforth as property, there is no longer anything to hope or to fear; consequently, intense passion is no longer possible.

Thomas gives a second reason why monogamy fails to arouse the full intensity of feeling. He says that "the object of attention has grown so familiar in consciousness that the emotional reactions are qualified." Here he touches on a well-known psychological law, which has been admitted for ages by all psychologists, and is known as the Law of Relativity. According to this law, freshness of stimulation is essential to vividness of feeling. Suppose I live near a church clock, which strikes with beautiful chimes every quarter of an hour. For the first few days I am delighted with the chimes; after a few weeks I no longer hear them. The miller cannot hear the sound of the mill, and, as Ovid tells us, the cowboy cannot perceive the odor of the cows. The same is true of all our sensations and perceptions. As Sully says in his "Outlines of Psychology":

"Our permanent surroundings and manner of life tend to grow indifferent, that is, to lose all or most of their affective concomitants. This applies at once to our pleasures and to our pains. Thus we get used, that is, comparatively indifferent, to surroundings, companions, lines of activity, which, when they were new, were highly enjoyable, or, on the other hand, particularly disagreeable."

Now it is evident that the above principles apply as directly to love as to any other mental phenomenon. What are the things that arouse love? First, physical attractiveness; second, mental attractiveness. But physical attractiveness is directly perceived by the senses. If, then, things that are perceived by the senses gradually cease to attract attention and to arouse emotion, it follows that physical beauty must obey this law like everything else. It is the same with mental attractiveness. Everybody knows that "a prophet has no honor in his own country," and that "no man is a hero to his valet." The reason is that a prophet and a hero are as tiresome as anyone else when you have to listen to them every day. Your minister may

be the finest preacher in the world, but you are as well pleased as anybody when a strange minister occupies the pulpit. Debs is probably the finest orator in America, but those who have heard him three or four times are quite willing to miss one of his meetings in order that they may hear someone else. Sometimes we make a new friend whose conversation at first delights us so much that we sit up half the night talking to him, but after we have lived with him a month we read the newspapers when he is talking. So it is with the mental attractions of the sexes. Many men and women marry from mental attraction, but after a while they are as pleased as anyone when a visitor drops in. As Oscar Wilde says, "In married life three is company and two is none."

Evidently, then, it follows from psychological laws which are recognized by all psychologists, that the intensity of love is inevitably diminished by familiarity, as well as by certainty of possession. But the diminution of love for one person does not diminish one's capacity for love. Strawberries get tiresome after they have been in season for two or three weeks, but when we are tired of strawberries we are ready for cherries and raspberries. When we have had enough of cherries, we are ready for apricots and peaches. We may hear one tune played or sung so often that we are sick of it, but that does not prevent our enjoying other tunes. Indeed, the more music we have heard, the more we like new tunes. The more books we have read, the fonder of reading we are. Much exercise of any faculty increases the pleasure of exercising that faculty. It is the same with love. Although our love for one object has diminished from satiety, we have still an undiminished capacity for loving new objects; indeed, the more we love, the more we want to love. Ovid tells us that no goddess is more easily vanquished than Venus. It is profoundly true. No goddess has had so many lovers as Venus, the only result is that no goddess is so anxious as Venus to have more lovers.

Some people may think that all this is very discouraging, because if it is really true it would tend to destroy all permanent relations between human beings. But the case is not so bad as that. A pleasure which has become tiresome recovers much of its freshness if we do not experience it for a while. We are very tired of strawberries at the end of the season, but next year they will be almost as delightful as ever. Sully says:

"Where we have to do, not with unbroken continuance, but with periodic recurrence, the counteracting influence of freshness or variety comes in. All forms of pleasureable activity, if **sufficiently intermitted**, retain much of their pristine freshness."

This applies to love, as well as to all things. A new love affair with an old lover is often one of the greatest of joys. Sometimes we hear of a man and woman getting divorced, and then, after trying other partners, marrying each other again. If you wish to love a person for life, the best way to manage it is to see your lover only now and again, and to love plenty of others in between.

Our investigations have made it clear that variety in love inevitably follows from the laws of psychology. That means that no person can possibly be exempt from the law of variety. A law which is not universal is no law at all. It is quite possible, however, that some persons may be much more inclined to variety than others. That will depend on temperament. As Sully says:

"What is known as liveliness of temperament shows itself mainly, perhaps, in a special mobility of attention or readiness to transfer it to any new object. The bright, impressionable, versatile mind is characterized by rapidity of mental movement."

From this we should expect that "the bright, impressionable, versatile mind" would be the most inclined to variety in love. That is exactly what we see. The lively girl is the born flirt. She will make eyes at a nice young man the moment she is introduced to him, and often before that, while the serious girl is much slower in getting to business, and consequently covers much less ground. Persons of lively temperament, like poets and musicians, are also great varietists, while scientists, philosophers, and other grave persons concentrate their affections more. But the difference is only one of degree. Every human being is more or less inclined to variety in love.

At this point someone will say: "But does not your reasoning apply to affection as well as to love? If the steady concentration of passion on one person is impossible, is not the steady concentration of affection on one person also impossible?"

In reply I say without hesitation that the law of variety applies just as much to affection as to everything else, but the fact easily escapes notice, for the simple reason that in affection there is no concentration of attention on the beloved object, and the affection is sufficiently varied by the events of daily life. Let us illustrate.

Two medical students live together in lodgings during their university course. They see a certain amount of each other, but each has many interests of his own. Each visits his own friends, and goes out by himself to dances, and falls a good many times in love during the course of his studies. The two students often talk confidentially together, but even then they are mainly interested, not in one another, but in the incidents they are describing to one another. At the end of the five years they have to separate, and suddenly they discover that the separation will be a painful one, because they have become very fond of each other. But that is the only occasion in the five years on which they have been clearly conscious of their affection; indeed, it is the only time that their thoughts have ever dwelt on each other at all. This is a very typical case of affection.

Now take a case of love. A young man falls deeply in love with a girl. When he is with her, he is intensely conscious of her and of nothing else. With his eyes he drinks in her golden hair, her long dark eyelashes, her melting blue eyes, her crimson lips, her lily hands; everything is noticed, and with intense vividness. When he is away

from her, he is still thinking of her; he is absent-minded and indifferent to everything around; he cannot even eat.

In the case of love there is a vivid concentration of attention, almost unvaried by other thoughts. In affection there is no concentration, very little vividness, and the mind is occupied by far the largest part of the time with other objects. Even in the case of a mother's love for her son, her attention is fixed chiefly on his affairs and prospects, rather than on his eyes, hair, and other personal characteristics. Consequently affection, being less vivid than love, is in less danger of wearing out; and it is already so much varied by other experiences, that the need for further variety is little felt.

It is worth noting that the same principles apply to all other matters. Vivid emotions always wear out soonest. Strawberries become tiresome in a month, but we can eat bread every day of our lives, provided we eat other things as well. The same tune played over and over for an hour would become unbearable, but we can easily endure daylight for fifteen or sixteen hours together. Every day we need relaxation from our business or our studies, but our house and furniture and garden can be endured for many months together without fatigue. The greater the concentration of attention on any object, the sooner comes the need of variety.

The old poet knew what he was talking about when he said:

"Love me little, love me long,
Is the burden of my song;
Love that is too hot and strong
Burneth soon to waste."

—R. B. KERR.

"RELIEF" FOR BOYS AND GIRLS.

On Tuesday, July 14th, 1908, the San Diego Sun published an account of the visits to the city of Mrs. Roberts, a noble woman who had in view the establishment of an Industrial Home of rescue for girls in dance halls and the so-called red-light district. I wrote to the editors, commending the movement and thanking them for the article "so plain, so timely and so altogether more vital to San Diegans than news (always amply illustrated) of the weddings, scandals and divorces of the old world "nobility;"—deploring the mistakes of society in dealing—in every large city, with the "social question." My letter was not published but at my written request was saved and on my going for it personally, was handed back. The only reason given by the modest young editor for its non-appearance being, "We didn't care to use it."

No doubt there is a big stick in the background, besides the popular horror of the ignorant on the true bearings of the sex question as related to the every day life and happiness of men, women and children.

Gratefully we recognize that our magazine, *Eugenics*, is bearing

aloft the blazing torch of truth, banishing the long darkness of superstition, leading us out into the open day to become familiarized with what we should know of ourselves and our duty to one another and to the rising generation so dependent on us for the candid, fearless and necessary education along sex lines.

That there is a deep under current of thought and inquiry among women is well known to intelligent, broad minded women.

They are thinking for themselves and asking a way out, not blaming any class or individual for conditions but realizing that suppressing Nature's truth is violating Nature's laws and creating confusion, vice and misery where all should be open confidence and instruction.

"A mother," I wrote, "a wise one, said to me as we conversed, 'I think boys need protecting and educating in sex knowledge, the development of the nervous system, at puberty, as much as girls do. My husband said to me once, 'I don't know what to do with Jack, he's gettin' so big and lusty and uneasy, for all he's so young. I believe he needs to know something of the world. I've a notion to take him into the city, and find some nice girl for him so he'll get some experience and relief. What do you think about it?'"

"I listened with amazement, and felt my bile risin' all the time. At last I spoke, 'An' had you thot of takin' your girls into town to find some nice young men for them? Don't you think they need to know something of the world, too?' 'They're human,' says I, 'they have passions just like the boys. Had you thot about that?' I spoke mighty sarcastic I can tell you, for I felt there was a crisis on hand."

"Why, are you crazy?" he said to me, an' I went on to tell him what he ought to have known all along. "No!" says I, "what our boys an' girls need is work an' plenty of it, but not drudgery; books an' lots of 'em, of the right kind; interesting but not exciting; company that cultivates their social faculties by freely mixing together openly and above board; having fun among the children and the old folks; music, of the best and the highest kind; home games—an' for children that have no homes, get them in, too. Then they never need "relief" such as you talk of. They grow naturally, harmoniously and innocently, but not ignorantly.

"If we do that," says I, "by our children and other people's children they'll come all right!"

"And what did he say?" I enquired.

"He never said a word; he was just dumbfounded. He saw that I had blazed out, and meant it, every word."

"But," she added, "I notice he didn't take the boy to the city, but bought him a violin that he'd been wantin' ever so long."

ALBINA L. WASHBURN.

1636 Second street, San Diego, California.

Let us quit saying, "In poor health"—for, health is a condition of harmony, mental and physical. Let us use rather the word *illth* as some bright one suggested some years ago.

Now, all together, "Illth!" (Then deny it!)—A. L. W.

[The above very interesting and very timely article was overlooked, sidetracked or mislaid for some months, but it has lost none of its force or timeliness. Such articles are always timely so long as ignorance, superstition and prudery in regard to sex, prevail among parents and children as they now do.—M. H.]

WOMEN'S "PRIVILEGES."

Mr. Belfort Bax, one of the most brilliant of Socialist writers, complains that women are a privileged sex. He thinks that instead of giving women a new privilege in the shape of a vote we ought to take from them existent privileges. He elaborated this idea many years ago in an amusing volume called "The Legal Subjection of Men," and ever since then he has met the increasing demand of women for equality with man by reminding them of some stupid laws which under the pretence of "protecting" women are in effect an absolute barrier to her free progress.

Perhaps when women have votes they will want these "privileges" abolished—perhaps not. Majority rule may some day mean that women will rule men as some men have hitherto ruled all men and women, and the privileges of a ruling caste or clan are not easily abolished. And there is probably a good deal of misunderstanding on the part of women as well as of men as to the origin and nature of these alleged privileges.

It is true that although a man may be successfully sued for the maintenance of a wife, a similar suit against a wife for the keep of her husband would (unless under exceptional circumstances) fail. This is typical of most of the so-called privileges of women, but there seems to be little prospect of change in this respect. The law and practice on this point have been made by men and the underlying considerations seem to have been that self respect forbids a man being kept by a woman and that the wife of a destitute man would probably be destitute too. Obviously the remedy is to be found in increasing the self respect of woman until she too will refuse to allow a man to keep her. She will demand higher wages for herself in the labour market and she will refuse to allow matrimonial alliances to stand in the way of her economic progress. As a house-keeping wife she will require a living wage—not pin money, not doles dependent on caprice or affection; not purchase money for her virtue or her love, but a salary for actual service where a common home is maintained and it is necessary or desirable that one of the partners should relinquish an outside profession. It is accordingly probable that while the law will not be altered manners and customs will change, and one of the changes will doubtless be to lessen the number of old-fashioned marriages. A woman who has to study her own future will hesitate before she sinks into the position of a permanent house-servant even in her own home. Housekeeping experiments with chums of the same sex are less risky than similar adventures between husband and wife—in the former there are fewer possibilities of inequality and

permanence to consider, change is more normal, complaints easier rectified and mutual consideration or mutual forbearances more common. And the privilege of compulsory maintenance by an unwilling husband will be a thing of the past when women decide to be the masters of their own destinies and refuse to invoke the witness of the law to their love-making and decline to accept the dubious protection of its marriage institution. Such independence so far from being a loss will mean a positive gain to woman, because she will be substituting a well-instructed self reliance for an ignorant dependence on what most often proves a rotten reed. Entering on an engagement or partnership with her eyes open, she will safeguard her own future and leave always the open door for her retreat from conditions that have ceased to be desirable.

Presumably it is one of women's "privileges" that although a man's claim for monetary damages for a woman's breach of promise of marriage is always met with derision and dismissal, a woman can still claim and often obtain such financial consolation. It is not wonderful that male juries have laughed out of existence masculine claims of this kind. It is to be hoped that feminine juries will be equally condemnatory of the claims of sordid women claimants. There is no excuse for such claims on either side, the time is going by when women will care to plead ignorance as a reason for claiming cash from a man who has deceived them. Very often indeed actions for breach of promise are merely a form of blackmail, the publicity of the case being the weapon held at the head of a respectable man, who is called on to stand and deliver. Breach of promise cases, like bigamy cases, often involve heartless and cruel fraud, robbery and outrage. It shows the absurdity of our laws when these things are dealt with thus indiscriminately, and there cannot be a worse condemnation of all law than to admit that "breach" actions must not be abolished because otherwise fraud and robbery could be perpetrated with impunity. One of the chief aims of sex rationalists is to separate sentiment from property considerations. We recognize that our marriage and sex customs and laws facilitate fraud by this confusion of terms and we want love to be free, not the subject of bargaining, trickery, fraud and blackmail.

What do our advanced women say to the husband's damages in divorce actions and the father's **solatium** for his daughter's seduction? Mr. Belfort Bax may regard these as women's privileges. I have never met a thinking woman who did not consider them an objectionable survival, and I know many who regard them as infamous. There can be precious little self-respect left to any man who would accept a money prize awarded to him by a divorce judge to be paid out of the pocket of the man on whom his wife's affection has been bestowed. The father must feel a proud man when he buys a new horse which he could not have afforded but for that terrible calamity to his daughter's honour!

Is there any difficulty in seeing the origin of these degrading cus-

toms? Woman's "virtue" or "fidelity" or "love" represents valuable property belonging to a husband or a father, never to the woman herself. She can be prosecuted and imprisoned for selling herself outside marriage, but the law recognizes other methods by which men may make money out of the woman.

GEORGE BEDBOROUGH.

"HOLY MATRIMONY."

By Huldah L. Potter-Loomis.

"Oh, hideous travesty of Nature's law,
Oh, hateful doctrine of a priestly creed."

"Holy Matrimony!" Infamous though cleverly mystified tyranny of the centuries, sanctioned by the church and legalized by the State,—at last, upon the vine-wreathed and orange-blossom-freighted altars are being laid just tribute to the slavish subservience thy priestly progenitors have demanded of thy victims.

It is indeed a harvest festival, for thy fruits are abundant. The "burnt offerings and sacrifices" of ancient days were as naught compared to these.

Never in the olden time did the priests stand as now, in consternation and with pious hands uplifted in protest at the over-abundance of the people's offerings.

Can it be "the gods" are satisfied?

Never, in the history of human worship of idols and of "flesh and blood offerings" upon priestly altars, has there been offered such sacrifice as to the Moloch of Marriage. The life tragedies as revealed in the divorce courts,—the criminal calendar,—the murderous abortion practices,—the congested insane asylums,—the increasing army of sexual perverts,—the swarming "red light districts" supported chiefly by married men,—the legalized assault by man upon his defenseless wife, torturing her affection, shocking and paralyzing its natural, voluntary expression, and finally assassinating it in the strangling embrace of lust, and throughout all this heart-breaking experience, enforcing the condition of motherhood upon her in spite of her prayers or protests, thus creating disgust, loathing and hatred, out of which have come suspicion, deceit, jealousy, and often-times murder and suicide,—the birth of unwelcome children into loveless homes, where constant quarreling and dissension prevail,—a fit atmosphere and condition in which to breed and cultivate criminals.

Could the "God of Authority" ask for more slavish subservience to its will, or the "God of Greed" more lavish and abundant outpouring of treasure at its feet, or the "God of Ignorance" more abject blindness of its devotees, or the "God of Passion" more absolute sway over its followers?

What pulpit oratory of obedience,—what priestly philosophy of pretense,—what daring decree of divinity can palliate or defend such a spectacle?

"WHEN PRIESTS THE SELLING DO."

"Whom God hath joined let no man put asunder,"
But who's to tell whom God hath joined, I wonder.
The uninspired might sometimes make a blunder.

Is God a slave that he should fetch and carry
For every reverend Tom, Dick, or Harry,
Who takes a license out to preach and marry?

A thousand creeds there are, a million preachers,
They cannot all be right or trusty teachers,
But all are money-needers, cash-beseechers.

Now marriages are founts of income steady,
So when a man —no matter who—would wed, he
Will always find some preacher willing, ready.

No couple is so hopelessly mismated,
No hasty twain so patently ill-fated
That each by each must soon be loathed and hated

But somewhere they will find a needy pastor
To mumble words that make misfortune master,
And drag long generations to disaster.

The conscientious priest in vain refuses;
It simply means a needed fee he loses;
They'll find another who his cloth abuses.

Always a little church is 'round the corner,
Where there's a needier pastor and forlornier;
Ten dollars makes him Satan's own suborner.

The world's a Gretna Green, whose wedding bell
Decoys mad couples down the primrose dell
That skirts past heaven into lingering hell.

And so we see the church's benediction
Sentence two souls to one lifelong affliction
And call it sacrament—a pleasing fiction!

It matters little where the wedding's done;
Once done it's done, the two are henceforth one,
However badly end the ill-begun.

They wed young runaways still out of breath;
They wed pale invalids on beds of death;
And men whose hiccups spoil the shibboleth.

They wed at church, at home, at county fair,
In wild beasts' cages, or balloons in air,
By proxy—anyhow and anywhere.

They wed old dupes to maids of seventeen;
Gold-hunting youths to cronies of withered mien;
Young princesses to kings they've never seen.

They wed the white and black, the halt, the blind,
The heiress and the coachman, kith with kind,
The hopelessly diseased, the weak of mind.

They see the unwilling daughter forced to wed;
Her lips are ashen but the words are said,
Her finger clasped with gold, her heart with lead.

They see the leering rake hale to the altar
The white young virgin, and they do not falter;
They fix the bit and throw to him the halter.

And then they dare to call these souls "united!"
They look with calm on futures so ill-plighted;
Yet breathe "divorce" and they are all affrighted!

And so we see unending misalliance,
Where lust and hate bid decency defiance,
While smug society smirks compliance.

When marriage fails, it proves God was not witness;
Else, proves in Him a lack of sense of fitness,
Or cruel joy in torment's exquisiteness.

Shall we not rather say—"Tis we that blunder!
And He demands divorce in voice of thunder.
Whom man misjoins—behold, God keeps asunder!

—John Lomax, in "Life."

DESIRABLE HUSBANDS.

Mabel Herbert Urner.

Hamlet—So you must take your husbands.

Ophelia—Still better and worse.

Let us be frank about it! When a woman says that, it means no more than that she wants man to be frank with her, while she is usually preparing to involve him in some one of her deeper subtleties. Man should not expect her to be frank; she cannot afford it—least of all to herself.

But let us be frank about it—enough to admit that every woman wants to marry: whether she knows it, and artfully conceals her eagerness, like the born gambler she is; or whether she lays the flattering unction to her poor deluded soul that she is enough of an entity to dispense with the quest of "her man and her child."

And it is hard for her to define satisfactorily the nature of her quest; save that, whether it be directed at one man or at some imagined Prince Charming—or at any one of the sterile substitutes with which woman seeks to avoid her fate, it is still her "being's end and aim."

If, for a while, she tries to deceive herself into believing that her "work," her "art," her "career," is all-sufficient; that her life can be lived without marriage—in the end, she pays dearly for this sophistry. For, sooner or later, the primal necessity for wifehood and motherhood becomes imperative; it is the wise heritage of every woman.

What exquisite pathos it is to hear a woman in her thirties say: "I never intend to marry." She must say that; her feminine pride, her delicacy, not to say her tact, demand it. She cannot boldly admit the truth. She cannot say: "I want to marry! With every fiber of my being, I want to marry, but the few opportunities I had in my first youth I let slip, and now—I have none."

No man can ever understand the heartsick dread, the cold, abject terror with which an unmarried woman realizes that she is no longer young—that her face, her hair, her hands cry out that youth has passed! This merciless ageing of the flesh—God!—what a horrible thing it is to be a woman! Each day, a little more withered, a little less round: angles coming where curves have been! Each day, her chances of wifehood growing less; her stock in the marriage mart fast decreasing; her value, her youth, her freshness, her fairness slipping away! Old age, lonely, loveless, childless—a hideous barren old age—looms gray before her. Frantically she resorts to massage, creams, lotions, "beautifiers"; she becomes a slave to all devices for preserving and "restoring" youth.

Every man she meets, she now regards as a possible husband. And yet, all the while she smiles bravely and says she never intends to marry; that she is

absorbed in her "work"; that she would not give up her "independence" for the ties and responsibilities of marriage. I am a traitor to my sex in saying so, yet I firmly believe that ninety-nine per cent of the unmarried women past thirty would marry any decent, kindly man that would ask them! Of course, they will deny it; they will lie about it to themselves, to each other, to the world. They must lie about it, or jeopardize to the vanishing point "their chances" of obtaining the one thing needful.

What a farce! What a pitiful, empty farce it all is, you say! And yet it is but a part of the tissue of pretense that life imposes on woman.

Men who have understood her, from Shakespeare to Ibsen, have given emphasis to this fact. Whether it be the woman who "stays put," like "pretty Ophelia," or the more daring spirits like Rosalind and Portia and Helena, or the modern mentally acute types, like Nora and Rebecca West, each must attain what she wants by such clever subterfuges as her intelligence can compass, and at the minimum risk of losing all if the man finds out how she is going about it.

To frankly admit this unfortunate situation to herself, would unnerve woman and rob her of her power to practice all the arts that make her most attractive to man.

What makes man most attractive to her is quite another matter.

I believe most women want to marry Don Juan!

A woman, highly emotional, and yet with a keen sense of the irony of things, and with the rare ability to stand aside and view herself impersonally, once told me that the most tragic as well as the most ludicrous moment of her life was when she greeted her husband one evening after she had been to the matinee. It had been a love-drama interpreted by a famous romantic actor. She had come away steeped with the wonderful scenes, athrill with all that love might make of life, with a fervid longing to bring some of the rose-colored romance into her own home.

When her husband came from the office, she met him at the door, threw herself in his arms, murmuring ardent, glowing love-phrases.

He kissed her absent-mindedly. "Why, yes—yes, dear, of course I love you. Aren't you well?" Then with real interest in his voice: "Did the roast come in time? I forgot to order it on the way down this morning, so I telephoned."

And then he could not understand why she sat down weakly on the hat-rack and laughed and cried hysterically.

Don Juan would never have failed to rise to such an occasion. Is it any wonder that women want to marry him?

But do not be alarmed! I am not agreeing with the clever satirist who said, "all women are rakes at heart." That is not at all why they find Don Juan infinitely attractive.

It is because women are always striving to keep love at some emotional height, while men, after a few years of marriage, are quite content to let romance die out and settle down to a placid, comfortable, humdrum existence.

How often does one see a woman past her first youth, and yet with her insatiable longing for romance still strong within her, striving with all her arts and wiles to make of her stolid, prosaic, middle-aged husband an ardent, romantic lover. Usually the man is blandly unconscious of her efforts; or at most mildly wonders why Mary, after all these years, could not take his love for granted, and not insist on being constantly told of it.

And there lies the tragedy of most women's lives. They want to be told—constantly, repeatedly told that they are loved. They can never be reconciled to taking it for granted. However faithful and devoted they may know their husbands are at heart, they want it in words. They want, through all their married life, all the little love-phrases and tender attentions of their honeymoons. And not one woman in ten thousand gets them! Yet with what pitiful persistency they keep on wanting!

This nemesis of longing pursues woman down her seven ages because the outcome of her quest depends so much more on circumstances than on herself. George Eliot said "a woman's life is made for her by the quality of the man whose love she brings herself to accept." But she must bring herself to accept whom she considers the best of the few that offer, or else have no life at all.

I care not who the woman, whether she be a dutiful little person with an eye on the main chance, like Ruth in that edifying Bible homily which primers of literature teach us to regard as a charming idyl, or whether she be a goddess, like Diana seeking her Endymion, or a lady of the camelias, like Manon Lescaut, she still must seek the complementary through the complimentary. That is the secret of the success of Don Juan and all "men who creep into houses and lead captive silly women," boasting, with a leer, that they understand them—that only a little flattery, a little cajolery, a little lying is necessary to "win them."

(Concluded in Next Issue.)

A FALSE ANALOGY.

In the January-February number of *Eugenics* Louisa Harding introduces a very misleading comparison. She says that a man may play one violin all his life, and may yet draw from it infinite variety of music. She intends us to infer that a man or woman may spend all his or her life with one person of the other sex, and yet draw infinite variety of experience from such an association.

Such is not the case. It is true that on one violin one can play the best music of Beethoven, Mozart, Bach, Chopin, Wagner, and all the other great composers. But it is impossible to draw such variety from the society of one human being. Every man and woman is an essentially limited creature, with certain faculties developed and certain others undeveloped, with certain peculiar tastes, prejudices, mannerisms, and limitations of all kinds. You may live with the most interesting person in the world; nevertheless, at the end of a year, you will spend more time in reading the newspapers than in listening to your companion. Even the most loving wife in the world gets more pleasure from dancing or flirting with a new, nice man than she does from chatting by the fireside with her own husband. I doubt if Louisa Harding would like to be confined to the music of one composer. Even Beethoven would soon get very dull if one had to listen to him all the time.

However, one violin alone would soon get rather tame. I doubt if Louisa Harding would take a ticket for a concert which consisted entirely of performances on one violin, even if it were played by the greatest violinist in the world. I am sure she would not go if all the pieces announced were by one composer. Yet a concert lasts only three hours. If lack of variety becomes unbearable in three hours, even under such favorable conditions, what shall we say of lack of variety which endures for a lifetime?

R. B. KERR.

REPLY.

The comparison still seems fair to the writer, for the reason that a violin, of itself, offers no variety of any sort. It can only serve as a medium for reproducing the thought of Beethoven, Mozart and Chopin (insofar as it is comprehended by one man or woman) and of one new person (the performer); as one human being can recite the sentiments of Goethe, Schiller and Heine, and originate his own. The idea was simply that there is as much difference in the tones of two violins as there is in the temperaments of two human folk. But the artist, having found a fine Stradivarius, will probably less concern himself about varying the instrument, than about widening his knowledge of music and of the world, so that he may the better express his own thoughts and those of other composers. Perhaps it would be better to put it in this way: That Dr. Wüllner and Conrad Bos, having once found that they can accomplish that most difficult feat of making fine music together, will not seek greater "variety" by practicing with other musicians, but will rather strive toward even greater unity of understanding, finding diversity in the study of new compositions and in better interpretations of the old, although (fortunately enough) there is no law to compel them so to act.

As to the performance by one artist, however: Some of us have seen benighted individuals who stood in line for a good hour, in order to procure tickets which should enable them to hear Bach, Beethoven and Grieg, indeed, but all as interpreted by one person, who played upon one piano, for a period of three

hours—which some auditors (not realizing that they should have been duly bored) may have wished extended to no less than twice that time. Those who care much for Chopin, and who believe that De Pachmann understands him better than any other artist, appear to listen with the greatest pleasure while that eccentric gentleman plays in succession, many numbers by a composer who used so little “variety” in writing, that his music may be almost instantly recognized without the assistance of a name on the program.

But there was certainly no intention to draw the conclusion that any of us should be confined to the “society of one human being,” or that it would not be a great misfortune to be compelled to be always in the audience of one composer, however talented. The orchestra of life is ours to listen to; but as to the geniuses who can in one lifetime cover the whole range of tone, and become master performers upon the harp, pipe organ, piano, violin and clarinet—I surmise they may be rather rare.

L. H.

UNITARY HOMES—A SYMPOSIUM

“To make a sunny fireside clime, for weans and wife,
That’s the true pathos and sublime of human life.”

—Robert Burns.

The three sweetest words in the English language are said to be Mother, Home, Heaven; and of these three the central or middle word is most important, because it includes the other two. There can be no home without a mother, an actual or potential mother; and heaven is simply an ideal of what our future home is to be, in the “Sweet By and By.”

Someone has said, “Home is where the heart is.” That is to say, home is where the affections center. If living with a man she does not love, though in a palace and surrounded with all that wealth can bestow, the married woman is homeless—unless she loves another man; in which case her home is with the other man, although she may never see the dwelling-place of her loved one.

“Stone walls do not a prison make;” and so, in like manner, we may say, “Palace walls do not a home make,” although those walls enclose all the treasures of nature and of art—all the gold of Ophir and all the gems of Golconda’s mines.

The lines quoted from Burns, at the head of this article, suggest and outline the ideal home, as taught by ethical leaders in all lands called Christian, though by no means the ideal practiced by the patriarchs and prophets revered by Christians everywhere, such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Solomon, and others. Neither did the revered fathers of the newer dispensation deny concubinage or plurality of wives to their followers.

But the exclusive monogamic ideal, beautiful and cherished as it is in love’s young dream, namely, a honeymoon of ecstatic love that lasts till death, and that is expected to last even beyond the grave—is found in practice to be impractical if not impossible; and the attempt to keep the fires of passionate love burning perennially, or for many years, on the altar of the monogamic home, has probably never yet been realized according to the expectations and ideals of the young lovers. The reason of this is found, probably, in nature itself. In

tensity of emotion of any kind, burns itself out and brings reaction; and with the reaction is pretty sure to come apathy and the substitution of sordid feelings, narrowly selfish aims, cruel self-indulgence in the conduct of the married pair toward each other, and especially toward the world outside the precincts of the monogamic home. Making a sunny fireside clime for weans and wife, degenerates in a multitude of instances, into a desire to cheat and rob all other "weans" and wives of their equal share of the world's opportunities. Hence the habit of accumulation of vast fortunes for heirs to spend in corrupting legislatures, judges and juries, and in vicious or criminal self-indulgence.

From the failure of and dissatisfaction with the monogamic ideal, also the failure of the polygamic ideal, as practised by the patriarchs of the Jewish and Christian Bible to satisfy the demands of evolutionary progress, there has grown up in the minds of thousands of intelligent people an ideal that includes the advantages of the segregated monogamic home, and also those of the polygamic or patriarchal, as practised by Hindoos, by Japanese, by Chinese, by Persians and Turks, and, in fact, by a vast majority of the human race, in modern, as well as in ancient times. This ideal has taken the shape of communistic co-operation, as in the "New Harmony Home" of Robert Owen, also the Oneida Community, led by John H. Noyes, and in many other instances that might be named; and now it would appear that the Western World is to see an effort to practicalize an ideal differing somewhat from any hitherto attempted, but very similar to the scheme outlined in the book, "Cityless and Countryless World—A Treatise on Co-operative Individualism," briefly reviewed in this number of EUGENICS.

Mention has been made in several late numbers of EUGENICS, of the "Unitary Home," as projected by Mr. B. F. Richards, of Palo Alto, Cal. A circular letter was sent out by Mr. Richards, also from this office, briefly outlining the ideal called by its author the "Unitary Home." In the symposium that follows this introduction, will be found the circular of Mr. Richards, and a few of the responses that have been sent to this office:

Dear Comrade: I am engaged in organizing a group of progressive people to build and occupy a Unitary Home—for the purpose of utilizing and enjoying the companionship of one another in the study of Life, in an effort to discover happier and more beneficial relations and modes of life than have hitherto prevailed.

Since I believe there can be no companionship and little or no substantial progress without full liberty of thought and speech and action among the members of such a group coupled with mutual assurances of good faith, I seek only those who will freely subscribe to the following pledges:

PLEDGE FOR BOTH SEXES.

As an organic member of the Unitary Home, earnestly seeking right solutions to all human problems, I will respect and uphold the right of every woman to absolute control of her own person, and I will earnestly endeavor to make myself a worthy member of the home, making my own physical perfection the high aim

of my life, and the greatest good of the whole group the supreme object of my endeavors.

PLEDGE FOR ADULT MALES.

In the capacity of an adult male member of the Unitary Home I will contribute continuously at least 40 per cent of my net earnings or income to a children's fund, out of which each child of every mother in the home shall receive a pro rata share, to be expended by the mother or as she may approve, to feed, clothe, shelter and educate the child until it is able to support itself by its own unaided efforts.

No effort will be made to own anything in common. On the contrary, all the adult occupants of the home will own their own apartments separately and own their own work-rooms, tools, machines, etc., and conduct their various businesses individually as far as possible. It is proposed to have each woman choose some particular business or occupation, from which she will derive an independent income, which in connection with the provision made by the males for the children will make doubly sure the freedom of every woman and reduce to a minimum the property causes of friction.

The adaptation of the Unitary Home to a division of domestic labors, just as industrial labors are divided, makes it possible for every mother, like every father, to choose some special division of domestic or other labor and fit herself for it so as to render more or less expert service for her own pecuniary gain and the general benefit of the whole group.

One or more basic industries will be the original source of wealth upon which all the subsidiary industries and occupations will depend for support. The basic industries may be agriculture, mining, quarrying, lumbering, manufacturing, etc.

If you desire to become a member of such a group kindly send me more or less detailed information concerning yourself, such as may be of value in effecting the organization of the home and its industries.

State amount of money at your disposal; the amount and kind of property owned by you which might be utilized for the project.

State amount of your income; your occupation or business and number in your family who would come with you into the home. Also the age and sex of each.

State what kind of work or service is most suited to your preferences and qualifications, and in what state of the Union and part of the state you would prefer to have the home located.

Submit any other information which you may deem advisable.

Yours for peaceful progress,

P. O. Box 348, Palo Alto, Calif.

B. F. RICHARDS.

Mr. Moses Harman, Dear Friend: In reply to your question, I will say that the Unitary Home of which you enclosed a circular, does not appeal to me at all. To me it seems more of a scheme to obtain money from gullible people. My advice would be that you should have nothing to do with it by advertising it in *Eugenics*, etc.

I enclose a little mite to help pay the postage on the January-February *Eugenics*.

VICTOR ROBINSON.

[One of the Alturians, New York.]

Dear Comrade Harmon: I think the Unitary Home is a good thing, if you can get the right people together. Those who have the spirit of liberty, and who will practice it.

I see by the circular, "no effort will be made to own anything in common." I suppose the land on which the home is to be built will be owned jointly by the community.

Sometime, in the near future, I will come to Southern California and join some co-operative anarchist-communistic community. I am the only one in the family holding radical views as to the freedom of woman, and the slavery of our present marriage laws. The others do not oppose me, being merely indifferent.

I am not married, being celibate, which to a certain extent is detrimental to my health. I have not solved the sexual problem satisfactorily for myself yet. What I need is the companionship of women who have emancipated themselves from sex slavery.

PAUL L. SAUTTER.

Philadelphia, Pa.

My dear Harman: In reply to your favor of March 9th: The plan of Mr. B. F. Richards is an attractive one but it is very doubtful whether it will work out in practice.

1. To find persons who are capable and are willing to devote 40 per cent of their net earnings to children who are not their own is not easy.

2. To get people who can get along in any community where there is close association is far from easy.

3. There does not yet appear to be any foundation for the scheme. The way that ought to be worked, speaking after the manner of the business man, is to get someone who would be enough interested in it to put up at least the land, or failing that, to get options on the land and then get the members.

The history of communities show that where the motive of emotional religion, which enables absolute domination by some strong man is absent, communities go to pieces; and whilst it is all right for Mr. Richards to try this thing, in my judgment it would be a great mistake for anybody who had influence in other directions to tie up to it.

Yours cordially,

BOLTON HALL.

P. S.—I am sending a small contribution for the postage.

Brother Harman: The Unitary Home scheme seems to be a good one in its general purpose and plan. As land gets scarcer and higher-priced, many liberals trying the group plan will be forced to live co-operatively in one building, and there is no good reason why the plan should not succeed—it only needs mutual liberty and mutual kindness, but can you find them?

I believe thoroughly in the co-operation of all adults in the love and support of all children—that the mothers be free, but I do not quite understand the arrangement Brother Richards proposes. Is so large a tax as 40 per cent necessary for this purpose? And, if so, why does it all fall on the men? The scheme is that both the women and men shall be earners and self-supporting; then why not tax all incomes and earnings, without regard to the sex of the owner, for the children's support? Are you trying to establish a matriarchate? Is it not enough to make the woman free and equal? Why confer on her special privileges?

And why try to make all business individual? Why not allow the members to work individually or collectively as they please, as seems most convenient and profitable? Co-operative work and production is much more economical than individual production.

I would say California was the best state in the Union to afford location for such a home.

Cordially yours,

New Jersey.

J. WILLIAM LLOYD.

M. Harman.

Dear Friend: In reply to your kind letter of March 8th regarding Unitary Homes, will say that I am a warm advocate of domestic co-operation in the way of Unitary Homes, but my plans are all of a large scope. In order to make Unitary Homes a success, domestic and industrial co-operation must be harmoniously combined. The three most essential factors of success are: (1) Sufficient funds for securing an ample supply of material resources; (2) A careful selection of the co-operators; (3) An honest, competent leader.

Mr. Richards' plans seem to be well laid. I think, however, that 40 per cent of each member's earnings would not be necessary for a children's fund. If Mr. Richards can get together enough land and money for building purposes, and then is careful enough to select only such members as are matured for a life lived on that liberal ideal, the plan may work out well; if not, it will

end in failure. I have not much faith in small, poor beginnings. I would like to live in a Unitary Home, but am not yet prepared to do so.

HENRY OLERICH, Omaha, Neb.

[Mr. Olerich is the author of the book called "Cityless and Countryless World," in which the ideals advocated are very similar to those of Mr. Richards. Whether Mr. R. drew his inspiration from the work of Henry Olerich I do not know. These ideals and plans, however, are in the air, so to speak. Thousands of people see the need of something better than the old, the narrowly-selfish and archaic methods of obtaining those prime necessities of human beings, namely, domestic companionship of the sexes ("Domesticity," as it is called by Bernard Shaw) and the right protection and training of infant children.—M. H.]

My dear Harman: Your letter and circular duly received. I am not of the opinion the movement will be a success. In the first place, reformers are not financiers. They are more interested in the advance of principles than in money-making. It seems to me that if it were possible for reformers in various special lines to be segregated, as has been often tried, it would be a disadvantage to the cause of general progress, which is the thing most desirable.

So far as I am concerned, while I greatly love to meet and enjoy converse with any and all sorts of reform advocates, I would rather run chances for happiness in a mixed society of all sorts, as we find people about us everywhere, than with any segregated class, no matter what that class might be.

I am now getting more acquainted in New York, but like the West better than the East. Am a westerner by acclimation—this is my native state. Eugenics is excellent. You hold out well. I congratulate you. That the choicest of blessings, health and happiness may be abidingly yours, is my sincere wish.

Most cordially yours,

JULIET H. SEVERANCE, M. D.

New York.

My dear Mr. Harman: The Unitary Home does not appeal to me because I do not think that the interests of woman and her children would be safeguarded; furthermore I fear that it would lead to promiscuous sexual intercourse. I am an advocate of marriage by law, but such marriages should be based on mutual love. When they are based on convenience or pecuniary considerations, they are prostitution. True, many marriages which at first appeared to be founded on love, turn out to be unhappy on account of incompatibility or other causes. In such cases I think divorce should be granted; for to go through life with uncongenial conditions existing at home warps and embitters the mind and has an exceedingly bad influence on children, if there are any around. For the temperament that can not love deeply and sincerely, perhaps legal marriage is not the proper thing.

While the state that woman will assume in the Unitary Home is horrifying to me, I shall, nevertheless, look forward with interest to the developments, which will doubtless be of educational value for future guidance.

New York.

ROBT. E. TAYLOR.

Dear Mr. Harman: My opinion of the Unitary Home is this: If it could be made practical by a total obliteration of the graft element in society, it would be a long, long dreamed-of paradise. But I very much fear that so long as nature endows woman with more motherly sympathy than reason, it will be some time before the Richards plan will be made practical. I am not saying what I like, but, as the old negro said, "I am just sayin' wat am." Until more people become intellectually above their desires and passions, I fear the Unitary Home is not for this age.

We are all struggling for compensation, but before we can expect fine horses, cattle, flowers, or inventions, we must have fine people. How are we to get them? Is not every beat and throb of nature spontaneous? Why then, should any limit, any restriction, be placed upon maternity, upon motherhood?

My own wife now lies buried near Altadena, Cal., buried there some twelve years ago; but I think if she had been allowed to marry a poor young man she really loved, her life would have been spared. But no, conventional society said, "B—— has a fine farm, a nice home, in Leavenworth county, Kansas, for her." Damn this way of placing a money value upon life. The Unitary Home, as I understand, will not be the refuge of cowardly medievalists, but of men and women who have suffered enough to understand. Mr. Richards, like many others, may fail in his attempt to establish this home, but his motive must and will finally triumph.

It is now, and has been for years, my intention to establish myself in Southern California in my old age. I am now located on a 640-acre homestead in the sand hills of Nebraska, and when opportunity presents itself, will sell. I am 55 years old. Am trying to develop an Angora goat ranch from a very small beginning, but finding California to be the leading state in the production of mohair, I want to make the change as soon as possible. I am living alone with my little band of Angoras. They are not hypocrites; no egotists, no seekers after vain glory—they live. A. B.

Nebraska.

Brother Harman: I can not say much about the Unitary Home plan, as the circular does not give enough particulars. But the idea is a grand one. I like anything that will take men, women and children away from the miserable, disgusting and degrading conditions of modern life in the city.

The question is, how many people can avail themselves of the plan, even if they had a desire to start out? Take me, for instance: a man of forty, in good health, or at least fairly good; have been engaged about eighteen years in the practice of dentistry. Driven from Russia by the horrors of the revolution and a mad government, I came to this country about three years ago; brought with me a wife and five children, ages at present between six and sixteen. None can earn a cent, all going to school; the wife slaving at home, and at times earning a few dollars outside, as nurse, midwife, masseuse. Of cash we have none; property none, of course; furniture not worth mentioning. Outside of dentistry I have no particular knowledge that can be turned into cash. Of course I can learn things; have a passion for country life and horticulture, and could in time make enough to support myself on the land; but who is going to pay my expenses until I can stand on my own feet? Of course mine is an exceptional case, and need not really be taken into account.

The pledge for adult males will call forth objections, and certainly questions. Why should every man contribute to a children's fund, if in every other respect individual ownership is to be the principle, and not communism? I mean, social ownership of everything, machinery, tools and land, the main source of real and only wealth. Does it not smack of charity if a man is asked to contribute to a fund for bringing up children of whom he is not the father? Why does not the father of the child provide for it, will be the first question asked.

I fully admit the right of every woman to her own person, and the right to choose who shall be the father of her child, but I can not quite admit her right to demand that every male should help her to bring up her child or children. But, I repeat, the idea of group life appeals to me strongly; in fact, it is the only way to uplift humanity. Left to himself, as at present, man or woman is entirely helpless to improve his condition, physical and moral. When the country is covered with a network of such groups working in harmony, then a superior type of men and women will make its appearance, and a good deal of the discussion about sex, sexual natures, sexual relations, etc., will become unnecessary; the superior type of man and woman will settle that question all right.

Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. WOLFE.

N. B. A society built entirely on the communistic plan would look upon all children as common property, so to speak; or rather as a common burden to be supported by all the members irrespective of whether a certain man is the father of a certain child or not. Another point: Why should not every single woman, I mean one who has no children, be called upon to contribute to the children's

fund? This point is of vital importance, and must be thoroughly threshed out and settled before the Unitary Home is opened, or else it may cause the wreck of the whole enterprise.

These responses, as might reasonably be expected, vary greatly in thought and expression. It will be noted, however, that few of the writers unqualifiedly condemn the ideal as presented by Mr. Richards.

In our next issue Mr. Richards will probably be heard from in answer to objections to his plan.

NEED OF CONCENTRATION

One of the inspired poets of the New Time wrote:

"There's lack of greatness in this generation.

And why? Because no more man centers on one thought.

We know this truth, and yet we heed it not,

The secret of success is concentration."

The following paragraphs are part of a long letter sent by a good friend in one of the chief centers of American learning and culture—one who while a member of the medical profession is pretty evidently not a member of the medical "trust":

It is assumed that those who take your journal are interested in a rational discussion of the marriage institution and the sex question in general. They may be interested in other reforms or sympathetic to other ideas, but you can not know that; and if they are, there are other mediums through which they may express their opinions. When you open the columns of your journal to too great a degree, for the discussion of other questions and reforms, no matter how worthy of support they may be, you are doing an injustice to your subscribers, for you are depriving them of something you know they have paid for, and using that space to give them something that they may or may not care for.

I will give you an instance: I like your discussions of political and economic subjects, but others with rights equal to mine, may not care for them. I appreciate the sincerity and good intentions (which are qualities that they seem unable to appreciate in their opponents) of the anti-vivisectionists and anti-vaccinationists, but I have long ago investigated their side of the questions involved, and am now no longer interested in them. Therefore, why should an otherwise good article be spoiled for me by a foolish diatribe on the vaccination question (pg. 301)? Anti-vaccinationists may be right or wrong, but let them thresh the question out in their own publications.

I am interested in dietetics, of course, but I am not interested in seeing it discussed in EUGENICS. There are hundreds of publications discussing this, but there is only one EUGENICS. If you open your columns to the Food-Faddists, the New-Thoughters, the Socialists, the Anarchists, the Psycho-Therapists, the Astrologers, the Single-Taxers, and the rest, you will succeed only in losing your subscribers. If I am interested in exploiting some idea that has no particular relation to the policy of your journal, I should expect you to refer me to your advertising columns, and not give me space in your reading matter. It seems to me the great trouble with American journalism today is that there is such a mass of newspapers and magazines with no fixed policy whatever. If we go through life trying to please everybody, we will surely succeed in pleasing nobody. If you stick to one policy that you know to be important and true, and hammer away at that, even "if it takes all summer," you will as certainly succeed as truth is certain to conquer; but if you attempt to exploit "side-lines," it will only be necessary for

you to take on enough of them to eventually disgust every subscriber you have. This will not be because the readers of THE JOURNAL OF EUGENICS are so narrowminded that they might not be able to tolerate an opinion contrary to the ones that they may hold, but merely because they will not be getting what they have paid for.

Surely the vein you have chosen to work is not exhausted; the last word has not been said; there is much, very much, that can yet be written on the subject. You are hampered, I know, but the very fact that a half-baked amateur article on the Subliminal Mind or the Dietetic Value of Turnips will get through the postoffice, while a frank and serious discussion of some phase of the sex question will not, is fairly good evidence to me that the latter is of more importance to the happiness of the human family.

With very much of the foregoing it is needless to say the editor of EUGENICS is in thorough accord. I have often protested, as our readers know, against loading the columns of the magazine, or those of its forerunner, "Lucifer," with many side lines, or side issues. In a recent number, when speaking of dietetics I used the exact language of our friendly critic. There are perhaps hundreds of journals devoted to the food question, but only one to the question of right generation.

The chief difficulty seems to lie in deciding just where to draw the line—where does eugenics end, and where does something else begin? All true reforms are closely inter-related; all more or less interdependent. For instance, in the case of a recent article alluded to by our doctor friend, wherein the subject of vaccination was introduced into an "otherwise good article"—(as he says), at first view I, too, was inclined to think the vaccination controversy would better be left out of EUGENICS; but on second thought I could see that subject of poisons is very closely connected with the success or failure of motherhood and fatherhood. As shown by Dr. Robinson in his book, "Never Told Tales," syphilitic poison may wholly defeat motherhood; so also it is believed by many that vaccine pus may prevent, in whole or in part, the right borning of children by poisoning the mother organism, as well as defeat the purpose of right borning by premature death of the well-born child—or causing it to be a life-long invalid—by injecting this poison into the veins of the child itself.

Besides its direct and undisputed evil results it is believed by many that the rapid increase of those two dread scourges of the human race, tuberculosis and syphilis, is largely due to the medical "fad" known as vaccination, or cow-pox poisoning.

Having been a victim of enforced vaccination myself, and being now impressed with the belief that I am still suffering from the effects of that experience while a helpless prisoner, I naturally feel hospitable toward those who would drive a dagger to the heart of what many consider the very worst medical delusion or mania of modern times.

Yes, the subject of eugenics—good borning, or right generation—involves and includes the subject of poisons, vaccine poison as well as all other poisons, and therefore it involves and includes also the the subject of "dietetics," which our good medical brother would rule out as not being pertinent to the central thought for which THE

JOURNAL OF EUGENICS stands—since the question of poisons in food and drink is one that the expectant mother must constantly consider, if she would give to her coming child the best possible organism, physical, mental and psychic.

She must know what kinds of food to eat and what to avoid; also whether she should use drinks that contain toxins—cafein and theine, also alcohol and other stimulants, whether vegetable or mineral toxins; and this again involves and includes, for the prospective mother, the whole question of therapeutics—the entire healing art.

Should poisonous drugs **ever** be used in case of disease of any kind? Some eminent physicians, such as our good brother, W. J. Robinson, editor of "Critic and Guide," and author of the book we have highly recommended, called "Never Told Tales," believe that drugs are useful and sometimes very necessary; others, like our good Brother, J. H. Tilden, editor "Stuffed Club," and author of the book, "Cursed Before Birth"—highly recommended by us to EUGENICS readers—think drug medication is all wrong, and productive of untold evils. Who shall decide when doctors disagree?

Evidently each for himself and herself, and therefore the arguments on both sides must be heard by the prospective parents of the new and better race.

Again, the question of homes is fundamentally important;—the question whether the segregated home and family, built upon the indissoluble monogamic marriage ideal, or the unitary home, the co-operative home and family, built upon the ideal of the individual self-ownership of woman, man and child, such as recommended by Brother Richards, is the best for producing the new and better race. And this again includes and involves the whole question of economics—which word means "the law of the house," as all scholars know—primarily and necessarily means **everything** that concerns the make-up and support of the home and the success of family life; and then again, economics involves and includes the question of **politics**, of political government, the state, the nation, the question of what the state and the nation mean, and what may rightfully be done in their name—involves and includes such moralistic questions as prohibition of the liquor traffic, the control of the sex and marriage relation, also the union of church and state, the right of women to a participation in municipal, state and national government, the education of children, and nearly every other question of vital importance to the life of human beings.

Where, then, shall the line be drawn between what is pertinent and right to be discussed in THE JOURNAL OF EUGENICS, and what should be excluded? "Sex includes all"—says Whitman, and similarly we may truthfully say, **eugenics** includes all.

Once more, in regard to this question of concentration of thought and effort upon one subject, to the exclusion of all others. There is a well grounded objection to very close specializations of all kinds, that may be expressed thus:

When a man devotes himself wholly to one line of thought, or profession or pursuit, there is believed to be danger of one-sided or unbalanced development, to the extent even of monomania, or partial insanity. Hence it is common to hear such remarks as this:

"Oh, Jones is a good fellow enough in his way, but he has his hobby, and whatever he says on any subject must be taken with a grain of allowance. He is a crank on 'Perpetual Motion' or 'Aerial Navigation' or 'Single Tax' or 'Socialism' or 'Spiritualism' or 'Anarchism' or 'Swedenborgianism' or 'Seventh Day Adventism' or 'Dietetics' or 'Prohibition' (as the case may be) and whatever he thinks or says on any subject whatever, is apt to be tinged or biased by his own particular fad."

Hence I would say to our critics that while success in any line of work depends greatly on concentration of effort, we—the editors and co-operators of and with *THE JOURNAL OF EUGENICS*—feel that we must pay attention, as far as possible, to all the nearly allied reforms, and by so doing promote our own symmetrical development and also avoid the imputation of being "faddists," "hobbyists" or extremists to the extent of discounting the force or value of what we may say, in the estimation of those whose good opinion it is important that we cultivate in order to get an unprejudiced hearing.

M. H.

IS THE HUMAN RACE DEGENERATING?

This question cannot be answered offhand in the affirmative because we still see all about us great progress in the arts, sciences, industries and especially in the rapid production of wealth.

And yet it is possible that we might ascribe all this to a very small percentage of the world's population. A few men like Columbus, Stephenson, Fulton, Morse, an Edison, a Westinghouse or an Eads, have done more to push forward civilization than have millions of the ordinary run of people.

The services rendered to mankind by a Vanderbilt, a Gould, a Rockefeller, a Morgan and a Belmont are insignificant in comparison, though perhaps of great importance as necessary steps in the course of evolution. To complete the list we might add the names of a few renowned educators and eminent statesmen.

But will our progress of the past few centuries continue indefinitely? If not, when will it stop? The histories of the world inform us that the human race has passed through varying periods of progress and stagnation. Periods of bright intellects, powerful minds and wonderful progress in the arts and letters, lasting for generations and centuries, followed by long periods of stagnation and so-called dark ages. Have we reached the zenith of our progress? Is the human race doomed to pass through another long period of retrogression?

If for every action there is a reaction, and the rebound is in proportion to the impelling force, then it is not only possible but alto-

gether probable that we shall be overtaken by one of the most accentuated retrograding periods during the coming centuries that the world has ever experienced. With the completion of the flying machine we will have reached the immediate, though not ultimate goal of our mechanical ingenuity. We shall then be able to outrun the fastest animal, outswim the fleetest fish and compete with the swiftest birds of the air.

But what are the signs of our times as regards our ability to keep on making the same rate of progress in the future that we have in the recent past? Are we not in danger right now, of sacrificing art, science, literature and philosophy for filthy lucre?

When we have built the last needed railroad, dug our last canal, constructed the last skyscraper and mortgaged and bonded ourselves to the utmost limit, what shall we do then? And while we are doing all this, will we continue to grind the faces of the poor who are doing the world's work, to a point where they will be absolutely unable to reproduce their kind, or where the toil and drudgery imposed on the women and children of the world will have made such inroads upon their general health and physical condition that the production of mentally sound and bodily healthy offspring will no longer be possible?

This may not be the immediate result of our universal system of child labor but the final outcome will be that, and nothing else.

You may accuse me of being a pessimist, an alarmist. But I am not. Only a few days ago I saw a statement in some statistical publication which referred to Fall River, Mass., standing at the head of the list in the death rate of children. A comparison of the figures made it appear that in many of the large cities of this country, including New York and Chicago, the death rate among children under one year of age ranged from about two hundred to two hundred and thirty per thousand. But for Fall River it was placed at four hundred and twenty (420) per 1000. And why this doubling of the rate for Fall River, which is by no means a large city? With a population slightly above 100,000, well and favorably located as regards access to pure water and food supply "the slaughter among the infants" ought not to exceed that of Chicago, yet as a matter of fact it is just double that. Then where shall we look for the cause of this enormous increase?

The employment of women and children in mills and factories for more than two generations.

It is not claimed that any considerable number of these children are wilfully and systematically murdered, but merely that they are brought into the world by parents, and more especially by mothers, who are unfit for the propagation of the race. Their vitality is sapped during that period of life when they should apply their time and talent to the best development of their minds and bodies. When instead of their daily and nightly toil lasting from 9 to 12 hours in dust and floating fibre they should attend schools and take outdoor exercise. But this is out of the question, for if we were to insist on filling

our mills, mines and factories with adult male labor and pay it the full value of its product, the income of our captains of industry would be so reduced that they might stop production altogether.

Thus we come to the question: Shall we give up our captains of industry or shall we stop our progress and the improvement of the human race?

So far as America is concerned the signs of the times are showing clearly that her people are at or past the turning point. The birth rate among those families able to rear at least three well born children is so low now that it scarcely averages one to the family. While those who are really unable to raise more than one or two, or should have none at all, as a rule have from five to fifteen—such as they are. The propagation of the more desirable element, as regards health and means, appears to be nearing the end while that of the undesirable and totally unfit is in a fair way to overstock the world with imbeciles, idiots and insane. And since our civilization obliges us to look after and take care of all the deaf, dumb, blind and insane the earth may be completely swamped by their numbers.

I know of one of the central states in this Union where less than thirty years ago they had one insane hospital while now they have four, and all crowded with patients that are supposed to be curable. The incurable and more harmless are being taken care of in County Infirmaries (Poor Houses) and city hospitals. In addition to all this the state maintains an institution for feeble minded children with several hundred inmates, with a grand total of more than five thousand persons mentally unbalanced in a population of less than 3,000,000 people.

And here it might as well be stated as anywhere that the female insane far outnumber the male in these institutions and many of them mothers, whose offspring are almost sure to inherit insane tendencies.

I have no doubt that there are many states in which imbecility and insanity have increased out of all proportion to the increase in population.

Now, when to the inmates of these institutions we add those of the deaf, dumb and blind asylums and all those confined in the reformatories and penitentiaries we get some idea of the vast numbers that must be supported at public expense.

Great as this burden may appear now, what will it be a quarter of a century hence if the tendency in that direction remains unchecked?

And yet if you suggest to our most "desirable citizens" that our present sex life is largely responsible for this condition of affairs they are up in the air in an instant. They are ready to place the blame anywhere and everywhere except where it properly belongs. There is little use to talk to these people about improving the human race by changing our system of sex life. They simply, as yet, will not listen to any argument that hints at freedom in sex matters and to suggest public nurseries is rank nonsense to them. They prefer to build churches and reformatories for the regeneration of bad people,

rather than establish systems and institutions for the generation of good people that will never need regenerating. The amount of money now spent in supporting all these institutions with their thousands and hundreds of thousands of physical, mental and moral degenerates, the world over, would more than support all the public nurseries needed under a proper system of sex life.

But so long as church and state continue to hold vast numbers in darkness on this subject the path of the reformer is hard to travel.

C. H. WESSELER.

OUTLOOK FOR EUGENICS

And now just a few words regarding the Outlook for EUGENICS. Am very glad to be able to report that since the issue of the January-February number, the darkness has cleared away to a very considerable extent. While it is not wise to crow till the day has fully dawned, or till the sun of prosperity has fully arisen upon the old-young magazine, it is simple truth to say that the outlook is better for it now than for several years.

One reason for making this statement is found in the list of those who have contributed to the "Sustaining Fund." If EUGENICS were a private enterprise, a money-making business for the benefit of the editor and publisher, the long list of contributors to this fund would be a source of humiliation and of mortification to the said editor and publisher, rather than of joy and gratulation.

Another cause for encouragement and hope, is the increase in book orders for home use and as presents to others. This, as all know, is one of the very best ways of sustaining the work of EUGENICS. Books and pamphlets go into the libraries, both public and private, and continue to excite thought and investigation on radical lines, long after their donors, also their authors and publishers, have passed from mortal sight and sound.

And still another cause of renewed hope is found in the new names that have been sent by a few of our more active and energetic cooperators. It is of course needless to say that without such additions to the subscription list, the magazine must soon suspend and go out of existence. It is needless to say that there is almost continual loss, from death, or from sheer inability to renew subscription; and if new subscribers do not come forward to take the place of these, it will be only a question of time when our much beloved banner will be permanently folded, and the "Star of the Morning" be quenched in everlasting night; and therefore it is cause of rejoicing to know that in the rush of conflicting interests and competing claims, some of our friends have not forgotten the needs of the old, and yet ever young, JOURNAL OF EUGENICS.

And now that the "winter of our discontent has been thawed" by the co-operative aid of those who feel that the work of EUGENICS is not a private or personal enterprise, but equally the work of all its

readers and well-wishers; and now that the physical skies have cleared and brought again the inspiring rays of the physical sun, it is confidently hoped that the **monthly issue** of EUGENICS can very soon be resumed.

The chief reason for the tardiness of the March-April number has been the difficulty of getting the mechanical work done on time. It will surprise many readers to be told that the printers and printing machines of this little city have been overrun with work for many months past, and yet such seems to be the fact.

Will It Last?

This is the important question now. As the summer advances, will our friends allow other interests, other cares, other calls for help, to so monopolize their time and means, that they will forget the needs of the eugenic movement? Time will tell.

Arrearages

During the fall and winter months we have sent out some hundreds of letters to subscribers in arrears. A few have responded with money to pay up and renew for a year ahead; some have sent enough to pay up to date, but asked to have their names dropped from the list—not from lack of interest, but simply from inability to pay ahead. So hard have the rulers and manipulators of our national currency and captains of our various industrial systems made it for the average producer and wage-earner, that many feel themselves absolutely compelled either to discontinue their subscriptions or to ask an extension of time for payment. The great majority, however, of those to whom statements of accounts were sent, have made no reply, probably simply postponing reply in the hope that soon they will be able to pay up and renew.

As often said before, we are quite willing to wait the convenience of our friends, in times like these, but think it a very small request when we ask a-line or two on a postal card, to say that the subscriber wishes his or her name continued, and will pay when circumstances permit.

Eugenic Booklets

Here is a suggestion that would be very useful, as some of us think, in getting new subscribers, and in extending the work of EUGENICS. We have issued a few cheap booklets, of small pamphlets, that can be sold for 5 cents each, that will serve as opening wedges, or as missionary documents for the use of those who have not heretofore met with any Eugenist literature.

"Conventional Marriage—Why I Oppose It"

This is the name of our latest 5-cent pamphlet. It is reprinted from Vol. II, No. 8-9 of EUGENICS, and is in great measure a reply to criticisms of the work of EUGENICS, including a brief biographical sketch of the editor, and of his various prosecutions and imprisonment by the Washington government. This pamphlet has been

warmly commended by competent judges, as a useful **starter** for beginners in the study of eugenics—a good **whetter** of appetite for the magazine and for the larger pamphlets and books sold by us, a revised and up-to-date list of these books being appended to the new booklet, "Conventional Marriage—Why I Oppose It."

"Free Man's Creed"

Another booklet of same size, is "Free Man's Creed"—a discussion of marriage from the standpoint of the "trinity," Freedom, Love and Wisdom. This booklet is same size, price and style as "Conventional Marriage—Why I Oppose It."

To friends who buy for distribution, these pamphlets will be sent at reduced prices—30 cents per dozen, two dollars per hundred, while they last.

"Institutional Marriage"

Another booklet that has been widely commended for beginners in the study of Eugenist literature, is "Institutional Marriage," presented in the form of an allegory or story—sold extensively at ten cents each, but now offered in quantity at fifty cents per dozen to those who wish to use them for missionary work.

"Motherhood in Freedom"

This pamphlet is out of print as a single booklet, but can still be supplied, in limited quantity, incorporated in Vol. II, No. 1, of "Our New Humanity," a pamphlet of ninety-two large pages, containing one of Kerr's famous allegories on Sex Superstition, called the "Greatest Sin," also "Jealousy, the Foe of Freedom," by Oscar Rotter, also essays by Earnest Winnie, E. C. Walker, May Clifford Hurd, and others—all for 25 cents.

These four, "Constitutional Marriage," "Free Man's Creed," "Institutional Marriage," and "Motherhood in Freedom," are by the editor of EUGENICS. Besides these we offer several other booklets that we cannot well say too much in favor of, as eye-openers in regard to the ages-old ignorance and superstitions that surround the subject of sex, of parenthood, and of the right to be born well, if born at all.

Prominent among these is "Social Freedom," by Hulda L. Potter-Loomis, old price 20 cents; but to our friends who want plenty of good and cheap ammunition, we will put the price down to 15 cents each, or \$1.00 per dozen; 60 cents for a half dozen.

Then we have a good supply of "The Strassburg Geese," a very striking allegory by R. B. Kerr, including also several other allegories showing up the amazing stupidity and blindness of the masses of people on eugenic questions; one of these other allegories is called the "Cat's Story," by Emile Zola; another, "A Traveler's Tale," by R. B. Kerr; also "A Strike of the Strassburg Geese," by Cyrus Coolridge—all in the same booklet; price 5 cents, or 30 cents per dozen.

Bound Volumes

Volumes I and II of EUGENICS are now ready for binding, but

before setting the binder to work, it is very desirable that we know how many of our readers want one or more copies. Vol. I will contain the first six numbers of the magazine—from July, 1907, to Dec., 1907, inclusive. Vol. II will contain eight numbers, from Jan., 1908, to January-February, 1909, inclusive.

The number of pages in each will be about the same—about 350. The price per volume—after consulting friends near and far—has been fixed at \$2.00. If, after seeing the books, the purchasers, are not satisfied that they have got their money's worth, they can return the volumes at our expense, and get their money back, or they can exchange them for other literature advertised by us.

One good lady friend offers \$25.00 for a bound copy of each of the first two volumes of the magazine in its present form.

Please order at once, so that we may know approximately how many copies to order from the bindery. We have no money at present to invest in binding volumes for which there is no immediate demand.

Shall we hear from you, good friends and co-operators, all?

Hopefully ever,

M. HARMAN.

BOOK REVIEWS

"Government Analyzed," by John R. Kelso, A. M.; author of "The Real Blasphemers"; "The Devil's Defense"; "Deity Analyzed"; "The Bible Analyzed"; "The Universe Analyzed," etc., etc., etc.

The last written of these books is Government Analyzed, which volume was left in an unfinished state by the untimely demise of the author. After his death, and by his own request, the work was completed by his surviving companion, Etta Dunbar Kelso.

- I. Derivations and Definitions of Political Terms.
- II. Various Forms of Government.
- III. General Principles of Government.
- IV. Functions of Government.
- V. Origin of Government.
- VI. Declaration of Independence.
- VII. Articles of Confederation.
- VIII. Defects of the Confederation.
- IX. Formation of the Constitution of the United States.
- X. Constitution of the United States.
- XI. Taxation.
- XII. Tariff or Protection.
- XIII. War.
- XIV. Punishments.
- XV. Marriage.
- XVI. Religion.
- XVII. Prohibition.
- XVIII. Money.
- XIX. What a Government Should Be.

Col. Kelso died while still a young man, comparatively speaking, because of wounds received in the "War of the Rebellion," as it is called. He possessed by nature a keenly analytical mind—a heritage

such as possessed by few of those who have attempted the role of historian and of investigator and delineator of fundamental problems such as outlined in the above table of contents of this truly remarkable book.

If the reader should note, in comparing the various chapters with each other, something of a discrepancy, something of a lack of congruity or coherence of thought, it will probably be due to the fact that the book is the product of two different minds, each an independent thinker—and to the other fact that no two minds can think just alike on any question.

The book is printed on good paper and clear type, and was first sold at \$1.50 per copy. The edition is now nearly exhausted, and will probably not be reprinted. The age is not yet ripe for the general reception of thoughts so radical and so fearlessly uttered as those of this ex-evangelist of the gospel of the Nazarene, this ex-Congressman and ex-colonel in the fratricidal war of 1860 to 1865.

Some years before his death, Col. Kelso wrote a pamphlet on Autonomistic Marriage, dedicated to the citizens of Valley Falls, Kansas, who had imprisoned two members of our publication company because of their failure to comply with the "rules of the game"—the rules laid down by priest and parson, by judge and Grundy, for all who should desire to take part in the popular gambling game called matrimony—"matter of money," as it is sometimes called.

This pamphlet is now out of print, but the Chapter of "Government Analyzed" called "Marriage," tells what this fearless rebel against all ancient superstitions thought of all such attempts to meddle with this the most truly personal and most sacredly private of all the human relationships.

The surviving partner of the firm of "Kelso and Dunbar," herself the finisher of the book now under review, has been a most generous helper of EUGENICS and of its forerunner, LUCIFER, for more than twenty years. She donated several hundred copies of "Government Analyzed" to help defray the expenses of the defensive fight against the Postal Censorship, most of which copies have been sold for that purpose; and now, believing that such teachings as those contained in this book were never so much needed as now, a copy of this eye-opener on what our American government really is, and how it became what it is, will be sent to every old subscriber to EUGENICS who will send \$1.50 for a year ahead, or who will send the name of one new subscriber with that sum in postal order, bank check, or postage stamps. This is simply the price of the book itself—which is a heavy one for the price, weighing nearly twenty-four ounces. In this way we sell the book at the publisher's price, and give a year's subscription to EUGENICS as premium.

"Sexual Ethics," by Professor August Forel, M. D., Ph. D., LL. D., formerly Professor of Psychiatry at and Director of the Insane Asylum in Zurich, Switzerland. With introduction by Dr. C. W.

Saleeby, F. R. S., Edin. London, the "New Age" Press, 140 Fleet St., 1908.

In his preface Dr. Saleeby tells us that Prof. Forel's large work entitled the "Sex Question" is by far the best work on the sex question in any language, and has actually received on the Continent (of Europe) something like the recognition which is its due.

In this larger work, as well as in the smaller one, "Sexual Ethics," the central thought, we are told, is that "there is no wealth but life—that the culture of the racial life is the vital industry of any people, and must so remain so long as three times in any century the only wealth of nations is reduced to dust and raised again from helpless infancy."

Both Saleeby and Forel give preference to monogamy as the ideal sexual life of human beings, but from passages like the following it would appear that the author of "Sexual Ethics" is not in favor of law-enforced monogamy as the only standard of morality, or of righteousness, in the sex relation. On pages 47 and 48 and of the volume under review appear these words:

Every woman who is healthy and strong should be proud of becoming a mother. If sexual intercourse were frankly and naturally treated as one of the most important acts in human life, the paternity of the child would be easily ascertainable. A woman should not wait until the birth of the child before speaking of it, but should promptly make a formal declaration as to its parentage to the registrar of births as soon as she becomes aware of her pregnancy. This would be easily practicable if all girls received proper instruction regarding the most important function of their lives. Instead of this, everything is now concealed from them, and they are brought up in gross ignorance of their sexual nature and duties.

If every pregnancy were at once legally recognized in this way, and if the law would determine the responsibilities of both parents toward their offspring, untrammelled by marriage laws and with the well-being of society as its only aim, the most pressing need of our time, from the standpoint of sexual ethics, would be satisfied. A complete equality can only be attained by naming all children after the mother. This is, moreover, the only rational and just system. It was formerly the custom among many primitive peoples.

Among the closing paragraphs of "Sexual Ethics" are the following:

In the sphere of sexual life we must endeavor to replace by truth and justice the present-day hypocrisy which parades under the false banner of "morality." We must also restore to woman the same natural and equal rights possessed by man. Moreover, we must no longer be content to remain indifferent and idle witnesses of the senseless and unthinking procreation of countless wretched children, whose parents are diseased and vicious, and whose lives are for the most part destined to be a curse both to themselves and their fellowmen.

We must therefore recommend to all persons who are sickly or infirm in body or mind, and especially to all suffering from hereditary ailments, the use of means for the prevention or regulation of conceptions, so that they may not, out of pure stupidity and ignorance, bring into the world creatures doomed to misery and misfortune, and predisposed to disease, insanity, and crime.

We must endeavor in this way to bring about a vast and universal sterilization of all worthless, incapable or diseased people, without attempting to

prohibit in an ascetic and impracticable manner the gratification of their normal sexual instinct and their desire for affection.

The qualification for parentage must not be the possession of a certain amount of money or property, but solely the social worth and intrinsic hereditary qualities of the two individuals.

The multiplication of all who are healthy, capable, and ethically fit must be encouraged as far as possible.

An excessive frequency of childbirths in the case of one woman must be prevented and regulated by the use of the means mentioned above.

In this way we shall carry out a true racial selection and prepare the way for a better and happier humanity.

And so at last we shall have brought our true sexual ethics into living being and reality.

The publishers' price for this book is one shilling net. We expect to keep it constantly in stock at the office of EUGENICS and will send it by mail to all applicants for 30 cents, stamps, or will give it as premium to new half-yearly subscribers to EUGENICS.

M. H.

"CITYLESS AND COUNTRYLESS WORLD, AN OUTLINE OF PRACTICAL CO-OPERATIVE INDIVIDUALISM."

By Henry Olerich, published by the author at Omaha, Neb.

Co-operation—"working together"—is the watch-word of today. The era of isolated competitive production is rapidly passing away. In its place we shall have to choose between government ownership and control of all industries, on the one hand, and voluntary co-operation in all productive industries on the other. The concentration of capital—including the ownership of raw materials and the ownership of the tools of production—including the tools of distribution and exchange—in the hands of a few men, with the connivance and aid of our political leaders and bosses, has made it hard, if not impossible, for the small and independent manufacturer, miner and farmer to succeed in the race of life; and now the only hope of those who would avoid slavery to the money lords, the factory lords, the transportation lords, the lords of the mine and farm—is to unite their forces in co-operative groups or colonies, in such states and territories as still have public lands suitable for producing all the necessities and some of the luxuries of life; and there produce, co-operatively, all that nature requires for life, health and happiness, and thus defeat the lords of corporate capital by being able to live without them, and without their slave-produced commodities.

The book, "Cityless and Countryless World" presents, in the form of a pleasing allegory, or story with a purpose, a practical method by which such a co-operative home on a large scale, can be built and sustained. Incidentally, as it were, the sex and parenthood questions are discussed and solved in a conversational way, between an inhabitant of the planet Mars and a champion of the old-time standards of sex-morality as taught and attempted to be enforced in all lands called Christian, on the planet earth.

Many thousands of these books have already been sold, and so far as I now recall, no purchaser has ever expressed dissatisfaction or disappointment. The book is a large one for the price—one dollar, postage 13 cents; there are 447 pages, well bound in red silk cloth; weight twenty-five ounces; in paper the price is 50 cents, postage 12 cents. By special arrangement with the author and publisher, who has been a generous helper for many years, we are enabled to offer the paper bound edition as premium to all subscribers who will pay up arrearage (if any) and renew for a year ahead. Also the same as premium, to all subscribers who are now paid ahead, who will send us a year's subscription for a new subscriber.

This offer holds good so long as the present supply of the book lasts.

SUSTAINING FUND.

Emma Wardlaw Best, Australia, \$2; W. C. James, Calif., \$2; Paul Robin, Paris, France, \$1; Wegie Lacefield, Calif., \$1.25; Simon Gelus, Ct., \$1; Beidenkapp, N. Y., \$1.75; J. O. Charbonneau, Calif., \$5; A. G. Lengberg, N. J., 50c; W. A. Rappaport, N. Y., 50c; F. W. Bosshard, Minn., 75c; David Glick, Pa., \$1; F. E. Lothringer, Kan., \$4; A Friend, Canada, \$7.50; A. Landers, Ct., \$1; L. W. J., Calif., \$2; B. L., Wash., \$125; Pauline Cantor, Calif., 50c; J. A. Hagstrom, Ill., \$2; Sarah R. Bowman, Pa., \$2; A. C. Pleydell, N. Y., 50c; H. E. Cowles, Calif., \$1; Chas. W. Dickinson, Wash., \$1; Elizabeth Breese, Ore., \$2; H. Henn, Ore., \$1; A. F. Howard, Ore., \$1; Geo. T. Remington, R. I., \$1; Herman Kuehn, Chicago, \$1.22; H. Tanner, Calif., 50c; Ella Slater, St. Louis, \$1; Anna Gunst, N. Y., \$1; Wm. B. DuBois, N. J., \$5; Samuel Rosenblom, \$2; Ed. Hays, N. Y., \$1; Alice Groff, Pa., \$1; Ed. S. Pilsworth, Mich., \$2; Jos. Balogh, \$2.10; Elsie C. Wilcox, Wash., 25c; Laura H. Ford, Fla., 50c; Ella Kautz and O. H. Stone, Wash., \$5; Victor Robinson, N. Y., \$1; Sara C. Campbell, Okla., 70c; Bolton Hall, N. Y., \$1; T. J. Tanner, Mo., 20c; Myra P. Weller, S. D., 10c; Robert E. Taylor, N. Y., 66c; Paul L. Sautter, Pa., \$1; E. W. Kochler, W. Va., 25c; M. L. Studebaker, N. J., 25c; A. B. Fish, N. Y., 50c; O. P. Loomis, Va., \$1; Geo. H. Coursen, Pa., \$1.

Dr. A. B. Stockham, Canada \$2; Geo. H. Coursen, Pa., \$1; G. J. Lambrigger, Neb., 50c; Mary C. Matthews, O., 50c; Dr. O. A. Rice, Ill., \$1; H. H. Cady, N. Y., 80c.

If any names have been omitted from this list that should appear therein we shall be glad to make the proper correction in next issue. Our helpers are hereby urgently requested to send names of friends who would probably appreciate trial subscriptions to *Eugenics*, or sample copies, or leaflets—to the amount of their respective donations to the *Eugenics*' "Sustaining Fund." Please do not delay, nor forget, to attend to this request. Yours gratefully and co-operatively.
M. HARMAN.

WHY WAS IT WRONG?

Two children, a boy and girl, were wading one hot summer day in a stream in the depths of a Wisconsin forest. They were cousins and had lived their short lives in the forest some fifty miles apart, perfect physically but entirely ignorant of anything save the few simple ideas they had acquired at the short terms of school they had attended. The summer was forty years ago when district schools were much inferior to those of the present. In mind and soul they were just as pure as the birds that sang over their heads in the tree tops.

The girl, with her mother, had come a few days before to visit her aunt, the boy's mother. Neither had ever had one of the opposite sex for a playmate before but in the few days they had spent together they had become the best of friends.

As they waded in the stream the boy said: "I wish you were a boy, Jennie." "Why," asked the girl. "Why, then we could take our clothes off and have a swim." "Why can't we anyway?" asked Jennie. "I don't know," said the boy, "but we could have a whole lot better time if we did." Jennie sprang out on the bank and said: "Let's take them off, then." The boy came out and in a minute two white, beautiful forms stood on the bank. Then two splashes rose on the air and a genuine swim was in progress. It was repeated the next day and the next. Then the children went home while the girl's heavy hair was still wet. Her mother inquired the cause of the dampness and the girl told her she had been in swimming with her cousin. Her mother told her aunt of the awful (?) occurrence and a council of the mothers and a brother of theirs was held to decide on proper punishment for the offenders. The brother insisted that the only way to do justice to the occasion was to use the rod vigorously and proved his position by numerous scripture quotations and the mothers were convinced. The boy was led to the back yard by his mother and a "gad" cut and applied until she grew weary. The girl was taken by her mother to her room. She begged her mother to tell her what she had done that was wrong.

"You naughty, naughty girl! how can you ask such a question?" was her mother's reply. Then a strap that had served to hold a "carpet-sack" together was found and the culprit ordered to bend over a trunk. As a preliminary her mother raised her dress to her shoulders. Under it she wore a short pair of drawers. Her mother paused and ordered her to remove them. She did so and resumed her position on the trunk and again her dress was raised and the strap rose and fell, each fall raising a broad red welt on the white skin and it kept rising and falling until her back and legs were a mass of red stripes crossed and crossed again.

An hour afterward the boy found her, still sobbing with the smart, in a corner of the haymow in the barn. His back was still painful and he felt sure his whipping had been the worst. The girl thought the contrary and, in a moment their garments were removed and each was examining the other's stripes. For an hour at least they sat naked allowing their heated suffering bodies to get cool. Their honest belief was that their crime consisted in going into the water.

The girl is now a highly successful professional woman in the west but she does not know yet what wrong she and her cousin committed. Can you tell?

JOHN WIRT.

Various Voices.

This is the Eugenist "Correspondence Bureau," or, perhaps better called the "Eugenist Drawing-room"—the room in which all the family are supposed to convene at regular intervals for confidential interchange of thoughts, opinions, suggestions upon matters of mutual interest. It is much better, as some of us think, that the *name* of each

writer be given, so that the personal identity of each be known to the rest of the family. Postoffice addresses can be had by inquiry at this office; or a letter addressed to any one of the various writers in this department, if sent in care of this office, will be duly forwarded.

M. H

I expect you to be persecuted as long as you live, for you have attacked the very foundation of the powers that be, by which they hold the race in bondage, but I know you are made of the stuff that will never yield. I don't think you could be happy without doing the work you are engaged in. If I don't pay up for *Eugenics* it is because I have not got the money.

TOM WHITE.

Oklahoma.

Dear Friend Harman: The greater my experience of mankind the more I become convinced of the primary importance of the work you are engaged in, viz., the destruction of marriage relations as they exist today. To make woman free, absolutely free, is a work worthy of the gods. Only then will there be real harmony and joy without fear, between men and women; then only, for the mass of mankind, will the real work of eugenics commence—the birthing of free, fearless, lusty (strong) men and women.

We may never shake hands, dear friend, or look each other in the eyes. Nevertheless I trust you count me with the elect of those who, like yourself, wish for a race freed from the garments of superstition, cant, hypocrisy and fear.

THOS. J. GRIFFITHS.

Montreal, Canada.

Madden's Book.

Enclosed find check to pay up what I am in arrears for *Eugenics*, and sufficient extra to bring me the publication until August 1, 1909. If there is any-

thing left, put it where it will do the most good.

How much work there is for us to do is well shown in Edwin C. Madden's book, "The U. S. Government's Shame, the Story of the Great Lewis Case." This is a book that should be studied by all intelligent persons in the land. They will then learn what despotism is in our postoffice department.

With best wishes for the life of *Eugenics* and its editor.

JOSHUA T. SMALL.

Massachusetts.

Letter From Dr. Stockham.

Dear Friend: I have just received the January *Eugenics*. I wonder if sometimes the soul does not cling to a tradition of ideals, and may it not suffer, as the rose does, by the limitations put upon it by its heritage.

Do you know, it is not what we do, but what we are unable to accomplish, that gives us fatigue and disobedient nerves. Now listen, dear heart; the work you have lived and suffered for is being carried on by press, by the stage, by the pulpit even. You have sown the seed, now watch the harvest in the courts, the drama, in periodicals. There is an average of about one in nine between divorce and weddings; these may not all be freed in spirit, but nevertheless each gets an education.

The stage especially emphasizes the "larger love," the limitless freedom of Nature's working. You will find this in the most classical drama, the vaudeville, and even in the prurient moving pictures. What seems evil, is educating the masses to sex freedom. Does economics keep pace with all this, so as to

care for the free mother and child? Shall we open the bud before it matures for bloom?

How would a department in *Eugenics*, "What of the Signs," help out? Let some bright, quick-witted young person watch periodicals and criticisms. Current Literature and the Literary Digest are always full of meat. Some of the editors are daring, and are giving food, real food, instead of merely victuals.

I am living with some of the children of the Oneida Community. Many of these are loyal to the teaching and practice of J. H. Noyes. In sex freedom they claim more than freedom to function as mothers: they understand both conservation and appropriation of sex energy to all life's purposes; to renewal and perpetuity of bodily functions, to awakening of intellect, to quickening of the spirit, thus really and truly applying the creative spirit to every department of life. It may be a blessed privilege to create a child, but it may be just as great a privilege, and do as much or more for the race, to create a work of art or make a discovery in mechanics. If I stand for any one thing, it is the conservation of creative energy. All good wishes.

A. B. STOCKHAM.

Ontario, Canada.

Reply to Reverend Locke.

Dear Mr. Harman:

I feel that I must write to *Eugenics*—which journal, by the way, is, as I think, the most progressive and helpful magazine now published in America. Of late I have been reading in a morning paper much of the sentimental gush of the reverend Mr. Locke, and here is how this gush has affected me.

If correctly reported this gentleman proclaims to his flock that the modern drama is very dangerous to society, and particularly does this resurrected fossil direct his attacks against Ibsen, the greatest of modern revolutionary dramatists—telling his hearers and readers that Ibsen seeks to undermine present harmonious marriage relations, and thinks that the great dramatist would dissolve the marriage tie altogether. In other words this reverend expounder of orthodox morals tells an intelligent community that marriage is not sacred or divine unless sanctioned by the clergy and the state.

Now to my mind the sanctimonious

piousness of the average minister of the gospel is nothing more nor less than superfluous hypocrisy. To my thinking the average minister is like the old-time lamp post—no longer useful. He still wears his long ministerial garb and carries his biblical appendix. These ancient fossils really belong to the carboniferous age in our evolutionary development. They never change, never move forward, so you can never—or at least very seldom—find one of them in the van of progressive thought. They always tag along behind, pulling back, trying to keep their flocks in the darkness of ignorance instead of encouraging them to seek the light of truth as it is in nature. With Ibsen, on the contrary, the object is to widen the intellectual horizon of his hearers or readers, by pointing to a larger life of freedom and love. Ibsen tells you to be your real self, to be natural instead of an imitator. Ibsen, like all great dramatists, realizes that we must deal with real human beings instead of with supernatural nonentities up in the skies. Ibsen carefully directs attention to the fact that we are filled, for the most part, with dead ideas, with lifeless old beliefs. Ibsen would have us slough off the old ideas, the worn out dogmas of a fossiliferous age.

The average sermon does not tell people how to be natural and real, but rather how to imitate some one else, making us a lot of intellectual imbeciles instead of free, progressive human beings. Ibsen would have us to be Realities and not Nonentities.

I am glad there is in America a journal devoted to the uplift of womanhood. For one I have been helped so much by its teachings that I most sincerely wish to see it placed in every American home. Earnestly do I hope, Mr. Harman, that you may long live to publish *Eugenics*, and thereby push forward the grand work of human emancipation from all slaveries. Yours for progress.

B. M. M.

Los Angeles.

Friend Harman: As to such colonies (as that of B. F. Richards) I have no more faith than in heaven. May be that a thousand years hence there may be some humans that can bunch that way.

E. B. FOOTE, M. D.

New York.

PROSPECTUS

Of the Journal of Eugenics for the year 1909—common calendar.

SUBJECTS: Discussion of the Connection of Eugenics with Economics.

Discussion of the Connection of Eugenics with Dietetics.

Discussion of Church-State Interference in Sex-Morals.

Discussion of Financial Endowment of Motherhood.

Eugenic Colonies in California and Elsewhere.

Training for Parenthood; Temperamental Adaptation of candidates.

"Love in Freedom," and its effect upon the Family and Home.

Failure of "Representative Government" and of "Majority-Rule."

The Gospel of "Dianism" and of "Karezzarism," and their Effect on Mental and Physical Health, and upon Racial Uplift or Degeneracy.

PREMIUMS: Each new subscriber to the Journal of Eugenics for the year 1909 will receive a copy of "Right to Be Born Well," a sixty-page pamphlet by M. Harman. Also a copy of "The Persecution and Appreciation of M. Harman," a 58-page pamphlet of letters and speeches read and delivered at the reception in Chicago, on the return of the prisoner from the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kan.

Half yearly subscribers will receive one of these pamphlets.

Three-month subscribers' will receive "Institutional Marriage," a lecture by the editor.

Price per year, \$1.25; 6 mo., 65c; 3 mo., 35c.

THE EUGENIST LIBRARY

When sending for books our friends are requested to name second or third choice, inasmuch as the stock of some of these is near exhausted and we find it difficult, often impossible, to get more.

"Eugenics—or Race Culture Lessons," by Lois Waisbrooker. Price 50c.

"Conventional Marriage—Why I Oppose It," by M. Harman. Price 5c.

Love's Coming of Age, by Edward Carpenter, Price \$1.

Never Told Tales, by Dr. Wm. J. Robinson, Price \$1.

"Woman's Source of Power," by Lois Waisbrooker. Price 25c.

"Bible Truth, Bursting It's Shell," by Lois Waisbrooker. Price 25 cents.

"Prodigal Daughter," by Rachel Campbell, including "Pioneer Chips" from the correspondence of Rachel Campbell, by Florence Johnson; also "Marriage, What It Was and Is—Will the Coming Woman Marry?" by M. Harman; also other radical essays. Price 25 cents.

"Motherhood in Freedom," by M. Harman, together with "Sexual Love Analyzed," by Ernest Winne; "Priestly Celibacy," by A. L. Rawson; "Incoherence of Transition," by E. C. Walker, and other essays. Price 25 cents.

"Boy Love," by Dr. Alice B. Stockham. Topics: Boy Lover, Girl Lover, Recreation, Courtesy, The Awakening. Price 25 cents.

"Tokology, a Book for Every Woman," by Dr. Alice B. Stockham. This large volume is in itself a library of most important knowledge for every mother or for every woman or girl who expects ever to become a mother. Price in very substantial and beautiful cloth binding, \$2.25; postage 15 cents.

"A Cityless and Countryless World," a treatise on "Co-operative Individualism." Price one dollar; postage 13 cents. Paper cover, 50c; postage 12c.

"Hilda's Home," a Story of Woman's Trials and Triumphs. Price in cloth \$1; postage paid.

"Cursed Before Birth"; Dr. H. J. Tilden; \$1, postpaid. A thrilling story.

"Social Freedom," by Hulda L. Potter Loomis. Price 20 cents.

"Borning Better Babies," by Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr. Price 25 cents.

"Marriage in Free Society," by Edward Carpenter. Price 25 cents.

"Right to Be Born Well," by M. Harman. Price 25 cents; cloth, 50 cents.

"Persecution and Appreciation" of M. Harman, by many speakers at the reception given the prisoner on his return home from the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas, to his home in Chicago. Price 10 cents.

"Administrative Process of the Postal Department." A letter to President Roosevelt, by Thaddeus Burr Wakeman. Price 10 cents.

"Institutional Marriage." A lecture before the Society of Anthropology, Chicago, by M. Harman. Price 10 cents.

"Marred in the Making," by Lydia Kingsmill Commander. Price 25 cents.

"What the Young Need to Know," by Edwin C. Walker. Price 15 cents.

"Evolution of Modesty," by Jonathan Mayo Crane. Price 5 cents.

Dr. Alice B. Stockham's "Karezza." Price \$1.

George N. Miller's "Strike of Sex." Price 25 cents.

"Religion and Sensualism, as Connected by Clergymen," by Theodore Schroeder. Price 10 cents.

"Age of Reason," by Thomas Paine. Paper cover; good paper and type. Price 15 cents.

"Diana," by Henry M. Parkhurst. Price 25 cents.

"The Old God and the New Humanity," by Winwood Reade. Price 10 cents.

"Vital Force," by Albert Chavaunnes. Price 25 cents.

"Marriage and Divorce," by Josephine K. Henry. Price 25 cents.

"Temperance Folly," by Lois Waisbrooker. Price 10 cents.

"Evolution of the Family," by Jonathan Mayo Crane. Price 10 cents.

"The Bright Side of Kissing, and the Dark Side," by E. B. Foote, Jr., M. D. Price 20 cents.

"A Freeman's Creed," by M. Harman. Price 5 cents.

"Judgment," by Wm. Platt. Price 10 cents.

"Freedom of the Press and Obscene Literature," by Theodore Schroeder. Price 25 cents.

"Mother Soul," by Laura Smith Wood. Price 25 cents.

"Our Despotical Postal Censorship," by Louis F. Post. Price 3 cents.

"Social Question," a Discussion of the Conjugal and Martial Relations, by Dr. Juliet H. Severance and David Jones, editor of the "Olive Branch." Price 15 cents.

"Studies in Sociology," by Albert Chavaunnes. Price 25 cents.

"Modern Paradise," by Henry Olerich. Price 50 cents.

"Varieties of Official Modesty," by Theodore Schroeder. Price 10 cents.

"A Tale of the Strassburg Geese," by R. B. Kerr. Price 10 cents.

"The New Hedonism," by Grant Allen. Price 10 cents.

"Vice, Its Friends and Its Foes," by Edwin C. Walker. Price 15 cents.

"Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses," by Edwin C. Walker. Price 15c.

"Do You Want FreeSpeech," by James F. Morton. Price 10 cents.

"The Rights of Periodicals," by James F. Morton. Price 10 cents.

"Communism and Conscience," by Edwin C. Walker. Price 25 cents.

"Import and Ultimate of Our Sex Natures," Edward Cowles. Price 5 cents.

"Who Is the Enemy, Comstock or You?" by Edwin C. Walker. Price 20c.

History of Religions, by Elizabeth Evans, Price 50c.

Ancient Sex Worship, Price 50c.

Love Ventures of Tom, Dick and Harry. "They were naked but not ashamed." An Amusing Satire upon Conventional Morality and Popular Forms of Government, Price 25c.

Endowment of Motherhood, by Dr. Eder, Price 25c.

"Government Analyzed," by Col. John R. Kelso, A. M., the famous "Union Scout." 519 pages. Well bound in cloth. Price \$1.00. A very timely book, now that the foundations of human governments are challenged on every hand.

"Free Land—A Social Anticipation," by Dr. Theodor Hertzka, the noted Austrian social philosopher. Translated by Arthur Ransom. Equatorial Africa is the scene of Dr. Hertzka's very interesting experiment. Price \$1.00. Well bound in cloth. Paper cover, 50c. 443 pages.

"Jaennette, the Reclaimed Delilah, a Thrilling Story of Abandoned Life," by "A Man of the World." Price 15 cents.

"Government as it Was, Is and Should Be," by M. Harman, together with Eugenist Essays by Lizzie M. Holmes, Moses Hull, M. Florence Johnson, Lucy N. Colman, Albert Chavannes and others. Price 25 cents.

"Life, Health and Longevity," by M. Harman; also, "The Curse of Mortality," by Henry Fevre, and "How to Escape the Curse," by Jonathan Mayo Crane; also, "True and False Morality," by L. C. James; also, "Can Marriage Be Abolished," by Albert Chavannes, and other essays. Price 25 cents.

"Conventional Marriage—Why I Oppose It." Some personal observations and experiences in the life of M. Harman. Price 5 cents.

"Human Right," by J. Madison Hook, with introduction by Edwin C. Walker. Price 5 cents.

"Religion and Rationalism," the relation of each to human liberty, by Edwin C. Walker. Price 5 cents.

Bound volumes of EUGENICS, Vols. I and II will be sent, while they last, for \$2 per volume.

GREATEST DETECTIVE STORY EVER WRITTEN.

"The Pinkerton Labor Spy," by Morris Friedman. The greatest expose of the Pinkerton Detective Agency ever written, showing up all the secrets of this great detective agency. Tells exactly how they do it. 75,000 copies sold first six months. This concerns you! Perhaps there is one of the agents of this mighty monster dogging your footsteps today. Get a copy at once. It will surprise you. The author was for years the confidential man in the Pinkerton Agency and has exposed in this book their innermost secrets. The greatest detective story ever written. Send 25 cents for a copy.

WILSHIRE BOOK COMPANY,

Room 204, 18 Frankfort Street, New York.

Another Woman Hung

On her husband's neck until he promised to buy her a little home from A. E. CLARK where five acres of oranges and figs will sustain a family.

Where those who embrace this opportunity will sit in the shade of their own vine and fig tree.

A. E. CLARK

1214 Walker Ave., Houston, Texas.

FOR SALE—A Library on Sex. 45 different publications, at a bargain. List of same sent on application. ✻ H. W. Boozer, 412 S. Division St., Grand Rapids, Mich.

TO-MORROW MAGAZINE

Stands for Rationalism in Dress, Diet, Education, Sex Matters, and in all the activities and relations of life.

Is bound to no creed or superstition. Is fearless in its expose of what Catholicism means. Stands for the Taxation of Church Property.

Send 10 cents for sample copy and special book offer. \$1 a year.

**TO-MORROW MAGAZINE,
139 East 56th St., Chicago, Ill.**

DO YOU RIDE

In the ox-cart of our grandfathers, or are you traveling.

IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY LIMITED?

Are you glued to antiquated theories, born of ignorance and in darkness, or is your mind open to the sunlight of reason?

Purchase a ticket over a well-ballasted, rational route, via A Stuffed Club, a magazine that teaches you how to LIVE, through common sense.

Sample copies, 10 cents. One dollar per year.

**Address, A STUFFED CLUB,
Box 375, Denver, Colo.**

THE STELLAR RAY

Is a practical New Thought Journal, so practical that it deals with INDIVIDUAL adaptation, INDIVIDUAL problems and the success of INDIVIDUAL lives, thus meeting a great need and helping every intelligent reader to obtain and maintain good health and success in life.

A sample copy will be sent upon request. Subscription price, \$1.00 per year in United States. Hodges Building, Detroit, Mich.

TELEPHONE CENTRAL 1475.

Morris Lychenheim, D. O. OSTEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN

**SUITE 102 THE MENTOR BUILDING,
161-163 STATE ST., CORNER MONROE,
CHICAGO.**

Residence: 446 Kenilworth av., Rogers Park, Chicago. Residence phone: Rogers Park 4341.

CORRESPONDENCE INVITED. Sanitarium facilities for those coming from a distance.

SEXUAL LIFE.

Issued monthly; each number consists of an essay of 1500 words. Topics of recent and forthcoming numbers: Race Suicide a Crime and Monogamy its Principal Cause; The God Idea as a Governor of Sexual Passion; The Invalid Wife a Cause of the Social Evil; Progress Demands Limited Intermarriage of Races; The Social Evil as a Business and the Reasons for its Being; The Necessities of Censorship and of Free Inquiry; Free Love is Social Suicide; etc., etc. Two numbers of our selection sent free upon request; four for ten cents; one year thirty cents, U. S. postage stamps.

Sexual Life, Tula de los Tuxtlas, Ver., Mexico.

HOW TO HAVE PRIZE BABIES.

A SHORT TALK TO SENSIBLE PEOPLE, ADULTS OF BOTH SEXES.

Some folks do not favor plain talk; they would prudishly prefer our headline to read: "How to Be Prudent Parents and Produce Praise-worthy Progeny."

Herbert Spencer wrote: "For the due discharge of parental functions, the proper guidance is to be found in science."

Amen, say we; just so; that's it; and after learning how to live right for your own sake, nothing can be more important than knowing how "to have and to hold" prize babies.

If "race suicide" is deplorable, then race improvement (stirpiculture, or scientific propagation) is very desirable, and, in short, plain talk, that simply means knowing how to mate and breed.

To wed or not to wed—when and whom to wed,—these are questions that most normal men and women must decide some time.

To breed or not to breed—who may and who ought not to—are some more questions that occur to thoughtful persons with due sense of responsibility for their acts.

Reckless, thoughtless, and ignorant people are overtaxing all public institutions with foundlings, feeble-minded, crippled, and incorrigible children.

To ruin yourself by ignorant misuse of mind or body, and have "hell to pay," is sorrowful enough, but

To pass on your blights, defects and diseases to innocent babes becomes a crime grievous in proportion as we come to know better.

At marriage ceremonies we are generally reminded that "marriage is ordained of God," and scripture teaches that "male and female created He them."

Then true reverence for Divine wisdom requires us to study the natural relations of the sexes, and learn all we can of harmonious marriage and wise parentage.

Newspapers are overloaded with sickening details of mismated couples, marital murder trials, divorce suits, deserted infants, and no end of the mutual miseries of marriage.

"Is marriage a failure?" is becoming a general cry, since many fools rush in where wise ones fear to tread.

Ella Wheeler Wilcox, in the *New York Journal*, rightly says: "Who is to blame but the fathers and mothers of both bride and groom? *It is upon the fathers and mothers of the land that nine-tenths of the blame for all unhappy marriages of the world rests. It is the ridiculous false modesty of parents and their shameful indifference to a subject which is the root of all existence.*"

An editorial in the *Minneapolis Tribune*, a conservative daily, well says: "After all, we are not very wise in dealing with obscure but vital questions that underlie the very foundations of civilized society. . . . We pour out money like water to endow colleges to teach everything, from Sanscrit to making mud pies, excepting the laws and conditions of that on which the vitality and perpetuity of the race depends. *We teach sons and daughters everything on earth except how to be fathers and mothers.*"

Parents should read up and do their duty, and when they fail, young folks should instruct themselves by the aid of good books. Therefore we say to them: "Look before you leap," be careful, go slow, study up, and prepare for the most important steps in life!

Those who agree with us so far will be glad to learn further of a book which essays to cover all these points, and which has been happily named Dr. Foote's "**HOME CYCLOPEDIA of Popular Medical, Social, and Sexual Science**"—largely devoted to the consideration of **Love, Marriage, and Parentage**, and all most pressing problems of family life. This is **THE BOOK** for every one who is married or expects to be. About half of it is "plain home talk" about the sexual relations, marriage, its history in all countries, curious varieties and experiments, mistakes, reforms and possible improvements. All who hesitate to consult home physicians about delicate questions will find them plainly answered in this great work of 1,200 pages, by an authority of fifty years' experience. By mail to any address for only \$2.00.

This 50 Cents to
Coupon the
Is Worth Buyer of
DR. FOOTE'S
HOME CYCLOPEDIA.

● This great \$2.00 book (as large as many sold at \$5.00) sent on receipt of \$1.50 with this coupon; "money back" if not suited.

MURRAY HILL PUBLISHING CO.

129 East 28th St., New York.