

# EUGENICS



Vol. III, Nos. 3-4

MAY-JUNE, 1909

Whole Nos. 1114-15

Truth for Authority not Authority for Truth.

---

Onward, onward, onward ever;  
Human Progress none can stay—  
He who makes the rash endeavor  
Shall like chaff be blown away.

---

The cure for the evils of Liberty is more Liberty.  
—T. B. Macaulay.

---

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

---

Sex Contains All. —Whitman.

---

EUGENICS—The Doctrine of Progress or Evolution,  
Especially in the Human Race Through Improved  
Conditions in the Relations of the Sexes.  
—Century Dictionary.

1319 Kellam Ave., Los Angeles, Calif., U. S. A.

M. HARMAN, Editor and Publisher

New York Agent: E. C. Walker, 244 W. 143d St.

## REMOVAL

Our friends and subscribers everywhere will please take notice that the Office of EUGENICS is now at 1319 Kellam Avenue—a ten-minute ride on Angeleno Heights car, from First and Broadway—one of the most beautiful and healthful locations in Los Angeles. Be sure to call when in the city.

---

## Contents of This Number

### EDITORIAL

**Spirit of Revolt; Why the Ballot Fails.**  
**Crimes and Criminals; Food, Land, Labor, Etc.**  
**Hill-Top Greetings: A Heart to Heart Talk.**  
**Health and Sanity Versus Clothes.**  
**Case of Anna Poltera—Latent Savagery.**  
**Imagination as Factor in Crime.**  
**Our Free Platform.**  
**What Motherhood in Freedom Means.**  
**R. B. Kerr and his Critics.**  
**Foundations of Society.**  
**A Word to Subscribers.**  
**A Movement That May Move.**  
**Short Lesson for Mothers.**  
**The Freeman Knowles Case.**  
**Sustaining Fund.**  
**Books Received.**

### CONTRIBUTED

**Welcome to Mrs. Pethick Laurence.—La Reine Baker.**  
**Unitary Home Ideal.—B. F. Richards.**  
**Healthfulness of Variety.—R. B. Kerr.**  
**Would Undermine the Foundations of Society.—F. A. Binney.**  
**One of Society's Mistakes.—Grace Potter.**  
**Lesson of Double Rose.—Lucien V. Pinney.**  
**Various Voices.**

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

SUCCESSOR TO LUCIFER THE LIGHT-BEARER

Published Bi-Monthly at 1219 Kellam Ave., Los Angeles, Cal.

Subscription Rates—One Year, \$1.00.

15 Cents a Copy.

M. HARMAN, Editor and Publisher

---

Vol. III Nos. 3-4

MAY-JUNE, 1909

Whole Nos. 1114-15

---

## BRIEF MENTION

### Spirit of Revolt

That the spirit of revolt is abroad in the world is evinced by more than one of the contributed articles in this issue of EUGENICS. Prominent among these is the letter of LaReine Baker entitled, "Welcome to Mrs. Pethick Laurence," on her release from Holloway Jail, London. Mrs. Baker was a delegate from Washington state to the international convention of Suffragists held in London in May of this year. When women, the mothers of the race, are willing to go to prison in defense of their equal right to the political franchise, it means that womanhood is waking up from its ages-old slumber. It means also that the children born of such mothers will never be the willing slaves of the owners of privilege, holders of "vested rights" that rob the masses of mankind by denying to them their equal right to Mother Nature's bounties.

\* \* \*

### Why the ballot fails

Right here we see the reason why the political franchise has hitherto proved a broken reed—why it has failed to bring liberty and justice to the masses. Simply because the majority of men have been born **leaners** instead of **lifters**. Simply because they were born without the desire and without the power of being **self-owning**, self-reliant, self-directing individuals. "Like mother like son," is far more true than "like father like son." But now that woman is heeding the old-time maxim, "He that would be free, himself must strike the blow," to break the fetter, we may reasonably expect the ballot to become a weapon in defense of equity in human affairs instead of a means of enslavement, as in all the past.

\* \* \*

### Crimes and Criminals

Another form of revolt is that against the worse than brutal treatment of helpless prisoners in jails and penitentiaries, and against legalized murder, known as the "death-penalty." Read

the article "A Movement that May Move," a movement headed by an "ex-convict," Col. Griffith J. Griffith, whose address on "Prison Reform" on the evening of June 13, before the Liberal Club of this city, was listened to with profound attention by a large audience of intelligent women and men, most of whom have signed a remonstrance against the present barbarous and revengeful methods of treating prisoners, whether guilty of crime or innocent of crime.

\* \* \*

### Food, land, labor, health and ethics

One of the compensations of the rapid increase in the cost of living, will probably be to drive people away from the cities, and to cause a universal revolt against the laws that make our common heritage—the land, the soil,—an article of speculative profit, an object of mercenary graft and greed. As a starter in the direction of reclaiming our lost inheritance in the land I earnestly ask careful reading of the series of articles on the "Unitary Home" by B. F. Richards of Carmel, California. The success of this proposed experiment would go far toward solving the labor problem, also the health-of-body-and-sanity-of-mind problem, and above all and beyond all it would solve the ethics-of-sex problem in the only practicable way. Please read the article entitled the "Unitary Home Ideal" in this issue of EUGENICS. Mr. Richards is having leaflets and circulars printed giving full description of his plans.

---

### HILL-TOP GREETINGS

---

#### A Heart to Heart Talk By the Editor of Eugenics to His Readers and Patrons—Not His Flock!

Once more the tide of time, the rolling year, has brought us to the milestone called the "Summer Solstice"—the Summer **Sun-Stand**—so named by people living in, or on, the northern hemisphere of the earth's surface—which term "sun-stand," as we all know, is a misnomer, a mere figure of speech, like unto the terms "sunset," "sunset," "new moon," "old moon," etc. The sun never stands; the sun never halts a moment in its onward course through the skies, that is, through the apparently limitless realms of space; but whence coming and whither going, when and where this solar journey began and when and where it will end, or will it ever end, are questions of which we know nothing, absolutely nothing!

The latest guess at the present age of our nearest sun that I have seen, is one hundred and fifteen million years, based on observations made by means of **radium**. All these millions of years, years measured by the earth's annual revolution round its parent, this parent is supposed to have been traveling in an orbit of its own, round a

grandparent sun, by some astronomers supposed to be the star called **Alcyone**, one of the cluster known as the **Pleiades**, or "seven stars," Then the question naturally arises, "How old is our sun in years, measured by its own revolutions round its **parent, Alcyone?**" Then again, the question would very naturally follow, "How old is Alcyone as measured by **her** revolutions round her supposed parent, the earth's great-grandmother sun?" And so on, and on, and on to infinity!

Such questions as these, such speculative problems, are of course idle and futile, quite as much so as is the search for the ultimate limit of nature in the other direction, that is, the search to find the ultimate "atom"—the **ion**, I think they call it now—matter so small that it cannot be divided again; which search is typified by the doggerel verse about the **fleas**:

"The larger fleas have little fleas upon their backs to bite em;  
And little fleas have lesser fleas, and so **ad infinitum.**"

Such speculations would seem a sinful or criminal waste of time and energy while so many other problems much nearer home remain unsolved, unanswered, and apparently unanswerable, and yet problems of such vital and imminent importance that, like the famous "Riddle of the Sphynx," if we do not solve them **they will destroy us.**

Among these near-home problems may be mentioned—

The **bread** problem, the food problem, necessarily including the **land** problem, because all food for the sustenance of the body is derived from the land, the soil. Right to the soil, then, means the right to **live**. Denial of right to the soil means denial of the right to live.

Closely allied to this problem is the problem of **labor** and **capital**, that is, the question of how much of the proceeds of labor should go to him who does the work **now**, and how much to him who happens to hold the stored results of former labor, called capital, or who claims to own the raw materials upon which the laborer must work in order to produce the necessities and conveniences of life.

And very nearly allied to the foregoing is the **currency** problem, the medium of **exchange** problem, the question of how much **tribute** (interest) the workers and the holders of capital should pay to him who works not at all, except head-work to plan how he can get the most out of those who must have this medium of exchange—exchange in production and distribution of commodities—that is, of the necessities of life.

And closely connected with these two problems is the **transportation** problem—the problem of the ownership and control of the means and the business of conveying persons and products of labor, or raw materials for the use of labor, from one place to another.

And very nearly associated with all the foregoing problems is the problem of **exchange of ideas**, exchange of thoughts, opinions,

sentiments, feelings, experiences, speculations, etc., etc.—that is to say, the problem of the right to **free speech**, free assembly and free communication by written or printed words as signs of thought, and sent by public carriers, by telegraph, telephone, or by any other means provided by human ingenuity.

And very intimately connected with all these problems, including and embracing all these problems because underlying all human **existence**, is the **eugenics** problem, the problem of right bearing, or bearing sound minds in sound bodies.

There is much truth in the old-time saying,

“The life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment.”

Also in this:

“A man’s life consists not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth;” and also in this modern aphorism:

“The institutions of any people are as good and as bad as the people themselves who make, or who passively endure, those institutions.”

If these sayings be true, as I maintain they are, then the eugenics problem takes precedence in importance of all other problems. Man makes institutions, laws, customs; institutions, laws, customs do not make men, though they all **react** upon their makers; therefore it follows that if we would have better human institutions we must first have better human **beings**.

How to create better human beings then must always be the “previous question,” as the lawyers say.

\* \* \*

Looking for causes before prescribing remedies as all good physicians do, let us ask,

“What is the cause, or the causes, of the rapid increase of crime—of murder, of suicide, of poverty and of suffering generally, in a land of plenty? a land of limitless resources?”

In our search for causes, good friends, let us try the inductive rather than the deductive method of inquiry. Let us reason from facts to principles—from effects to causes, thus:

## HEALTH AND SANITY

### VERSUS CLOTHES.

A few days ago a man introducing himself as Walter P. Smith, apparently in excellent health, called at the office of **Eugenics** and bought some books.

Later, and before leaving the city, he wrote us a letter in regard to his experiences in search of health. The following paragraphs contain the main points in his story:

I went to Arizona several years ago a physical wreck—a victim of consumption. Since then I have done what is rarely done—really conquered this disease, and now will tell you how I did it. I have lived out of doors day and night, which is a pleasure in Arizona,—reducing my life to the simplest terms, discarding all superficialities civilities or of civilization, **including my clothes**, which I consider quite unnecessary for anything but cold and inclement weather. I do not believe in covering up the body as

a thing to be ashamed of. **Nature** is not ashamed, and why should we be? Then the habit of wearing clothing keeps the body tender, and sensitive to colds and other diseases. These can be avoided, and hardiness and vigor induced, by exposing the body to its natural element. You cannot realize the truth of this unless you have either lived in this manner, or have observed the deterioration in races that have always gone without clothing but have been induced or forced to adopt the garments of civilization. I have done both, and have made quite a study of the subject. For this I have had good opportunity, as my home is close to one of the Indian reservations in Southern Arizona, where the poor Indians are being "civilized" right into their graves.

WALTER P. SMITH, Phoenix, Arizona.

In a recent issue of the Los Angeles "Times Magazine," the editor of "Care of the Body," mentions the criticisms passed upon Kermit Roosevelt by the "good women of the Anti-Cigarette League," because that young "Nimrod" had carried to Africa "6,000 cigarettes, 325 pipes, and a great quantity of tobacco as presents to the dusky potentates," and added to the criticisms of the good women this comment:

"Well the cigarettes will not do the darkies much more harm than the civilized clothes which the missionaries induce them to wear. Both will gradually bring on tuberculosis."

All this is in line with the history of "civilization" in the Sandwich Islands. When the American missionaries began their work among these naked, peaceful and happy islanders, the population is believed to have been not less than 300,000; now it is about 30,000, or about one-tenth of what it was when the civilizing and Christianizing process began. When King Kalakaua, the dethroned monarch of those islands, was traveling in the United States some years ago, in answer to questions regarding his people, he is reported to have said,

"It is a curious fact that wherever the missionaries come in my country, depopulation ensues."

Just how much of this depopulation was, or is, due to the wearing of clothes in a country where clothes are an encumbrance, a worse than useless habit, shutting out the air and sunshine from one of the most vital organs, the **skin**, cannot perhaps be told with certainty; but from the testimony of Livingstone and other African travelers, there can be little doubt that much of the increased mortality, as well as much of the increased immorality and criminality observed among the natives of hot climates since their adoption of European customs, is directly due to the **change** from natural nudity to artificial covering-up of the pores of the skin.

What we call immorality and criminality are simply signs of lack of mental balance, lack of mental poise—in other words, lack of mental soundness, mental sanity, mental **health**. If going without clothes will cure tuberculosis, as in the case of Walter Smith, who says he has had no symptoms of disease for the last 18 months, and in many other like instances; if going without clothes will cure the

ills of the body, is it not reasonable to infer that it would go far towards curing the diseases of the mind?—so closely allied are mind and body.

A very large part of the insanities, the vices and crimes, in so-called civilized countries, arises from **perversion of the sex-nature**, perversion of the sexual or reproductive instinct. Mrs. French-Sheldon, author of the book, "From Sultan to Sultan," testifies that during her several months' sojourn among naked tribes of "Darkest Africa," she never once heard of a case of sexual crime, sexual abuse of sexual outrage, and her belief was that such cases did not exist among those naked tribes, any more than among wild animals.

In one of the public parks of Los Angeles a few weeks ago, Anna Poltera, a nine-year-old school girl, was assaulted, outraged and killed—her clothes literally torn from her person in the struggle that preceded the rape and the horrible mutilation of her little body. Is not this a sad commentary on our boasted civilization, with its costly schools, its Sunday schools, its churches, public libraries, daily papers, magazines, and other supposed civilizing and refining agencies, that Anna Poltera would have been incomparably more safe in the wilds of Africa than in the city of Los Angeles, one of the chief centers of learning, culture and of civilization, so-called, in the United States? The perpetrator or perpetrators of this terrible crime have not been found, but the circumstantial evidence shows that the girl, while on her way home from school about four o'clock in the afternoon, was decoyed into the high grass of a comparatively unfrequented park, and there outraged by one or more men, then killed to cover up the awful crime.

For weeks the papers of this city and state were largely filled with accounts of the "man-hunt"—the systematic search for the rapist, and with discussions as to what should be done with him when caught. Large rewards were offered and are still offered for the arrest and conviction of the criminal or criminals.

The Goldfield (Nevada) "Tribune," in a leaded editorial of May 28, said that "if the citizens of Los Angeles have any red blood in their veins, they will set their face sternly against the movement"

**LATENT SAVAGERY.** (of the prison reform league for the abolition of capital punishment and other radical reforms), adding, "The latent savagery of man is roused by the contemplation of such perfidy, and one naturally halts to think of a punishment commensurate with the crime."

But is it not the testimony of all human history that cruel and vindictive punishments do not prevent crimes, but rather produce the opposite effect?

Does the hanging and burning of negro rapists in the South put an end to assaults upon white women by negroes?

And why draw the "color line" in this matter of rape? A few years ago five or six white men caught a white girl in the suburbs of Newport, Ky., held her a prisoner several hours, during which time they all by turns satisfied their sex appetite upon her defenseless body, then left her in a dying condition, apparently. These men were afterwards arrested and tried—some of them confessing their guilt and informing on the others. Two or three were hanged, the rest sentenced to life-imprisonment.

Have there been no assaults upon white girls and women by white men since this wholesale hanging for rape?

**WHO ARE THE SAVAGES.** In the light of such testimony as that of Mrs. French-Sheldon and of the other observers of sex morals among naked tribes, white and black, brown and red, is it not pertinent to ask, **who are the real savages**, the uncivilized and unclothed tribes of men, or the half-civilized and clothed negroes and white men of the United States?

The rapist, whether white or black, whether married to the woman he abuses sexually or not married to her, is simply **insane**, **sexually** insane, but what is the **cause** of his insanity?

After making all due allowance for bad habits of eating, drinking, reading dime novels, etc., etc., is not the inference legitimate that the wearing of clothes is a chief, if not **the** chief, cause of sexual insanity, of sexual outrages, of sexual excesses both within and without the marriage pale?

By the abnormal heat promoted and confined by clothing around the genitals—more clothing being worn over this part of the body and more continuously worn there, than upon any other part (then consider the **chafing** caused by the pressure of this clothing upon the sensitive reproductive organs whenever there is motion of the body), what wonder that abnormal sexual desires should torment the youth or sensuous adult man, and impel him to seek relief in the only way that suggests itself to his untutored or wrongly educated mind?

**IMAGINATION AS FACTOR IN IMMORALITY AND CRIME.** But after all is said, perhaps the most compelling cause of sex perversion, of sex insanity, and of crimes against womanhood, is the power of **imagination**, the power of untrained, ignorant or falsely instructed imagination; and for this evil the hiding of the body from sight by the wearing of clothes, and the taboo against talking about

or even thinking about sex, is chiefly to blame.

**Mystery** and **prohibition** are the soil in which a perverted imagination grows, thrives and prepares for its deadly work.

If parents and teachers would freely tell to children and pupils all that is known in regard to sex; if girls were told from infancy onward that a tremendous responsibility rests upon them as creators of a new race; told that every girl enshrines in her body the creatory in which is to be moulded a new human being, and that she herself will be held responsible for the right preparation of her body for the work of creation; if boys were early instructed in regard to their part of the responsibility in creating new human beings, and told of the dangers of sex abuse, dangers of waste and perversion of their own sex powers and life forces; and above all and beyond all, if every boy were taught to respect, to honor and reverence, the sex-hood of girls and women to such extent that he would **rather die than profane** the sexhood of woman, or selfishly seek a passing gratification by forcing, or overpersuading, a girl or woman to satisfy his sex-appetite,—if such teachings were made a leading part in home and school instruction of the young, in the family, the kindergarten, the Sunday school, the common school, the high school, the college and university, also in the clubs, the secret lodges, etc., etc.; and with all this, if everybody were to cease speaking of sex as something so vile, so unclean, so base and debasing that the less said and the less thought about it the better; then, in the course of a generation or two we might reasonably expect an end to rapes, and murders growing out of rapes, whether in wedlock or outside of wedlock.

Then we might reasonably expect a race of human beings so well born that they would need neither priests nor governors, neither lawyers nor physicians, neither penitentiaries for the criminal nor asylums for the insane or the feeble-minded.

\* \* \*

The little story printed in last *Eugenics*, entitled, "Why Was It Wrong?" conveys a most useful lesson. If all children were like this girl and boy—innocent of the idea that there can be any wrong in the naked human body, there would be fewer insanities, rapes and murders such as the Anna Poltera case, and the Newport (Ky.) case, than now.

**OUR FREE PLATFORM.** That each subscriber and supporter of *Eugenics* should have a fair share of the space therein, is the earnest desire of him who occupies the position of conductor, moderator, or chairman. While it is not possible to print more than a fraction of the matter sent us, the effort is made to print **representative** letters and articles, so that the readers can see what the general trend of sentiment is on subjects of common interest. Just now the two subjects that seem most to divide our readers, are the "Unitary Home," as championed by B. F. Richards, and "Variety in Love," or as sometimes called, "Inclusive Love," as distinguished from the popular Exclusive, Monogamic code—which discussion is led by Robert B. Kerr.

Inasmuch as Mr. Kerr is the beginner of, and the leader in, this latter controversy, I have given to him more space than to any other who has taken part therein. It has been charged that I have shown partiality because giving no space for reply to the first two installments of the Kerr series; the fact being that, until quite lately, no one has seemed willing to measure swords with the man who appears to have a never-failing reservoir of facts and arguments at his command, drawn alike from history and from current literature, as well as from personal observation. Now there is no lack of defenders of the monogamic side, entirely too many to be heard in one issue of the magazine.

Preferring not to enter the lists as a disputant for either side in this controversy, I will venture a few reflections upon some of the leading features of the case, as I see them.

First, let me say that no discussion can possibly be more pertinent to the main object of our magazine, than is this problem of the right relation of the sexes. This accords with the definition of eugenics as given by the "Century Dictionary," namely, the doctrine of progress, especially in the human race, through improved conditions in the relations of the sexes." It is a hopeful sign when professors in colleges and universities, as well as some writers for popular magazines, boldly challenge the divinity of the church-state standards of morality in the conjugal relations and home life of the human animal, the talking animal, and compare these standards with the teachings of Nature as shown in the lives of our near kindred, the so-called dumb animals, the quadrupeds and birds in a wild state. Hence also, we need not be surprised to find everywhere the editors of popular magazines, and of daily papers, with one accord denouncing this revolt against old-time standards of sex-morality.

And why should these editors denounce this revolt?

Looking for causes the answer is plain enough. These daily papers and large magazines are published for profit—for money. They know where the bulk of their profits come from. They know that their best customers are the men and women who uphold the present popular standards of sex-morality.

And why should the men of money uphold old-time standards of morals in sex-life and in the home?

Simply because these leaders of modern society know that the overthrow of the conventional ideas of purity, of chastity and of virtue in sex-life, and in the home life, would soon put an end to their own vested privileges, would soon put an end to their power over the multitude of wage-earners, the exploited human "mudsills."

They know full well that freedom in love-relation, freedom of motherhood, freedom of woman to choose the father of her child—not once only in her life but at all times, would result in children so well born, children so strong, so brave and so self-reliant that the

present system of land-monopoly, of tariff-robbery, of gold-standard-restricted-and-banker-owned currency, of speculative gambling in the commonest necessities of life, of speculation gambling in railway stocks by which it is possible for a very few men to own and control all the railways in the country—they know full well that when the free sons of free mothers come upon the stage of action, then the owners of such privileges will **own them no longer.**

Is not all this reason enough for the present attitude of the popular editor and publisher in regard to the growing revolt against the priest-made and capitalistic standards of sex morality?

Before giving a few quotations from leading editors of popular journals, let me tell you, good friends, in a realistic way, what is here meant by Motherhood in Freedom.

**WHAT MOTHERHOOD IN FREEDOM MEANS.** A few years ago one of the oldest, most faithful and most generously helpful of all the patrons of "Lucifer, the Light-Bearer," related to me the following story of personal experience:

"I married early in life, a young man near my own age. We were thrown much together by working in the same shop—a large tailor shop. We were mutually attracted by congeniality of thought and sentiment on most subjects; attended the same lectures, read the same books, and took much pleasure in each other's company; and thus it was not long before my young friend proposed marriage. I told him I liked him well as a friend and comrade, but that the thought of any nearer relationship had never entered my head. He was persistent, however, and finally I allowed myself to be over-persuaded; we married. The union was fairly successful in every way except one—the most important of all, namely, offspring. Four children were born, all dying in infancy—apparently for lack of vitality—except one, the eldest, a girl. Too frail in health and strength for the battle of life, but very intellectual, very beautiful, very dutiful and good. When of marriageable age she asked my advice. Said she:

"Of all my suitors I am attracted to but two, and for very different reasons. Herbert is a genius, as you know,—has wonderful powers as a speaker and writer, but otherwise has little to recommend him. Ralph, on the contrary, is mediocre in intellect but whenever he comes into the room, I feel drawn to him in a way I do not understand. An almost irresistible impulse seizes me to get near him, to fondle and caress him. When Herbert calls to see me, I seem lifted out of myself, intellectually and psychically. His conversation is so grand, his sentiments so noble, so refined and spiritual; but when on parting he tries to kiss me, I push him away. I neither want to caress him or be caressed by him. Now, what shall I do? Both seem necessary to my happiness, but I can not marry them both."

In reply I said: "If you have any regard for the welfare of your prospective children, never marry a man to whom you are drawn on the intellectual plane only. I say this because of my own experience and observation. There must be a powerful physical attraction or passion if you want your and his children to live and be a blessing to themselves and to others."

"My daughter took my advice—married the man of mediocre intellect, but who was a splendid specimen of manhood on the physical side. She lived a year and died in childbirth, because she had not enough of the physical to stand the ordeal of maternity. The child lived; I raised him, and he is a strong and successful man today."

\* \* \*

Now, as I see it, this beautiful and good young woman died—I saw her picture; too frail, too refined and spiritual for this world—died prematurely because of **two** things; first, lack of proper physical endowment, and second, lack of intellectual and spiritual companionship. Died of a broken heart, so to speak. Her husband was well fitted to be the physical father of her child, but utterly unsuited for life-long companionship with a woman such as he married.

Do I need to follow the moral of this little story? Some years ago I wrote a booklet entitled, "Motherhood in Freedom," in which the central thought is that most men are fragmentary specimens of the genus homo, and that woman, as builder of the new race, needs the companionship of more than one man—needs the aid of many men, in fact—not sex-companionship, but comradeship such as will enable her to weave into the warp and woof of her coming child the best that there is in many men.

This is the Oneida Community idea. It is not practicable under the monogamic system of mating and living in pairs, but would be quite practicable in the "Unitary Home," such as that advocated by B. F. Richards and others.

Mrs. W. S. S., in this issue of **Eugenics**, longs for "some healing talks" from the pen of Alice B. Stockham. The books of Dr. Stockham abound with the Oneida teachings. She is now living with people brought up in that community, and has promised to write an article for **Eugenics**, giving the history of that wonderful experiment in home-building for all-round success, financial, educational, social, and especially for eugenic, or child-building, success.

## A FEW THOUGHTS

### ON R. B. KERR

### AND HIS CRITICS.

I cannot quite agree with the writer of the series of articles entitled, "A Plea for Variety in Love," in his dogmatic and sweeping assertion that "the fundamental principle of eugenics is the abolition of monogamy," and when he says, "Anybody who talks about monogamous eugenics is simply a quack

and a humbug of the very worst kind"—see page 247 of the January-February number.

Brother Kerr is doubtless **honest** as well as **earnest** in opposing monogamy; why cannot he accord the same mental qualities to those who **defend** monogamy? Dogmatism and intolerance are not characteristic of the philosophic spirit. In his earlier years Dr. Benjamin Franklin was very positive and often dogmatic in argument, but in his riper years he would modestly say, "Such and such appears to me to be the truth of the matter under discussion—tomorrow I may think differently."

I fully agree when Kerr says "the woman of the future will select superior men for fathers," but this does not mean necessarily that the woman of the future will select a **different** man for the father of **each** of her children. In this issue will be found a very interesting letter from Mrs. W. S. S., a young married woman who, while apparently defending monogamy, says:

"If I did not care to continue the present relationship longer, I'd divorce somehow; or if impossible (to divorce), I'd do as I pleased, anyway."

This is not by any means the old idea of monogamy, which is understood to mean the exclusive union, and for life, of one woman with one man, whether the arrangement proves happy to both or not. So long as her husband fully satisfies Mrs. W. S. S., she can rightfully call her union with him a monogamous one; it is **voluntary** monogamy, a very different thing from **marriage**, which means compulsory, or law-enforced sex union.

Brother Kerr believes in nature, and knows that many species of birds and some kinds of quadrupeds are monogamous in their sexual habits. It is believed that the human species is the epitome, or outcome, of all other animated beings. If so, then we should expect some women and men to be monogamous by hereditary inclination. To compel voluntary monogamists to be **involuntary** "varietists" would not be in accord with the basic principles of Liberty and Justice, of which principles I have always understood friend Kerr to be a strenuous defender.

**Liberty** to choose and to refuse is the central thought in eugenics as I understand the term, and if Liberty, coupled with a Normal Sense of Responsibility should lead to **monogamy**, then monogamy let it be. If Liberty with an enlightened sense of responsibility should lead to **varietism**, then let it be varietism. As Saul of Tarsus said of observing holy days, "Let each be fully persuaded in his own mind," and as Herbert Spencer said, "Each has the right to do as he pleases so long as he does not invade the equal rights of others."

Just here I want to say that I feel a diffidence in commenting upon Mr. Kerr and upon his critics because of uncertainty as to what they mean by the terms used by them. In what I myself say I wish it clearly understood always that when speaking of freedom in love I

mean **all** forms of **voluntary** love relationships, whether monogamous, polygamous, polyandrous, varietist, or even **promiscuous**. A noted woman lecturer was asked by a man in the audience at one of her meetings:

"Am I to understand, madame lecturer, that you advocate **promiscuity**?"

"Yes, certainly," was the prompt reply. "If you, for instance, desire promiscuous sex relationships, and if you can find women who voluntarily meet you on that plane, I should certainly not favor a law that would prohibit you and them from so living. I would say, 'live your promiscuous life, by all means, until experience shows you the folly of such conduct.' Experience teaches a dear school, saith the proverb, but fools will learn in no other way. We are all fools at some time in our lives. Some learn wisdom in that school; some are willing to learn by the experience of others, and of some it may truthfully be said, 'Though brayed in a mortar yet will they not be wise.'"

I agree with this woman lecturer.

In his next utterance on "Varietism," I will thank Mr. Kerr to explain whether by the term "love" he means simply the physical manifestation of the sex appetite, or does he include what is known as psychic or **soul** love, which is supposed to exist quite independently of physical desire, and which is often repelled or even destroyed by such manifestation, or expression.

I will also ask Brother Binney if there is any infallible test by which people can tell when they have found their "soul-mate," or would he advise a series of "trial marriages" to find out. Our friend is certainly not ignorant of the fact that two people may satisfy each other perfectly for months, or even years, and then gradually grow apart without any fault of either partner. He is also physiologist enough to know that temperaments change, **auras** change, so that what was once heaven becomes hell to one or both the partners to the intimate association called marriage. Would he demand in such cases that there should be no opportunity for readjustment of conjugal relations?

**WOULD "UNDERMINE THE FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIETY."** Brother Binney is doubtless quite as honest and earnest in his opposition to "varietism" as Brother Kerr in his opposition to monogamy. Both are prone to make extreme statements, as

when Friend Binney says "Kerr's article is based on a fallacy and is entirely untrue," and as when he says:

"If **Eugenics** were read and its teachings endorsed in all the colleges of America," etc., (see his reply in this issue), "it would undermine the foundations of society."

Mr. Kerr would probably rejoin: "True, O King!"

Yea, verily, Friend B., I, too, would say, you are eminently in the right, for once, at least, if not always right. Let us consider a moment these two questions, What is "society" today, and what are its "foundations?" We have only to look about us, walk through the slums of the city, visit the houses of the poor, and read the daily papers, to find out that human society is an aggregation consisting of two classes, namely, the exploiters and the exploited; the idle and wastefully extravagant rich, and the overworked, the underpaid, the underfed and badly housed poor; the privileged and arrogant monopolists and the unprivileged, the robbed, the enslaved and the meekly submissive masses.

Then as to "foundations." As some of us see it, the chief foundation-stone of all these iniquities (inequities) is the denial of freedom to womanhood and motherhood in the realm of sex and reproduction, the enslavement of the race-builders in the exercise of their creative powers and functions; the control of womanhood and motherhood by church-made and lawyer-made laws in regard to "legitimacy" and "illegitimacy," "bastardy," "purity," "chastity," "womanly virtue," etc., etc.

Let anyone read the long article, finished in this number, entitled "Desirable Husbands," by Mabel Herbert Urner, and if he does not sympathize with the author thereof when she exclaims,

"God! what a horrible thing it is to be a woman!"

and if he (or she) does not inwardly curse the laws and customs that compel woman to be a deceiver, to be untrue to herself, untrue to her children if she should become a mother (because of the power of prenatal impression), and thereby also be untrue to the community of which she is a part, cursing such community by giving birth to inferior human stock—in many cases breeding foredoomed criminals, mental or physical dwarfs, imbeciles, or at best bringing into the world those who must compete for a living in the already overstocked labor-market, and who will probably join the army of "scabs" (willing slaves) because, through inheritance, they lack the courage to stand up for their rights as citizens of the world, and thus help to bring on labor-wars, making perpetual the reign of the heartless monopolistic employer of labor—if, I repeat, such reader does not inwardly curse such man-made laws and customs, then he (or she) is lacking in human sympathy, else I am off my mental balance.

Please read the "Short Lesson for Mothers" in this issue, which lesson is part of an article that has been long waiting for insertion; read also, as very pertinent to the question of basic "foundations," the article entitled, "Testimony of the Double Rose," by L. V. Pinney, and also "One of Society's Mistakes," by Grace Potter.

But taking Brother Binney's words as he evidently intended them to be taken, let us ask, is it probable that "Variety in Love," (which is one of the forms of liberty in love) would have the effect that he fears? I well remember being asked by the defenders of

chattel slavery. "Do you want your daughter to marry a nigger?" Chattel slavery was abolished, but mixing of the races instead of becoming universal, is much less frequent now than under the old regime. For like reasons, would not licentious indulgence and misdirection of the sex-passion be **less** under sex freedom, than now, under sex-slavery? I remember also, that, while a member of the sect called "Universalists," an orthodox Christian said to me something like this:

"Why, Mr. Harman, if I believed, as you do, that there is no hell in the next world, I'd **just turn myself loose** and have a 'high old time'! I'd pay no regard to laws of God or man. I'd cheat, steal, rob, or even murder when it suited my own interest,—just so long as I could do so and escape the sheriff or hangman."

The reply was, "Well, so long as you are that sort of man, perhaps it is best that you stick to the doctrine of hell in the next world. The time will probably come when you will wonder that you ever believed in a God who needed a hell to keep his children from robbing and murdering each other. Then you will cease to need the doctrine of hell to compel you to be an honest and humane man."

And just so in the realm of sex-morality. The self-respecting, self-reliant man or woman needs not the terrors of law or religion to keep him or her moral; and this I say as an advocate of liberty in love, not as a "varietist" or monogamist.

Much more I would like to say on this head, but will advert in this place to the criticism against the Hedonistic doctrine that pleasure is the best promoter of morality—"Be happy and you will be good," is the Hedonist motto. Reference to the vice known as homosexuality—Oscar Wilde case—is a tremendous argument in favor of liberty in love, which principle must include "variety in love" as well as monogamy, polygamy, etc., etc. If woman had been sexually free in Greece, the terrible indictment against Socrates and other eminent philosophers, for unnatural vice, would most probably never have been heard of; nor would our modern colleges have been disgraced by the prevalence of this vice among the students, as now, if the priest and civil ruler had not, for selfish reasons, inculcated and enforced artificial standards of morality in sex-relations.

---

**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.

### A WORD TO SUBSCRIBERS—OLD AND NEW

Please read the "Hill-Top Greeting" in this issue, then read this:

Never before in the history of **Eugenics**, or of its forerunner, "Lucifer," Son of the Morning, have so many subscribers fallen into the rear-guard as now; yet so long as they do not notify us that they no longer desire the visits of the magazine the natural inference is that they wish still to be reckoned as members of the Eugenist army of progress. Knowing something of the terrible struggle for existence that is now the lot of the unprivileged masses, consequent upon the ever increasing cost of life's prime necessities—in a land of over-production on all lines except legal tender money—no blame can attach to a large proportion of these rear-guard subscribers, and therefore we make this offer to all whose subscription expired a year or more ago, as shown by the tags on mailing wrappers:

Send us one dollar in postal order, postage stamps, bank check or "currency," and we will move up your credit to January, 1910. That is to say instead of a place on the roll of the rear-guard you will be promoted to the **van-guard** of what many people very earnestly believe to be the bravest, most logical and most truly progressive of all the armies of progressive thought, now on the planet Earth.

We promise at least a bi-monthly issue—48 pages, such as the present number—more frequently if possible, and will credit you one issue ahead for each failure to publish bi-monthly, on or near the right time.

2nd. To all subscribers whose names are in arrears **less** than one year we say:

Send us one dollar and we will credit you up to July, 1910, or one year ahead from present time,—provided, always, that you do not feel able to pay arrearage, otherwise \$1 a year.

3d. To those whose names are on the **van-guard** roll, this offer is made:

Send us the name of **one** new subscriber and fifty cents in stamps, or coin, and we will send the Bi-monthly one year (or oftener) and to any number of new subscribers you may send, **as agent**, at the same rate. Half yearly subscription at 25 cents each. **Trial** subscribers will receive **three back** numbers and a copy of "Conventional Marriage," all for 25 cents. Postage free in all these offers.

Of course it will be understood that these offers to rear-guard and **van-guard** members of the Eugenist army, are **Emergency measures**, consequent upon the "Hold-up" feats of the law-protected gamblers in **high places**, whose necessities compel them to hold up and rob women, men and children, all over the land, and drive them to starvation, to insanity or suicide.

Time and space fail to note all the very timely and very readable articles now in type for this issue some of which will certainly be side-tracked and left over by the foreman in the final make-up. In addition to these there is slated for next issue a long and exceedingly well prepared article on "Socialism and Marriage" by a prominent English Socialist, George Bedborough, also other timely and well prepared articles by well-known American writers; such as the "Curse of Christian Morality," by Lois Waisbrocker;" "The Increase of Crime," by Dr. Mary Walker;" "Is There Help for Josephine." by Professor Edgar Lucien Larkin, Astronomer at Mt. Lowe Observatory, Echo Mountain, California; and others too numerous to mention.

The fact that we can publish only once in two months is largely responsible for the failure to find room for these very excellent and very timely articles. I have taken more than my share of space perhaps in recent issues, and yet several articles of mine failed to get into print, such as A General Survey of Current Literature, Book Notices and Reviews, Chapter of my Autobiography, etc. Our many good friends are once more requested to exercise the "Grace of Patience" while waiting their turn, and meantime if they could do a little missionary work in getting new subscribers, the time would probably be hastened, when, by more frequent issues their contributions will sooner see the light of print.

M. H.

---

### Vacation Talk

If enough funds come in on time, the editor expects to make the promised trip to Seattle, and the Yukon-Alaska Fair—also to wayside cities in the interest of Eugenics and its Literature, to be gone perhaps three months. Having secured the help of a very competent person as assistant, an expert stenographer who has done most excellent work in our office for the past three months, it is confidently believed the interests of **Eugenics** will be well cared for during the editor's proposed absence, provided only that the necessary financial aid be forthcoming.

M. H.

---

"War in the Air, and Particularly How Mr. Bert Smallways Fared While It Lasted," by H. G. Wells, author of "New World for Old," etc., etc. The Macmillan Company, New York. A thrilling story by a master painter of what lies in the near future for the nations of the world, if the mad race for military supremacy is not very soon abandoned. A large book, 395 pages, finely illustrated, price \$1.50.

### A MOVEMENT THAT MAY MOVE

The Prison Reform League, started recently in Los Angeles and intended to be a national movement, seems worthy of more than a passing notice. Its statement of principles is simplicity itself, and is as follows: (1) The abolition of capital punishment, that the State may no longer swell the list of murders by becoming itself a murderer. (2) Reform of the administration of criminal law, a task that the United States has not undertaken since it became a nation. (3) Restraint to be for the sole purpose of protecting society and reforming the offender.

We doubt if there is a single subject on which the humaner thought of the age is so much united as on the conviction that our treatment of prisoners is simply barbarous, and that the State, by taking life in cold blood, openly declares itself the apostle of violence. This being so, and understanding, as we do, that this present movement is being taken hold of with a vim; that arrangements are already under way for the opening of Chicago and Boston offices, with the purpose of starting a systematic agitation East; that special efforts are being directed toward interesting writers of all denominations, and that leagues will be formed as quickly as possible in every State, for which purpose lecturers are already in the field—these things being so, we have hopes of much good resulting. You should send to the secretary, Griffith J. Griffith, 443 South Main street, Los Angeles, for blanks, attaching your signature to the same and procuring as many others as possible. Much pressure must be brought to bear and many signatures must be obtained before the authorities can be made to pay attention.

The secretary, Col. Griffith, has been very active in this cause since his own release from San Quentin, and has written many admirable things, drawn from his own actual experiences. We like the following statement by him, which appeared recently in the daily press:

"I am not so unkind as to wish for others the experience that I myself have gone through, but as an educator it would be invaluable.

Let any man who is skeptical as to the inherent vitality of this movement see and hear what I have seen and heard and I will guarantee that his skepticism will vanish like a snowball in July.

"While I was in San Quentin half a dozen executions took place. With some forty others I was locked in the laundry, all convicts being on such occasions shut up in their cells or in the various workshops. The thud of the falling body was in each case distinctly audible, jarring the entire building. There is a silence that is far more eloquent than any speech, and in the long hush that preceded the actual deed the thought that was busy in the minds of my fellow prisoners was to be read easily on their faces.

"I can bear more direct testimony to the univereal comment

that succeeded, whenever opportunity came for discussion. It ran invariably on the strain that the State had committed another murder, with the constant corollary—"If the State may kill why not we?"

"That such sentiments—engendered, you must remember, in circumstances in which they necessarily leave the profoundest and most lasting mark—can be other than poisonous to our public thought is, to me at least, incredible.

"I may add, in connection with this entire subject of prison reform that for 14 months I slept nightly with the forty-eight others, in the room immediately above the dungeon, in which the strait-jacket and other forms of torture that are a blot on our civilization and give the lie to our professed Christianity and the Sermon on the Mount, were constantly in use. I know what I heard, wrung from the lips of anguish, during those wakeful nights.

"Through a thousand exact agencies, of which I am only one, it has got about, far more generally than may be supposed, that these conditions exist, and that they are shameful. Such works as "No. 9009," Brand Whitlock's "Turn of the Balance," and others have been read with profound interest and have made a deep impression; the leading magazines of the country are constantly handling the question, in one or other of its phases, and, in a word, the signs that this is a vital and immediately pressing question are to be seen on every hand by those who take the trouble to look.

"I anticipate that this movement will receive the support of well known writers throughout the country, and it certainly will be agitated actively from the platform."

---

## WELCOME TO MRS. PETHICK LAWRENCE

By Mrs. La Reine Helen Baker (of Spokane, Wash.)

London, England, April 17, 1909.

Yesterday, April 16th, I, with fifteen hundred other women, stood at the gates of Holloway Prison at 8 a. m., awaiting the release of dear Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, who had served two months in her bare and narrow cell.

She was made to feel how much she had been missed by hundreds of women, from all walks in life. Mrs. Lawrence was welcomed as a dear sister and friend, and for her very self. She was made to feel that she was not only a leader of a great woman's movement, but that she was the friend and comrade of every woman in the world, and that we were there, each and all of us, as members of one great and united family of women.

It did mean for many the shortening of a holiday, for others a very early rising; but those who have themselves been in prison, know what it means to see that gathering of women outside the gates of Holloway.

Today, Saturday, came the official and public welcome, and the women have shown the politicians and public how women honor those who suffer in woman's cause. The procession was the most effective ever held in London, a great success, large in numbers, and dignified and impressive.

Every one wore the colors—purple, white and green—and with bands playing and banners waving, they marched through the streets, a brave army of women engaged in a war against Government which refuses them the power to help build up a truly Imperial race.

The procession ended at Aldwych Theatre, where Mrs. Pethick Lawrence spoke for two hours to a house filled to overflowing. The demonstration was a magnificent success, and I believe the speaker felt, in spite of hardships of prison, that it was good to be alive and able to play a noble part in the fight for the freedom of women and the upliftment of the human race.




---

## A PLEA FOR VARIETY IN LOVE

---

### 3. The Healthfulness of Variety

---

R. B. KERR.

It is almost universally believed that the general prevalence of variety in love would lead to terrible consequences. Not merely old-fashioned and conservative people, but those who consider themselves advanced, like Socialists and Secularists, tremble at the very thought of men and women being free to practice variety in love. Most people have no very clear idea as to what would happen under such conditions, but they are afraid of something vaguely awful which they cannot exactly imagine. It is generally thought, however, that the people would ruin their health by universal excess, and that a nation which permitted variety would somehow "go down."

Before proceeding to deal with these fears, I wish to point out that a number of very similar fears have existed in the past, in regard to other matters. It is hardly possible for us now to realize what a dangerous thing music was once held to be. Plato favored a rigid censorship of music, and in his ideal republic he prohibited all but the most martial and unspiritual kinds of music. Ovid tells us that "lutes, flutes, and lyres enervate the mind." The whole of

Greek and Latin literature is filled with similar statements. Mahomet forbade music altogether. In "The Troubadours and Courts of Love," by J. F. Rowbotham, we are told that "Mahomet had frowned on music from the very first; he had decried it; he had condemned it. His practical spirit had set itself in strong opposition to all such gay and pleasant unbending and relaxing of the soul." As a consequence, "music became to the Moslems an illicit pleasure, like wine was." Even to the present day, music is forbidden in all the mosques of the Mahomedan church. Yet music is now considered such a good thing, that a number of hospitals have lately been opened in Europe for the purpose of curing diseases by musical treatment.

It is also hard to realize what a wicked and dangerous thing washing was once held to be. For hundreds of years the Christian church frowned on washing. Aged nuns who had never washed were regarded as wonders of holiness. Buckle tells us that in 1566 the King of Spain issued a decree to the Moriscoes that "as bathing was a heathenish custom, all public baths were to be destroyed, and even all baths in private houses." Even as recently as 1760, according to the same writer, a proposal to clean the streets of Madrid aroused such anger, not merely among the populace, but among the medical profession, that it had to be abandoned.

I remember very distinctly that in my childhood all pleasures were considered very mischievous, while all hateful things were considered healthful and beneficial. Sugar and fruit were considered bad for children, because they were nice. On the other hand, the vilest medicines were considered splendid things, which ought to be taken on every possible occasion. If a child had a slight cold, or if its dinner slightly disagreed with it, copious doses of castor oil or some other abomination were forced down its throat. It was also considered good that children should work hard for eight or nine hours a day at that most horrible form of child labor called "education." When I was eight years old, I had to work as hard for eight hours a day as any child has now to work in the factories of West Virginia, and I got soundly thrashed if I did not work hard enough.

The opinion of intelligent persons has now totally changed on subjects like these. It is now admitted, both by philosophers and practical men, that natural inclination is the best guide in matters of diet and education. Pleasure, instead of being considered a horribly wicked thing, is now regarded as the best evidence of health, and the best test of wholesomeness. It is also considered to be in itself a very good and invigorating thing. Herbert Spencer says that "there is no such tonic as happiness." He also says: "Every pleasure increases vitality; every pain decreases vitality. Every pleasure raises the tide of life; every pain lowers the tide of life." The eminent psychologists Bain and Sully say exactly the same thing in slightly different words.

In view of these facts, it is clear that popular superstitions are the most worthless of all guides. We must therefore consider Varietism on its merits, without regard to the prejudices of the vulgar.

The first great argument against variety is that it would lead to universal excess. Well, does it? Variety has been tried enough in America to enable us to give a positive answer to that question. The Oneida Community practiced variety for thirty-three years, and it contained at one time as many as 246 persons above fourteen years of age. There was undoubtedly some regulation, which led to quarrels; but there were unquestionably plenty of opportunities for practicing variety. The Community was situated in New York State, very near many populous places, and it was visited by multitudes of well-qualified observers. Yet we find that all the persons who ever visited the Oneida Community are unanimous in their testimony that the members of the Community were exceedingly temperate in every sense, and very industrious. The Albany Evening Times described them as "plain, thoughtful people, well informed and well behaved." The "Truth Seeker" said that they were "a very temperate, industrious, peaceful, prosperous, law-abiding, virtuous people." The New Haven "Sunday Register" called them "thrifty, industrious, and honest—qualities all too rare." Goldwin Smith called the children of the Community "a fine, healthy-looking, merry set of infants." From these accounts it is very evident that the members of the Oneida Community did not ruin their health and dissipate their energy in sexual excess.

Many communities very like the Oneida one have existed in America, but it has always been found that freedom, far from making the members plunge into excess, made them more temperate than ordinary persons. I have visited one such community, which contained about 120 persons, and I found that it was in every sense the most temperate community I ever visited.

Those who imagine that freedom would lead to excess should read Montaigne's famous essay entitled "How our desires increase by being thwarted." Montaigne shows quite clearly that the best way to make people very anxious to do anything is to forbid them to do it, and he gives a number of illustrations to show how strikingly true this is of sexual desire. As a wise man said long ago, "Stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant."

Let me also remind timid persons that there is a form of excess already so prevalent among the young, that it is a subject of universal lamentation among doctors and parents. Surely it is obvious that freedom and variety in love would almost entirely sweep away this form of excess, and would in so doing conserve the energy of the body instead of dissipating it.

A few days ago I was reading a little publication called "Sexual Life," issued in Mexico by J. Herbert Foster. It contained a vigorous onslaught on Varietism, and was full of sweeping statements

which were quite without foundation. Among other things he said: "Licentiousness has ever been a leading factor in the decline of nations." By "licentiousness" he meant "varietism," as every line of his article showed. Now, I challenge Mr. Foster or anyone else to mention a single instance in history in which Varietism ever contributed to the decline of any nation. As the charge is made so often, I shall examine it in detail.

Let us begin with an example which is at present discussed every day in the newspapers. It is admitted by all that the British Empire is in danger of destruction. Even its leading statesmen tell us that. Will anyone allege that variety in love has anything to do with the growing weakness of England? On the contrary, we all know that England is by far the chastest of the great nations of the world. And who are England's dangerous enemies? Germany and Austria. These two nations have just shown the world that they can do as they please on the continent of Europe, and they are building ships so fast that the British navy is said to be in danger. Are Germany and Austria very monogamous? On the contrary, Austria has for many years held the world's championship in illegitimacy. In Austria proper, 23 per cent of all the children born are illegitimate, and in Hungary 15 per cent. In Vienna, the capital of Austria, 45 per cent of all the children born are illegitimate, and in Prague 44 per cent. Of course, illegitimacy does not always mean variety, but I think all authorities admit that Austrian illegitimacy is accompanied by widespread variety in love. The statistics of illegitimacy apply mainly to the working class, but for many centuries the upper class women of Austria have been famous for their amours. Speaking of the Austrian ladies, Lady Mary Wortley Montague says: "A woman looks out for a lover as soon as she is married, as part of her equipage, without which she could not be genteel."

(To be continued.)

## WOULD UNDERMINE THE FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIETY

Mr. Kerr's article under above title in **Eugenics** (Jan.-Feb. No.) is very plausible, interesting and, apparently, logical; but I venture to think its publication, unanswered, is calculated to do much harm, because it is based on a fallacy, and is entirely untrue. If **Eugenics** were read and its teachings endorsed in all the colleges in America, and the principles enunciated by Mr. Kerr were preached to the rising generation of young men and women, it would undermine the foundations of society and introduce an era of so-called licentious "Free Love" and of self-indulgence.

Some time ago Mr. Kerr propounded the preposterous doctrine that whatever was pleasurable to the senses was right and had the approval of Nature. I suppose he forgot that the vilest crimes against Nature, degrading to body and soul (such as sent Oscar

Wilde to jail and an unhonored grave) could all be justified if that kind of reasoning held good. If bestiality of that sort did not afford sensuous "pleasure," would its votaries be guilty of it?

Not to pursue the above preposterous idea further, let us see what Mr. Kerr's latest reasoning amounts to. He sees that people tire of every enjoyment, if they are surfeited with it: music, good things to eat, charming friends, beautiful scenery—everything palls on the taste if you have the same thing eternally, and therefore (concludes Mr. Kerr) it is the same with Love. He even goes so far as to say, "When a man and woman are definitely apportioned to one another (which I suppose is Mr. Kerr's way of saying when they love each other so much as to voluntarily agree to live together as man and wife) and are 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."

This is the argument of the sensualist all over. It looks as if Mr. Kerr hadn't the least idea of what Love is, or that he knows the difference between Love and Lust. Every word of his arguments and all his illustrations apply to Lust, but do not apply to true Love, which increases in enjoyment as lovers grow older. Lust kills Love. We see it every day. The seducer of girls soon tires of his victims, and the more he indulges his morbid, lustful craving for fresh "conquests," the lower he sinks spiritually, and the more brutal he becomes.

I have noticed, again and again, that men who are habitually unchaste are devoid of all sentiment. They jeer at the ideal, at all high motives, at love, at tenderness and emotions. In short, they are mere animals, and when their animal passions are gratified there is a feeling of mutual repulsion between those who just before were mutually attracted; and thus, it frequently happens, that a sensual brute will strike and murder his victim without compunction, and the vile seducer of an innocent girl will not scruple to sell her into "white slavery" to the keeper of houses of prostitution.

The idea of Mr. Kerr saying when a couple of true lovers are once united in marriage there is "no longer anything to hope or to fear," is preposterous from the point of view of one who believes in true love. Only from the point of view of the believer in Free Lust is such a statement true. The cap fits such a degraded specimen of manhood exactly; and alas, it is only too true that because young people of both sexes are brought up in entire ignorance of the laws of sex which ought to be taught thru proper books in all schools, there is a frightful amount of unchastity in most, if not all, young men and in quite a large number of young women. Every such sin against purity diminishes their capacity for Pure Love, just on the same principle that a young man whose tastes run in the direction of billiards, cigarettes and saloons, can't see any attraction in

a beautiful landscape, the songs of the birds in a quiet forest glade, or in a lovely sunset.

The idea of telling a young girl, dreaming of her coming marriage, of prattling children and a happy home, that, once married, she has "nothing to hope for or to fear" is ridiculous. If this is not pernicious nonsense, I don't know what it is.

It is simply the point of view of a lustful sensualist and a materialist, who lives only on the animal plane, and I venture to affirm that no one can realize the absurdity of this kind of reasoning until he learns from the revelations of spiritualism that for every one there is only **one true love**, your soul mate with whom only can you be truly happy for all eternity.

It is because we don't marry or seek to marry our soul mates that perfect happiness in marriage seldom is found; and this explains why writers, like Mr. Kerr, instead of going to the root of the evil, try to explain it on the theory that it is "natural" and God-ordained that men should have "variety in love."

If these false ideas were to be planted in the minds of the young and of all married couples thru the circulation of **Eugenics** without their falsity being exposed, then the sooner this magazine expires the better.

FRED A. BINNEY,  
San Diego, Calif.

---

### THE UNITARY HOME IDEAL

My ideal is a human society wherein no one is clothed with any authority nor invested with any power to impose his will as law upon any other person; not even the majority should have the right to exercise such privilege.

Self ownership, self rule, self control, should be the unquestioned privilege of every normal person.

And since every human being is a dependent of Mother Earth, he must have access to some section of the earth's surface, over which he may reign as absolute lord and master. This power of access is expressed in individual ownership, which may properly be called the Tool of Liberty.

But liberty is not freedom. In order to be free a man must have possession or use of the means of satisfying all his wants. Mere ownership of land will not suffice for this purpose; because man is a social creature with wants many and varied, which cannot be supplied by his own unaided efforts. He must have the companionship and help of others of his kind. And in order to have these he must respond in a friendly manner to the like needs of his fellows.

The pressure of these needs stimulates the inventive faculty, which causes to spring forth machines, devices and institutions which, by debrees, are making us free, and by which in time, if in-

dividual initiative be not stifled by impatient ignorance, we shall be completely free from poverty and from all tyrannies.

The Unitary Home is an institution designed to enlarge the social life of every man, woman and child; to protect every woman in the exercise of her right of motherhood and of her equal right to refuse it; to provide childhood and youth with every possible facility for healthy growth and the development of well-balanced character; to lift the burden of domestic cares and drudgeries from the shoulders of woman and make men and women the free and helpful companions of each other in all the complex affairs of life.

But the Unitary Home will scarcely be realized as an isolated experiment. Rather will the home be realized as the exponent of a more or less extensive movement. A number of them should arise contemporaneously in different localities as integral members of one system. They will then support and reinforce the efforts of each other, making comparatively easy what would be a difficult task if each were undertaken as an isolated experiment.

A universal service agency, designed to establish universal relationships among a certain number of different groups of special undertakings somewhat after the manner of the telephone central, would form the nucleus of the home. This agency would establish business relations with first one and then another of many persons, each qualified and equipped to render some special service to some or all the others, so that when the home is complete in its organization it will have as many different services represented in its membership as there are different faculties or groups of faculties in the human brain.

With a universal service agency connecting every member with the means of satisfying every normal want, there would be no need of any constituted authority for the making of any law or rule of action to govern the conduct of any number. Contracts and agreements freely entered into between one member and another, would be the only laws which any member would be required or expected to observe.

In my introductory circular I suggested a contribution of 40 per cent of income by the male members to a children's fund for the equal benefit of each child of the home:

I conceived it to be in the interest of a pure womanhood and of a strong, vigorous, self-poised race, that every woman be exempt from all sordid and irrelevant influences and considerations where her sex is concerned, so that she should have no reason nor excuse to bestow a sexual favor except for strong, pure, unadulterated passion. And so I sought, by making an impersonal provision for the offspring of every union, to protect the women from the various influences which tempt her to prostitute her powers of life.

There are those who would have the "Government" make this provision. But since the Government, as commonly understood, has no place in my ideal society, I proposed a means whereby men

might voluntarily discharge an obligation which some are so radical as to believe rests upon all men. For the parents of a child are not the child's Creator. They are merely the immediate agents of creative forces. The whole universal mass of living things is the Creator of every creature, and the cause of its death as well.

Those who understand this truth will readily understand their own responsibilities in respect of every child.

I can readily understand why a man having a large income which he vainly imagines is his by reason of his own merit alone and who, entertaining no thought nor care for the comfort and success of others, repudiating his moral obligations to the society which brought him into life and gave him opportunities for gaining riches, should object to putting any portion of his income into a pool for the support and education of "other men's children." Such a man belongs to the old civilization with its sordid ideals and circumscribed views of life which are rapidly passing away before the advent of purer ideals and grander views. But why a man with a moderate and uncertain income should seriously object to the principle of helping to support the children of other men who contribute to the support of his own children is not so clear, in view of the direct and indirect benefits to flow from such voluntary socialization of the burdens of reproduction.

Every child that is well born, properly reared and trained for the duties of life is a valuable social asset, adding to the value of life for every man.

Every child that begins the struggle of life with a poor endowment of brain and brawn, who suffers neglect and is not properly trained, is a burden upon the whole social body.

The mother who draws support for her children from one man alone is less free than the mother who draws support from a fund provided by many men. And the man who limits his contributions to one woman for the benefit of that one woman's children alone, has less right to be the progenitor of other women's children than the man who contributes to a fund for the benefit of the children of many women.

And the children whose support comes from one man alone is less sure of support than the children whose support comes from a fund provided by many men.

Parenthood imposes responsibilities upon both parents, but it exacts a tribute of vital force from the mother from which the father is wholly exempt. To compensate the mother for this inequality the father should provide the mother with the material equivalent of this force. But he is under no just obligation to render material compensation for matehood services. For the services of matehood are mutual and carry with them mutual compensations.

For any one to degrade these mutual services to the level of commercial transactions is prostitution, regardless of the sanctions

of religion, law or custom. For a woman to render the services of matehood for a specific price for each service rendered, is more honorable than to levy continuous tribute, or tribute extending beyond the season of service. Tribute of that character is dishonorable tribute—as dishonorable as “graft” in any other field. And no woman of spirit, refinement and true culture could exact such tribute without experiencing a feeling of repugnance and self-loathing.

The 40 per cent may be too much or too little. That is merely a matter of detail. It is my personal opinion that it is not too much. It will have to cover not only the cost of food and raiment and shelter and education for the children, but must at least partly compensate the mother as well for her contribution of vital force. If any man thinks that, in view of these facts 40 per cent of his income is too much, let him ask himself if he would willingly undergo the ordeal and pay the price of maternity which every mother pays.

In addition to the above suggested reasons for the impersonal children's fund should be noted two other important factors, namely: first, the tendency toward an equal distribution of the fruits of industry through the children as the beneficiaries, and second, the unifying and purifying influence of this service of children, upon adults.

There are other good reasons to support the principle of the pool. But these will suffice to indicate its general tendencies.

But let no one suppose that the Unitary Home must stand or fall upon this proposition. It is a principle just as applicable to pairs living in segregated homes. That would be a wise mother who would insist on behalf of her children that their material welfare be safeguarded by a general fund of this character, whether or not she cared for the Unitary Home. And the Unitary Home could exist and thrive without it.

B. F. RICHARDS,  
Carmel, Calif.

---

## WHY TEACH WOMAN TO REVOLT?

May 1, 1909.

Moses Harman.

Dear Brother:—The March-April number of *Eugenics* came this morning and I have looked it thru. The fight for the freedom of woman to own and control her own person is a noble one, and one which I heartily endorse. However, I hoped when I sent my trial subscription, to gain some suggestions by which I personally might be a better mother, might better fit myself for that holy privilege. Every woman may find suggestions wherever she turns along that line, but the new and advanced ideas along that line collected in a magazine form would be highly appreciated. But I have received, largely, from it ideas which only could trend toward misery and unhappiness with any woman less fortunate than I. If a woman is married to a man who rules her more than is his

right, what gain is there in teaching her to revolt, to despise him, to bring to her already troubled life a spirit which only increases her misery?

If our own blessed Dr. Alice B. Stockham could give us some of her healing talks which touch the hearts of the parties so bound, and teach them the better way; if each number of **Eugenics** would give an article of instructions for parties who expect to become parents; if we could be taught how to live in the bonds we already have instead of being made to chafe in them; if we could only receive careful instructions as to the use and value of a well directed sex life; if we could only be taught how to live our sex life truly; if we could be given thots in the wise direction of the darlings to whom we have given birth; if we could be told how to make our natures deeper, broader, richer and more worthy of parenthood; if we could have our minds uplifted from the rut of the disgrace of sex and of sex relationship; if we could be shown by beautiful pictures, stories and talks what a glorious, what an inexpressibly beautiful gift is the human body, which is the temple of the soul, a temple to keep chaste and pure, to protect and cherish; if we could be made to feel the divinity of building a little body for a little life; could be taught and ever reminded that such a task is the culminating and individualizing of a life that always was, and that we are making self-consciousness possible; if we could be taught the best conditions for the inception of the new life—if we could be taught these things instead of being told so much about the curse of institutional marriage and the quarrel between Mr. So-and-so and his wife; so much about the Defense of Eugenics, Variety in Love, the troubles of forced monogamy, and so on, how many mothers would rise in a chorus of praise of the dear **Journal of Eugenics!**

And I would be enclosing a good big gold certificate for a year's—several years—subscription instead of asking, as I now do, to have it discontinued.

Woman has never had such freedom in her home relations, her business world and her whole life. The world is growing better every hour, for good must be triumphant since Good is All. But woman must learn how to use freedom, and with that knowledge she will gain it.

At the age of seventeen I began an association with a young man who, like myself, had the future at heart. We talked of the future and the past, then inside of six weeks from the first companionship with each other, I was his promised life companion, yet free to change my choice if I so desired. We talked of home and what we wished to make it; of our little ones—I dreaded to think of them then, but knew I would want them some day when we should be married and in our own dear little home. I demanded sex freedom?—oh no! I did not need to, for he gave that, and said I should be the one to decide, and we vowed while yet unbound by wedlock, that never! never!! never!!! would we bear into our home

a babe **unwanted**, nor an **accident**, nor yet the fruit of **sex desire** only. That we should relate ourselves fully **only** with the earnest desire for babes, and then with the full light of intense love ruling every thought. I am twenty years old now, will soon be twenty-one. Almost two years we have been joined together by love, in wedlock. I have not yet accepted the responsibility of motherhood, because—I am every day being fitted for it—learning new truths, receiving new light upon the care, the begetting and training of that most sacred of all gifts, a little child.

What need have I to be taught to consider institutional marriage with hatred or bitterness? If I did not care to continue the present relationship longer, I'd divorce somehow; or if impossible (I can scarcely conceive of the impossibility of a divorce unless thru church relations, which I could sever if I chose), I'd do as I pleased, anyway.

So there are a few of us who have received light to live well under present laws, or out from under them, and we can not berate **Eugenics**, but only cancel our subscriptions, with our own personal needs (high and holy ones too,) unsatisfied, and a sad "if" as our reason.

Dear Brother; I love you. I love your fight for freedom, I love your grand life as I know it. But I somehow feel as though you could have served us, the mothers of **today**, besides being the fore-runner of the day of voluntary monogamy—or voluntary polygamy—which you are.

Eugenics (the word) stands for "well borning," for regeneration and right generation, and how gladly we would see the full meaning of the word embodied in the work which bears the name! We, the mothers; we, who were not taught as children how to use our creative life wisely, who now seek the master who shall train us wisely!

And now, I would like to take your hands, those loving hands that have written such words of fire in behalf of freedom and womanhood, and tell you I do not mean to censure or to criticise your work of love,—it has been a faithful one, fraught with terrible suffering. I only meant to tell you the cry of my own soul, the cry of a million hearts of men and women, for man is also anxious to learn how to live today in his present perplexing surroundings—so that life may respond in harmonious tones, and woman only wants to be led to the mysteries and beauties of the creative life, to find and unroll the last mystery, to do the last possible measure which shall make her darlings better, more true, more beautiful, more divine.

I have tried to love **Eugenics**, but it has been sometimes a thorn which gave me great pain. I know too well the tragedies of wedlock—have seen them next door; have lived and mingled with them, and I can only say the victims could have been happy members of a glorious wedlock if they had been taught the meaning

of sex, the sacredness of the body, and had given more careful, more frank and honest consideration to the life they were to enter, before marriage.

And now I can only say I love the editor, and expect to know him some time, even if not in this mortal sphere. But I must ask to have the magazine discontinued for now. If ever it embodies the thoughts I so much desire, send a sample, and a subscription price to begin with will be forwarded before time for the next copy. Ever your friend in the plea for better, grander and worthier parenthood.

MRS. W. S. S.

---

## ONE OF SOCIETY'S MISTAKES

By Grace Potter

In a little town not fifteen minutes' distant from the New York City hall, there has been a modern tragedy enacted within the year, six modern tragedies to be exact.

A young girl, in the first year of High School, gave birth to a baby boy a few weeks ago in that town. The night before a scared, astonished boy, a classmate of the girl, had been haled to the girl's home by her father and a marriage ceremony performed. There was nothing to indicate the two were suited to life companionship. It was not thought they were in love with each other. But because the father knew that Society would cruelly follow with its scorn his daughter and the child she was to bear, he demanded that they marry.

Who was responsible for this girl and boy tragedy? And five others in the town just like it, except that the other girls are not to be married and two wrongs thereby bungled into what Society is unsensitive enough to recognize as a right? The children were studying in school, French, Latin, Algebra, a smattering of Physiology and perhaps English Literature. Of Life they were told so little that they sometimes wondered what the use of all they were cramming into their poor little minds could be. More often the idea that their lessons could have any relation to their everyday acts was so impossible that they merely thought of them as something to be gotten over quickly so that they could have a good time.

The children were at an age when the mysteries of growth are beginning to manifest themselves in ways that would make any intelligent boy or girl seek explanation. No explanation was given, it is fair to say, by either teachers or parents. Such things are not taught in school and the parents who tell children frankly and honestly about sex are so few that they but serve to prove the rule to the contrary. Failing of any thoughtful explanation by adults, children learn these things as best they may in distorted, perverted stories, which most often so shock a child that the whole subject is from that time on clothed with shame for him. This has been so,

as far back as we know, and is responsible for the attitude of mind that makes it impossible for most men and women to discuss with their children how human life begins.

So children are taught Latin roots, and French conjugations, they are taught how to do mathematical problems in which the value of  $X$  is to be calculated by the use of  $a$  and  $b$ . They learn the number of bones in the human body and the properties of muscular tissue. They read certain books in English literature all of which presuppose an understanding of fundamental things in physical life. Teach them anything, says Custom, so long as it is absolutely removed from their present need. But don't by any possibility help them to understand the phenomena of body and spirit which any but a stupid deficient child cannot fail to wish enlightenment about, above everything else in the world.

So nothing is done to help them to a sane comprehension of natural facts that must be thought about sometimes in a way that is either right or wrong. Whose fault is it? Is it the fault of those who don't teach them anything about the matter, or is it the poor ignorant children's fault when their lack of knowledge results in babies being born? Babies for whom there is no one able to work and care, and on account of whose birth Society is going to do its best to make the little girl mothers outcasts?

If we would only give children credit for the common sense they really have, if we would only help them as much as we can to understand life as far as we understand it ourselves, we could feel then that any tragedies which ensued at least we had been humane enough to try and avert. And perhaps there would be no tragedies; those who know boys and girls best say they are more reasonable and amenable to sensible advice and help than adults.

Educators have said for so long that every child old enough to ask questions was old enough to be told the truth that it seems as if parents and teachers ought to have learned it. Any student who wants to know about such things will no more be harmed by being told how a baby is developed than new crystals are formed. No more be harmed by an explanation of the value and use of the human body than by an explanation of how to eliminate  $X$  from an equation. And who supposes there is any High School student in the United States who doesn't want such knowledge? Or that it wouldn't be vastly more important to him than chemistry or algebra? For these latter may be learned correctly at any time by anyone who wants to know about them from books.

We are accustomed to give as an excuse for not telling children about sex matters that we fear they will overestimate the importance of them. So we cover the whole subject with a cloak of mystery and make it thereby assume proportions unknown in the sane light of facts. Then another excuse is that we are fearful of their making mistakes. Anyone who stops to think must realize that it is ignorance that is dangerous and distorted truth even more so. And children not

told truth either remain ignorant or get the truth distorted from servants or playmates or unspeakable books.

As the parents do not teach this, the schools should. But, O, says the School Board, as it has always said when any suggestion was made, there isn't time to teach such things in school. Then cut out some of the things already taught and **make time**. It seems very sensible in some ways the idea they have in some schools nowadays of teaching the boys how to cook, so when they go camping they can make their own coffee and biscuits, and fry bacon and eggs and roast potatoes. And the girls are taught how to do things equally as foreign to the usual school board's conception of what children ought to be taught. So the school board's idea that there isn't time isn't going to be at all conclusive to us.

More of the sorrows of later life than can ever be traced to it are due to the cruel custom of telling a child stupid lies instead of an explanation of the truth when the facts of life are asked for.

Does anybody believe that boys and girls would be less likely to develop into men and women we should be proud of if we taught them:

1. What passion is.

2. How conception takes place.

3. That the sum of all our knowledge amounts to little more than ignorance anyway, because each succeeding generation has had to learn for itself the lessons the preceding generation might have taught it. But that we, whatever mistakes we may unconsciously make, will not keep on making this that science and statistics and personal experience teach us is one of the greatest mistakes possible

Doesn't it seem as if children told frankly and honestly all we can tell them will grow up into better men and women and, when they come to have children, have better children because we told them what we could?

It is worth trying.—New York.

---

### A SHORT LESSON FOR MOTHERS

"Mrs. J— was the mother of several children who were not by any means remarkable for their beauty. She had one child, however, which differed very markedly from the others in this respect. She attributed the beauty of this child to the influence of a beautiful French doll, which had been sent from Paris to one of her children, and which she kept locked up in a drawer for fear of its being destroyed. At this time she was pregnant, and being strongly impressed by the beauty of the doll, she could not refrain from frequently taking a look at it. When her child was born the result was a remarkable resemblance between the child and the doll."—Aedoeoov. Elliott, pg. 84.

Mrs. A.— her husband and all her children (with one exception) were quite dark-haired, ordinary-looking people. When she was

pregnant with this one, she had at the side of her bed a lovely picture of a little girl with golden curls and dark, violet eyes, with dark lashes and eyebrows. She was constantly looking at the picture and longing that her child might be as beautiful. When the little one was born, to her great delight the likeness was so remarkable that artists repeatedly requested her to sit for her picture."—Aedeology, Elliott, pg. 84-85.

The following case, as recorded by a physician, came from the lips of a gentleman whose son had just been committed to State prison. (The names must be withheld.)

"When I was married, I thought that for the first year my wife and I could live more cheaply by remaining with my mother in the old homestead. We did so. My wife was timid and bashful in the presence of her mother-in-law, and never felt at home. She soon became pregnant, and in that condition had cravings for articles of delicacy, in which she did not dare indulge in my mother's presence. She would obtain and secrete bits of cake, preserves and other niceties, as she found opportunity, and would eat them in her own room or out of sight. After our boy was born and had become sufficiently grown to sit at the table, we noticed that while there he would never eat any piece of cake, pie, or other delicacy that was offered him, but if possible would secrete a piece and go away slyly in a corner or behind a door and greedily devour it there. At first we thought this only an amusing freak of childhood, and called it cunning; but after a time it became annoying. We wondered at it and tried to break it up, but without avail. He soon began to take other things, but we thought it only a common, childish fault, and hoped it would be outgrown. When he was but a few years old, I took him one day to a store to buy him a pair of shoes. His eyes fell on a pair of boy's boots, which took his fancy, and he said he wanted them. I thought shoes preferable, and purchased a pair. When we reached home I was pained to find that he had the boots hidden under his coat. I reprimanded him, reasoned with him and tried to show him the wickedness of the theft; but he insisted that he wanted the boots, and was going to have them. I told him he must take them back and tell the storekeeper he was sorry; but he stubbornly refused. I compelled him to go with me and return the boots, but not a word of regret could I induce him to utter. From that time onward my troubles increased. In spite of all we could say or do the boy would appropriate whatever he could lay his hands on that pleased his fancy. All my property has been spent in paying fines and rescuing him from the consequences of his evil propensity; the peace of my family has been destroyed, and I am a broken-hearted man—all for the sake of saving a few paltry dollars at the beginning of my married life! Poor boy! I know he cannot help stealing, and therefore I am glad he is where he can have no chance to steal."—Elliott's Aedeology, pages 93-95.

Almost the exact counterpart of the first of these instances occurred in my mother's family. So great was the resemblance of my youngest sister to a large French doll of which my mother seemed simply infatuated while building this child, that it was the subject of common remark among her friends. At the age of 86 years my mother, during my last visit with her, spoke of this instance as illustrative of the mother's power and responsibility in creating new human beings, and, inferentially, of the need of works of art in homes where children are conceived, gestated and born.

M. H.

---

### SUSTAINING FUND

R. Craig, Pa., 85c; Morris, Scheibel, Ill., \$3; J. O. Charbonneau, Calif., \$1; Miss J. H. Witte, Calif., 10c; Fred Ulmer, Ida., \$5; Dr. F. B. Walters, Pa., \$1.50; M. C. Powers, Calif., 50c; Dr. G. W. Brown, Ill., 25c; Herman Kuehn, Ill., 95c; Dr. E. Moorfield, Va., \$1; A. G. Lenberg, N. J., 20c; Albert Steinhauser, Minn., 75c; W. L. Cheney, Conn., \$2; H. E. Sawdon, Mont., 75c; Minnie H. Mickelson, Ida., 75c; F. Siman, Nebr., \$2; A Friend, Colo., \$2; Dr. F. G. de Stone, Calif., \$1; H. Henn, Ore., \$2.50; G. J. Lambrigger, Nebr., \$1; A Friend, Wash., \$25; Paul Kutchan, Va., \$10; C. W. Dickinson, Wash., \$2.50; John Eininger, N. D., \$2.50; R. H. Walker, Mo., \$1.30; D. Gillstrom, Minn., \$1.25; C. Hardon, N. H., \$4; M. H. Coffin, Colo., \$1.; Dr. Mary E. Walker, N. Y., \$4; Edw. Hayes, N. Y., \$1; Arthur P. Burch, N. Wales, \$1.25; Dr. Mark Rowe, Ill., \$5; W. E. Pennington, N. C., \$3; H. H. Cady, N. Y., \$4; M. L. Studebaker, N. J., 25; John Ostrom, Kans., \$2.

Some of the above named helpers sent names of their friends as new subscribers, to the amount of their donations. It is hereby respectfully suggested and even urged, that all will do so.

---

### CASE OF FREEMAN KNOWLES

One of the later cases of outrage by the U. S. government against the primal right of freedom of speech is that of Freeman Knowles, editor of the "Lantern," Deadwood, South Dakota. For publishing a manly protest against one of the "sins of society" in its treatment of the so-called "Erring Woman," Mr. Knowles has been sentenced to two years in prison and to pay a fine of \$500. Every reader of **Eugenics** should write to Brother Knowles, and help him in all possible ways. In his issue of June 17, the editor refers to two similar cases in these words:

"Grand Old Moses Harman, one of the best men who ever suffered for humanity, was sentenced by a wretch on the federal bench to five years in the penitentiary for telling of the sexual outrages suffered by women at the hands of their husbands. Bernarr

Macfadden, editor of *Physical Culture*, a man who has done more good than any federal judge has done harm (and that is putting it very strong), has been sentenced in the federal court to imprisonment in the penitentiary for two years and pay a fine of two thousand dollars for telling in a serial story just what is going on in "high life" every day in the year. The real prosecutors in this case were the members of the patent "medicine" trust, whose "business" has been greatly injured by Macfadden's teachings to the people, which has shown them that the great mass of stuff sold as patent "medicine" is deadly poison. This patent "medicine" trust used the federal court as its tool and mouthpiece, just as the Lawrence county gang did in my case."

### THE TESTIMONY OF THE DOUBLE ROSE

In the year 1852 a book of over three hundred pages was published in New York by Fowlers & Wells, bearing the somewhat unattractive title of "Passional Zoology." It professes to be a translation from the French of A. Toussenel. Townsend may be a celebrated personage. The fact that I do not find him in the encyclopedias or the dictionary of authors is of small account. My name is not there either, nor the name of the translator, the ver ylearned Dr. F. E. Lazarus, who lived near Guntersville, Alabama, and died in 1896. His pen name was "Edgeworth." Dr. Lazarus gives us no introduction to his author, but the fact that the doctor chooses to interpret him is evidence that vital truth lies hidden between the covers of this book. After delving through pages of what to me was mostly rubbish I came upon indications of "pay dirt," and at length discovered that "Passion is the will of God;" that "Liberty, which tends to happiness, is obedience to the law of attraction," and that attractions are proportional to destinies. Within the limit of this tether Toussenel's orbit becomes great enough to include all creation and the uncreated gods thereof.

A certain French viscount having offered a prize of more than two hundred dollars for the first solution of the problem presented by Malthus (who had just turned the two demons, Arithmetical and Geometrical Progression loose upon the world and left the common man nothing better to do than go out and hang himself), Toussenel tackled the problem and so comes within the orbit of Luci—I beg pardon—within the orbit of EUGENICS. I quote from pages 334-5:

"Passional analogy alone contains the secret of its (this problem's) integral solution; and if M. de Cormenin will hear me and be just, he will keep his twelve hundred francs to himself; or rather he will make a present of them to the double rose, because this flower has given a solution of the Malthus problem long before the latter had received a name among men, because the double rose had said from the day after its invention by the Rhodians, that a flower which becomes double is a flower that transforms its stamens into petals, and which consequently becomes barren by exuberance of sap and of richness. That is to say, viscount, that so long as misery shall continue increasing, the fecundity of the female sex will follow the same

course; and that but one method exists of placing a curb on the continual profligation, viz., to surround all women with the delights of luxury, comprising the incentives to attractive labor, since action invigorates the organism, and gives an edge to the enjoyment of sensations, while it diverts from the tendencies to excess, and fortifies the too sensitive nerves. Except through luxury (at once active and passive), except through general riches, no salvation.

"But if you refuse to believe the double rose upon its word, viscount, I refer you to the opinion of the well-conditioned cow and mare, who will tell you the same things, absolutely the same things, as the double rose. Finally, if this imposing unanimity of testimony should not suffice to establish the unalterable conviction, I call you in last appeal before the authority of the carps of Sologne. Ask the proprietor of the ponds there how they manage in regard to the multiplication of the carp; they will answer you that the ponds of Sologne are so favorable to the growth of carp, that the rapid development of their size (luxury), renders them quite barren, and that they, the proprietors, are obliged, in order to preserve the breed of their fish, to have carp ponds of misery, where they keep the carp exclusively destined for reproduction. These special ponds for breeding are narrow channels of water, where the female carp are crowded together by myriads, and die of hunger. Being unable to get fat these carp lay eggs, and these prolific carp have been baptized in Sologne with the significant name of "peinards"—sufferers. Do you understand, viscount, the analogy which exists between the carp and the women of the people whose fecundity justly alarms you? Those households piled upon each other in the narrow carperies of industrial cities—those brats swarming in the nether parts of our own societies—there is the human pinard. I asked of you the prize of twelve hundred francs for the double rose; I retract, let it be equally distributed between the double rose and the pinard of Sologne. How happy the people would be were thier governments analogists."

Misery loves company, and children are sometimes company, though of the children of Misery, generally speaking, it may well be said that their room is better than their company. I have supposed that children were antipathetic to luxury, but the supposition may be due to that limited use of the observant faculties which led he Mosaic barbarians to suppose that the sun moves round the earth. Henceforth I keep my eye peeled for evidence that luxury is antipathetic to children or to progeny of any kind. Now that attention is called to it I find that my observation of men and domestic animals sustains the proposition, and in my vegetable garden luxurious vines barren of fruit have too often given corroborative testimony to that of the double rose and every other double flower. I suggest that eugenic students watch out from this time on, mindful that a pleasing theory not abundantly sustained by facts is no more to be trusted than a postulate of the theologians.

The Toussenet antiseptic ought to be more agreeable to woman than anything the drug store or operating table has to offer, though with her usual perversity she may for a while yet prefer the established methods of prevention and cure. Her right to choose must be defended at all hazards. But even lovely woman may not be able to change the decree that to him that hath not shall more children be given than he can decently provide for, and as often to him that hath shall be given not enough children to project his name. Thus do we convict Nature of conniving to preserve the unfit by proportioning

fecundity to the death rate. Where existence is short or precarious there progeny swarms, exceptions being made no more for man than insect. Wholesome luxury that does not foster unwholesome idleness probably preserves life, and this prolongation would indicate fewer children for natural reasons. And these natural reasons substantiate the conclusions of Toussenel.

L. V. PINNEY.

Winsted, Conn.

---

#### **Opposes Kerr and Richards, But Wants Free Discussion**

M. Harman.—Dear Sir: Merely expressing an opinion, I think Richards' proposed colony scheme impractical for people—laborers, people of my class. I further believe that legal monogamic marriage, bad as it is, is promotive of more general happiness than universal "variety in love" (I take that to mean promiscuous intercourse) would be. It seems to me that R. B. Kerr's article, "The Psychology of Variety" is more of a literary jugglery than a scientific exposition. I believe in free discussion of this subject, and the removal of the legal restrictions preventing the stating of ideas so that they can be understood.

J. C. NORDVIE, Washington.

---

#### **Thinks It Sectional**

Mr. and Mrs. Kerr's ideas did not accord precisely with mine when I knew them in this country, and I am too doubtful of improved social conditions arising from better sexual relations alone, to ally myself with your sectional propaganda. Yours in sincere good wishes and progressive aims,

JANE C. H., Edinburg, Scotland.

---

#### **Endorses Kerr**

Recently I sent you 10 cents in stamps for the January-February number. Someone stole the same from me. If you have any more on hand, please send me one at once, for which I enclose 10 cents in stamps. I should very much like to get R. B. Kerr's article on the English eugenic movement and the first of his articles on "variety in love." These two contributions are among the best for clearness and sanity that I have seen in many a day.

H. C. UTHOFF,

Illinois.

---

#### **BOOKS RECEIVED**

One of the most valuable books that has ever come to the Editor's book table is T. W. Doane's *Bible Myths and Their Parallels in Other Religions*. I say this because the author has applied to the subject of Sacred Literature the comparative method of study, which is the only method by which the world has reached certitude in anything. There is an old saying to the effect that "comparisons are odious." This is true only with the bigot who never makes them.

The sciences have been built up by this method. Anatomy became a science only with Comparative Anatomy. Physiology became a science only after the comparative method had been applied to that line of investigation. The same was true of Psychology. Now what is true of these sciences is true of Mythologies and Religions. The man who studies but one religion can never understand that religion. The man who reads but one bible can never understand that bible. Here in one compact volume the author has gathered the Old and New Testament Myths and Miracles with those of heathen nations of antiquity, compared them and inquired into their origin and meaning with an insight and comprehensiveness that makes the book invaluable to all students of religious literatures. Bible Myths and Their Parrallels in Other Religions. By T. W. Doane. The Commonwealth Company, 28 Lafayette Place, New York; for sale at this office, price \$2.50.

---

From the author, Victor Robinson, comes an autograph copy of the book, "Comrade Kropotkin," a finely printed and bound volume concerning the life and work of one of the greatest of living writers Peter Alexievitch Kropotkin. Price one dollar; published by the Altrurians, 12 Mt. Morris Park West, New York City.

---

Another autograph copy of a booklet from the Altrurian Press is "A Symposium on Humanitarians," conducted by Victor Robinson. Price, 25 cents in paper cover; in cloth, 50 cents.

The conductor of this symposium asked a number of people to "Name your ten favorite humanitarians of the 19th Century." One hundred answers were received from physicians, editors, authors, lecturers, judges, labor-reformers, etc., etc. The booklet under review gives the answers of this hundred persons. Having been honored by an invitation to join the symposium from the conductor aforesaid, I find my name mentioned in the book, in the following all too flattering manner, for which mention, however, Conductor Robinson will please accept my very sincere thanks:

Moses Harman, for 25 years editor of Lucifer (recently changed to Eugenics), the most persecuted of all editors. He is a pure-hearted old reformer who has long tried to educate the people along sexual lines. Especially has he proclaimed woman's right to her own body. For these crimes he has several times been imprisoned and condemned to hard labor. His last arrest occurred when he was over 75 years of age. When my request reached him, he was in a striped suit behind the bars. He was permitted to answer, and this is his list:

1. Thomas Paine; 2 Victor Hugo; 3. Emerson; 4. Darwin; 5. Bradlaugh; 6. Spencer; 7. Ingersoll; 8. A. J. Davis; 9. Walt Whitman; 10. Leo. Tolstoy.  
 "A symposium on Humanitarians," page 22.

---

"Love and Parentage (A Practical Ideal)," by William Platt, author of "Women, Love and Life," "Love Triumphant," etc. Price, half crown net; Yellon, Williams & Co., Ltd., London, 1909.

## 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.

### Our New Headquarters

Dear Moses Harman:

Am so pleased you are up on the hill! Good, good, I say. So much better in every way—more at home, mid vines and roses. Then, too, you will have so much more time to yourself, and be in the quiet.

MRS. B. L. R.

Hotel Cecil, London, May 19, '09.

(Yes, we find it much better for health and comfort to have the office of EUGENICS on "Angeleno Heights," 500 feet or more above the dust, noise and turmoil of the busy city streets. Always we shall be glad to have our friends call on us at our new headquarters. Take Angeleno Heights car at First and Broadway; get off at corner of Edgeware and Kellam avenues. Walk three doors west to The Bungalow, rear of house 1319 Kellam. Friends would confer a favor by notifying us in advance, if possible when intending to call. Phone Sunset, Temple 264.

Moses Harman. Dear sir:—Enclosed herewith find P. O. money order for \$10. Put me in good standing for EUGENICS, and advance my subscription one year. Balance accept for the good of the cause.

FRED ULMER, Idaho.

A free man (Nebraska widower, 50 years young) desires to adopt a child (a free born girl 8 to 14 years of age preferred.) Will give her good

home and rear and educate her according to the ideals of free womanhood, and with regard to any special faculty she may develop in music, art, etc. For full particulars, address Alfred Bradlaugh, Lyric Theater, Omaha, Neb.

Dear Comrade Harman: You were very kind to send me your excellent magazine, three of which I have received. Enclosed find money order for \$1.25. Please continue to send it for one year. I mean to take it as long as you are its editor and as long as I live, if possible. It is surely a grand work in which you are engaged. Wishing you all success and prosperity, LAURA C. L., Arkansas.

Moses Harman: I have read your "Autobiographical" in the March April number, and I think you broke the record in writing that article. Years do not impair your ability to write. So, if you could have perfect health you ought to live forever and keep on writing. The world will need your writings for a long time yet—yes, it will always need them. The last EUGENICS is most excellent. With all good wishes, as ever,

SARA CRIST CAMPBELL,

Oklahoma.

Journal of Eugenics.

Gentlemen: I am interested in the subject of the effects of the intermarriage of blood relatives. I am anxious to secure a good up-to-date book on the subject. I do not care

for a discussion of the practice among heathen nations, but rather the effects as noticed among civilized people. Can you supply such a book? If so, please quote price. If you cannot supply the book, I would be glad to know where I might be able to obtain it.

CHAS. I. B. Pennsylvania.

I know nothing better than Dr. E. B. Foote's "Cyclopedia of Medical, Social and Sexual Science, advertised in EUGENICS. If our readers know of anything better we should be glad to hear from them in regard thereto.

M. H.

Translated "Hilda's Home."

My dear friend and benefactor, M. Harman:

Although my busy life is well filled with work, I cannot forget or cease crying about one I revere as I do you and your work. Two years ago I had for a frontispiece in my magazine (Freyja) four women, Lillian Harman being one of the four. I mention this to show you that I am and have been an interested spectator—and not quite idle—of your fight for better motherhood and the right to be born well. I translated "Hilda's Home" (into Icelandic), and also "Women and Economics," by Stetson—or part of the latter from "Lucifer." Hilda's Home made such a stir that for a time it seemed going to swamp "Freyja." But I successfully met all attacks. One of our weekly editors tried to stamp "Freyja" as immoral, but I answered him in such a way that he not only gave it up but published the condemned article in his own paper.

Now, dear friend, let me know if your magazine has been held up again, or why I do not get it.

Sincerely,

MARGRET J. BENEDICTSSON?

Winnipeg, Canada.

(Mrs. Benedictsson is editor of the Icelandic Monthly Magazine "Freyja," devoted to woman's political, economic and social rights, price \$1.00 a year; outside Canada, \$1.50. Our friends who read Icelandic or Norwegian are hereby requested to write for a sample copy of the brave

little journal, "Freyja," or better, send a year's subscription to the above address. M. H.)

Birth Place of Thomas Paine

Dear Moses Harman: We have today visited the room where Thomas Paine was born, and many other very interesting places connected with Paine's early life. Thetford is a very beautiful old place, thickly wooded, and with old vines and many varieties of shrubs and flowers—really is worth while when you come to Europe, and of course you will. We learned so much of the social life of Thomas Paine, along with what we knew of his political and religious life. The greatest factor in moulding Paine's character during his youthful days, appears not to have been his schoolfellows or the general public life of the small borough in which he resided, but rather the Quaker beliefs of his parents.

LA REINE BAKER,

Thetford, England,

May 23, 1909.

Home address, Spokane, Wash.

The Old Story of Man's Perfidy and Woman's Helplessness.

June 8, 1909.

Dear sir:—I am a woman who has "loved not wisely but too well." I am deserted by the one who should shield me, and have very little money; I could go to friends, but will not.

Do you know of any place in California where I could find a home and be true to myself and babe? Are there any homes amongst the so-called Freelovers' colonies, where a woman can go and be taken care of during and preceding confinement without being classed as "fallen?" If you know of any place you think would be of interest, kindly tell me who to correspond with in reference to the matter. By so doing you will be a friend to one who needs a friend.

\* \* \*

Of course it is useless to blame anyone or anything for occurrences like this. No use to preach prudence, self-control and foresight to women and girls, men and boys, born and bred under present social conditions

and with present false ideas in regard to sex, its uses, its abuses, and as to what constitutes purity, virtue, chastity, or responsibility for consequences. It is the very essence of sex-passion and the reproductive instinct, to recklessly defy prudence, self-control and foresight.

Have our readers anything to offer to the writer of the above letter? If so, please write to her in care of this office. M. H.

### Something About Co-operation.

My beloved brother: Yours of May 27th at hand. In reply you will please find P. O. order for \$2.50. Now, please do not give me credit on any account other than my "good will" account. In your letter of some little time ago you said you wanted to be co-operative. I do not consider that it is necessary for me to receive some individual direct compensation or return for any little help that is given EUGENICS. Are you not continually giving to the world the best you have, and are we not all "parts of one stupenduous whole?" Then you are now giving, and all the years back of prison confinement and other persecutions have you been giving, to me as a universal entity? Your persecutors sent you to prison. If they could, they would have sent you to hell; but they would never have succeeded in placing in bondage that indomitable spirit, the love of true freedom with which every atom of your being is imbued. Will you let me know about what time you expect to be in Seattle, and how long do you expect to remain? I hope much good will come from your trip. If it is convenient for me to go to Seattle, I would be much pleased to meet you. I would like to go to the "Home Colony" and visit a few days. If there is a school or society of Vendanta philosophy in Los Angeles, may I ask you to kindly send me their address.

Yours in love for Love's sake,  
C. W. D. Washington.

### Reply to P. C. I and to R. B. Kerr

If P. C. I. thinks marriage among the real workers, the mass of the

people, is a graft for women—then P. C. I. is not a woman who has tried it, nor even observed at all carefully. To one who has done so it appears that in a majority of cases the woman pays dearly for the privilege of getting a hard job, with very poor assurance of receiving support for herself and her children out of it.

In considering the possibility of women's freedom, let us not worry about the men that her **firting** would set to fighting and killing each other. Should such an improbable result flow from woman's freedom, I am sure that the sufferings of these men would not be any worse, nor their loss to society any greater, than is that of thousands of women who are now ruined and killed through bondage to the lusts of men.

The great majority of women are now in a considerable degree under the control of men. And what are the fruits of the system? Among other things, women carry a burden of about six times more sexing than they have any use for. Then why under the sun, should anyone assume that, given her liberty, woman would launch into a career of promiscuous and excessive sexual affairs?

If either **love** or freedom were considered as essential in the sex relation, what effect would it have on the sex practices of today?

If I know anything about the real meaning of free love, or what it would do for society, it stands not for more and indiscriminate animal indulgence of sex, but for **less**. Since woman is less impetuous and frequent in physical desire than is man, her freedom to choose in the matter would be a restricting element. Though it may well be that woman, freed from all coercion, would make a better lover than she does today.

It would seem that women might embrace this ideal of free love through superficial selfishness, but the men who take it upon themselves must do so with the enlightened selfishness that sees that it is worth while to place self-restraint upon their superabundant passions for the sake of the greater satisfaction and good to be found in **free love**, both to themselves individually and to the race.

If I am not taking too much time, may I call attention to one of the most familiar figures in our Drawing Room,—R. B. Kerr? Where are our eugenists of the monogamic ideal, that they don't come forward with their reasons for disagreeing with the opinions of this very positive and plain-spoken exponent of variety in love? How do eugenists regard his most important point, that for racial improvement the better men must each be father of more than one woman's children?

Don't understand me as taking a tilt against Brother Kerr when I offer a suggestion regarding variety in love. Granting that there may be a tendency in human nature that gives rise to desires to renew with fresh partners the excitements incident to courtship, why must we consider it a tendency worth yielding to or cultivating?

It is conceded, I believe, that primitive man had a tendency to take his mate by force, also that this spirit of aggression is still much alive in the male human of today. But we say this is an evil tendency; the whole force of eugenics is pitted against it. Some people have a tendency to flit from one occupation to another, for the sake of fresh interest, etc. But we say of such that they are "Jacks of all trades and good at none." Those who wish to excel in anything must concentrate their attention upon that particular object. Perhaps mating is no exception. Considering the value of secure and long-established comradeship, perhaps its attainment is worth the sacrifice of this scattering tendency in love. This is offered as a thought that an individual might apply to him or herself, not as a system to be enforced upon others.

MAUD STARNES-BRITAIN,  
Canada.

**Why Co-operation Fails**

In the "Nautilus," for February, William E. Towne, the husband of Elizabeth, had an article on "Why Co-operative Enterprises Fail." He thinks the main reason is "because the people have never yet been sufficiently familiar with the principles of co-operation."

Not so, William. The reason is much simpler than that. It is because human nature is essentially selfish, and successful co-operation implies unselfishness.

When men and women become unselfish, then we may expect to see a success made of co-operation. That will be a long, long time after you and I are dead and gone, William.

To a certain extent, such for instance as in marketing products through a central agency, and in purchasing supplies at wholesale, co-operation may be and is effective today, but the greatest liberty must be left to the individual, or any attempt at co-operation will inevitably, sooner or later, prove a dismal failure. This is true even when people are cemented together by the strong bonds of religious fanaticism, although in such cases it takes them longer to find it out. X.

Liberal minded man wishes female correspondent of same or a higher degree of advancement. Address P. O. box 591, Stockton, Cal.



**BILL'S AVENUE** makes you cheerful and thoughtful. It is a personal department in the WHEEL OF LIFE that grows on you. You find yourself waiting with interest for what "Bill" has to say next.

**"AN AMERICAN MADONNA"** is a serial running in the WHEEL OF LIFE. It is written by

Mary Ives Todd, the ablest writer of Liberal fiction since Grant Allen, and is a beautiful presentation of the essentially modern problem of the Woman in Business.

**THE WHEEL OF LIFE.**

A monthly periodical. It deals with ORIGINS, the origin of Marriage, of Ethics, of Religion, of Brotherhood, of the belief in Immortality. It treats broadly of Love, of Human Instincts and Ideals. It takes in the whole Wheel of Life, treating all subjects in such a clear, plain and spicy way that the dust is shaken out and they become as interesting as a novel to even the casual reader. Send 10 cents for a six months' trial subscription or a quarter for a year.

**"CONFESSIONS OF A DRONE"** by Joseph Medill Patterson, author of "A LITTLE BROTHER OF THE WICH," sent without extra charge with a 6 months' trial subscription to the WHEEL OF LIFE". Address

LIFE PUB. CO., Desk A, St. Louis, Mo.

**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 162 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.

**BOOKS AND PERIODICALS FOR  
THINKERS AND DOERS. . . . .****SCARCE WORKS FOUND.**

Especial Attention Given to Old and New Publications in the Field of Freethought, Secularism, Evolutionary Science, Economics, Ethics, Sex, Sociology, and Free Press. Old Works on Slavery constitute a Leading Line. Also, Radical Fiction. What do you offer me in rare works in these departments? What do you want me to find for you?

If in your reading you come across a rational, progressive book, new or old, let me know about it. Many a good work lies hidden for years in the enormous mass of rubbish.

Send for lists and circulars.

**EDWIN C. WALKER,**

**244 W. 143d St., Manhattan, New York City**

**CURIOSITY** brought us our first customer.

**VEGETARIAN CAFETERIAS**

Health, Happiness, a Clear Brain, and a Greater Capacity for Work.

No. 1

259 South Hill Street.

No. 2

622 South Broadway.

ADVERTISING

# Latest Reductions

WATCH PRICES CUT TO UNDERSSELL ALL COMPETITION

## A FEW SAMPLE PRICES OF BEST WATCHES

Hampden: 18 size, "Special R-Way," 23 jls., \$26; "New R-Way," 23 jls., \$20; "JOHN HANCOCK," 21 jls., \$16.50; Dueber Watch Co., 21 jls., \$15.  
Elgin: "Veritas," 23 jls., \$29; "Father Time," 21 jls., \$22.50; "B. W. Raymond," 19 jls., \$20; "B. W. Raymond," 17 jls., \$18.50.  
Waltham: "Vanguard," 23 jls., \$29; "Crescent Street," 21 jls., \$22.50; "Appleton, Tracy & Co., Premier," 17 jls., \$18.50; same, not "Premier," \$16.

## THE ABOVE GUARANTEED TO PASS R-WAY INSPECTION

Sundries: "Waltham," "P. S. Bartlett" or Elgin "Wheeler," 17 jls., adjusted, nickel, \$9; same, gilt, \$7; same, Hampden, nickel, \$8; same, not adjusted, \$7; Elgin, Waltham or Hampden, nickel, 15 jls., \$6; Elgin or Waltham, nickel, non-catchable hair spring, 7 jls., \$5; Hampden, 7 jls., gilt, \$4.50; "Standard" or "Century," 7 jls., \$3.

## ALL THE ABOVE IN 2, 3, OR 4 OUNCE SILVERINE CASES, PREPAID

In silver, or gold filled screw case, accompanied by manufacturer's and my guarantee for 20 years, \$3.00, or in hunting case, \$5.50 more. In 25 year screw case, \$5, or in hunting case, \$8.50 more than in silverine case. In solid gold case, \$10 to \$50 more.

## THE IDEAL GENTLEMAN'S WATCH

Small (12) size Hampden, elegant, artistic, hand-chased or "engine-turned," gold filled hunting case, guaranteed 25 years, "Gen'l Stark," 15 jls., \$15; "Deuber Grand," 17 jls., adjusted, \$17.50; "John Hancock," 21 jls., extra fine, \$29.50. In open face screw case, \$1.00 less. Also in solid gold.

## LADIES' GOLD WATCHES

Large (6) size Elgin, Waltham or Hampden, 20 year gold filled, latest style, artistic hand-chased, 7 jls., \$9; 15 jls., \$11; 165 jls., adj., \$15. Small (0) size, 7 jls., \$11; 15 jls., \$13; 165 jls., adj., \$18. "Riverside," 17 jls., extra fine, \$24. In 25 year case, \$1.00 more. In 14k solid gold case, \$10 to \$50 more. Latter with diamonds, all in velvet box, prepaid, with guarantee. EVERY WATCH FRESH FROM FACTORY. THESE \$1.00 LESS.

## CHAINS

Long Guards, latest style, soldered links, opals or other sets in slides, rolled plated, \$1, \$1.50 and \$2. Best Filled Gold, \$2.50, \$3 and \$4. Extra heavy, \$5. Solid gold, \$8, \$10, \$15 and \$25. GENTS' CHAINS, SAME VARIETY. Orders filled from any catalogue at same prices or less. Cash refunded at option.

DIAMONDS, PEARLS, OPALS, ETC.—IN RINGS, PINS, PENDANTS OR

## OTHER JEWELRY

I am an expert in this line and will save you 20 per cent if you will order of me. Engagement and Wedding Rings a specialty.

## THE INGERSOLL SPOON

The most artistic Spoon ever made. Sterling, Tea, \$2; Orange, \$2.25; Sugar, \$2.50. Gilt Bowls, 50 cents more.

My Beautiful Freethought Badge: Solid Gold, \$2, \$2.75, \$3, 4, \$7, \$15 and up.

Send for price list of Jewelry, Rings, Silver and Plated Ware, Optical Goods and my tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free. Highest price paid for old gold.

# Otto Wettstein

110 N. KENSINGTON AVE.

LAGRANGE, COOK CO., ILL.

## 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.

**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.  
 "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.  
 "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.  
 "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.  
 "Diana," by Henry M. Parkhurst. Price 25 cents.  
 "Marriage and Divorce," by Josephine K. Henry. Price 25 cents.  
 "The Bright Side or 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.  
 "Mother Soul," by Laura Smith Wood. Price 25 cents.  
 "A Tale of the Strassburg Geese," by R. B. Kerr. 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.  
 "Import and Ultimate of Our Sex Natures," Edward Cowles. Price 5 cents.  
 "Life, Health and Longevity," by M. Harman; also, "The Curse of Maternity," 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.