

# The Word

VOL. 2.

PRINCETON, MASS., DECEMBER,

NO. 8.

## THE WORD,

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF REFORM,

for the abolition of speculative income, of woman's slavery and war government; regards all claims to property, not founded on a labor title, as morally void, and asserts the free use of land to be the inalienable privilege of every human being—one having the right to own or sell only his service impressed on it. Not by restrictive methods, but through liberty and reciprocity. The Word seeks the extinction of interest, rent, dividends, and profit, except as they represent work done; the abolition of railway, telegraphic, banking, trades-union and other corporations charging more than actual cost for values furnished, and the repudiation of all so-called debts, the principal whereof has been paid, in the form of interest.

E. H. HEYWOOD, EDITOR.

Contributors, correspondents, and those from whose works extracts may be printed are responsible only for their own opinions. The Editor must not be understood to approve or reject any views, not editorial, unless he says so.

Terms: 75 cents annually, in advance; 5 copies \$3.30; 10 copies \$6.00; 20 copies \$11.00; 50 copies \$20.00; 100 copies \$37.50. Single copies 7 cents. Subscribers who wish to continue, will please remit in time, for the paper is not sent except on payment in advance. Address,

THE WORD,

PRINCETON, MASS.

## THE OPPOSITION.

THE ABOLITION OF INTEREST UNJUST AND IMPOSSIBLE.—No Rate Excessive if the Liberty is "Equally Shared."

Livery stable keepers charge more for the use of their horses and vehicles than the mere excess of their value and wear; they always charge a profit. The same is true of all business. Whatever is sold, whether property or the use of property, is sold for more than its cost; and this excess of price over cost is profit, which is analogous to interest. Wages, profit, and rent are the three sources of all revenue by which men pay for their living; and as legitimate as an author's and interest is simply one species of profit. "It is," says Adam Smith, "the compensation which the borrower pays to the lender for the profit which he has an opportunity of making by the use of the money." Part of this profit naturally belongs to the borrower, who runs the risk and takes the trouble of employing it; and part to the lender, who affords him an opportunity of making this profit. No rate of interest is excessive, and the benefit is equally shared. The qualification is all-important. This rule would justify the slaveholder's agreement with his slave, provided the former justly owned the latter. But since property in man is intrinsically unjust, the slaveholder charged profit or interest on his property, namely, the slave's interest on the property of the master for the price himself. The claim of the master for the price of the slave was unjust to start with; therefore no agreement by which the price was to be paid could be just. If the claim had been just, the agreement would also have been just.

That interest paid for the use of money is partly compensation to the lender for running the risk of never getting it back, is plain from the fact that the rate of interest depends partly on the amount of the risk run. Doubtful security will not bring money at so low a rate as first-class security. This is just. The lender offsets the greater risk by the greater profit. There is of course no just claim for a return of the interest, for the risk has been already run. There is no more relevancy in scrutinizing the reasons why the lender values the use of the money, than in scrutinizing the reasons of the borrower for doing the same thing. It is enough that money can be used for all purposes, legitimate and illegitimate; that this use has a definite value, which belongs to him who owns the money; and that the lender yields up the use of the money for a compensation. Both parties want to use the money for the motives of the borrower are as likely to be selfish as those of the lender; the whole inquiry into motives is superfluous. All that concerns us now is that a fair bargain is made, by which one party gets what he wants from another by paying a price for it, which, if not excessive, is justly due. The value of the use of money is based on the fact that, when prudently used, it will bring a profit to somebody; and the justice of charging interest depends on the fact that this profit belongs to lender and borrower. The probability and amount of this profit, as estimated at the time of borrowing, ought to determine the rate of interest charged. If the profit is sure, the total interest should be half of it; if the risk is great, the interest should be more in proportion. This is theoretical, however; the rate of interest cannot practically be so nicely adjusted, but will be governed by the average probabilities of profit at the time in general business.

What Mr. Heberling calls the "rent of wealth," is simply payment for the use of it. The rent of

interest is paid for the use of it; it is really the house on the capital invested in the land and the building. The liveryman's charge for horses and carriages is also really interest on the capital invested in them, since he never dreams of charging only for the actual wear-and-tear. Now this use of wealth is just as truly sold for the time being as the wealth itself is sold permanently in the case of ordinary merchandise. If it is just to charge for a barrel of flour, it is just to charge for a year's loan of a hundred dollars. There is a *quid pro quo* in either case. Interest, it is true, "takes from the borrower; but it does the same of a peck of potatoes taken from the consumer for the benefit of the farmer. The only question is—does the borrower receive a fair equivalent for the interest he pays? If he at least did not think so, he would not borrow—unless he is charged excessively under the pressure of necessity; which of course is cruel.

But interest-paying no more feeds overgrown wealth than does the payment of a profit on merchandise; the trouble is not there. Unfortunate money-making of all kinds is easy to the rich and hard to the poor; yet we fear that inequalities of wealth will not be obviated so long as men are unequal in the money-making faculty, give themselves with unequal zeal to the pursuit of money, or find the circumstances and opportunities of life unequal. There is too much truth in the scripture—"To him that hath shall be given and from him that hath not shall be taken away, even that which he hath." But the only approximate remedy for such inequalities is, not to attempt the impossible and really unjust abolition of interest, but rather to increase the general welfare by increasing the general intelligence and virtue. Education, mental and moral, promises more relief to suffering poverty than the sweeping destruction of usages which after all have their real basis in the common sense of mankind. It will open a career for every one who is industrious, and do much to raise the whole community above want. If there is a better remedy, we hope most sincerely it will be discovered and proclaimed.—*F. E. Abbot Editor of The Index, Oct. 9th.*

## PROFIT THE BASIS OF PROPERTY?

We argued that, if the liveryman was right, so was the man who charged a moderate interest for the use of his money, since the principle involved was the same in both cases. Mr. Tucker is quite mistaken as to the "question at issue." It was not "whether taking more than cost is morally wrong," but whether all interest-taking is morally wrong. We cannot turn aside presently to discuss irrelevant issues. The "reasoning in a circle" which Mr. Tucker imagines he has detected cannot be found in our article. Having mis-ceived the subject under discussion, it is not surprising that he avoids the dreadful "circle" by shooting off at a tangent. We pointed out the *strict analogy* between interest, profit or rent, but did not have the justice of either on that of the other; as Mr. Tucker will perceive at a glance, if he will take the trouble to read carefully the article he has criticized. The justice of taking interest, of charging profit, of levying rent, and of demanding wages, depends on the answer to be given to a deeper question than Mr. Tucker has yet asked, namely—*has anybody a right to say he owes anything?* Did he ever reflect that to entail the right to make a reasonable profit is at bottom to challenge the right to own property of any sort? By what right does the seller charge even cost to the purchaser? Why is not property common to all? Why was not Proudhon right when he declared all property robbery? Mr. Tucker does not seem to be aware that when he denies all right to take interest, he logically denies all right to demand wages or even to charge original cost; for he is in fact denying the right to property itself, and should plant himself on the most ultra communism. He either goes too far, or not half far enough.

Does Mr. Tucker oppose the public school system? It would seem so; but we hope not. Nobody is to be educated till he can pay for it himself,—if radicals are to count it "unjust" to be called upon to bear their share of the burden of educating the wretched children of the street, farewell to all possibility of a republic on this earth. If Mr. Tucker and his neighbor are equally desirous of an exchange, and equally derive benefit from it, it takes a clearer head or a keener conscience than ours to discern any wrong in the transaction. There is no "right of might" in the case; it is a voluntary and advantageous barter on both sides.—*Mr. Abbot in The Index Oct. 23rd.*

Intellectually. Against the tide of old-world wickedness and unbelief, this rush of materialism and atheism, this revival from Gehenna, which is coming in upon us from England and Europe, the time has come to set up a standard of revolt. It is a devilish oppression, ten thousand times worse than the stamp acts and exactions of British tyranny a hundred years ago. It must be stopped or all that is distinctively valuable in America will be destroyed. Under its influence the nation is losing its spiritual and moral manhood. It is sapping all our educa-

tional systems and institutions. It is fascinating and capturing the youth of the nation, our brightest and best. It has taken possession of the newspaper press; statistics show that nearly all the leading secular journalists of the country are its servants and mediums. It is in the atmosphere, pressing into all the channels of thought and action. It is at the bottom of political corruption.—*Oncida Circular.*

"LET US HAVE PEACE." My loving wife: I'm comin' one nex week an hav forgiv you fer jaw-in me. He come on the 7 o'clock train and shall stay one hereafter & tri to be an altered man. I want peace and so do yew why shouldn't we hav each other as we used ter when we jined together in the wholly bands of madlock ive jined a temperance society but if yew jaw me agin fur cummin' one I'll wolly yew like thy fur we must have pease as grant ses.

## IS INTEREST TAKING UNJUST?

The principle which justifies liverymen in their claim for reasonable hire does not apply to money-lenders; since real wealth (such as horses and vehicles) decreases in value while in use, which is not true of money. Would not Mr. Abbot's rule (that a contract is not criminal which benefits both parties) justify the agreement which the master made with the slave to give him all he would earn in excess of a fixed sum to be delivered to the master, under which contract the slave was very profitable to the master, and by working very hard, succeeded in buying his own freedom? Is it not the old false principle of supply and demand acting regardless of equity, in the manner in which "might makes right"? Mr. Abbot says: "It is a great mistake to think it costs the lender nothing. He foregoes the use of the money lent, and runs the risk of never being repaid." We fail to see how the claim for interest makes the payment of the principal any more certain, nor do lenders return the interest at the payment of the principal. As to foregoing "the use of the money lent," we would ask—what use? The use of it by buying bread, books, or the comforts of life, or by supplying the means of self or family elevation! If so we think it should not be lent but in exceptional cases. But money-lenders as a class offer no such needs as a reason for their claim for interest. What they "forego" is rather the use of their money by investing in railroad bonds, or insurance stock, or lands that are expected to pay very heavy dividends or sell at an advance, or by speculating in city real estate, gold, grain, or other property that offers heavy profits. Possibly they have to forego taking stock in a manufactory that sells the labor of the poor at double what it costs, or forego the use of their money as a means of furnishing themselves employment as merchants by which they expect a fair income in the form of selling at prices limited only by the life of their trade. I admit that it requires more usefulness to forego all these chances than most of our capitalists or laborers possess; but that does not eradicate the injustice from the present oppressive financial and commercial systems of practice. But is it not this privilege of speculating that gives to the use of money what Mr. Abbot is pleased to call "real, direct value, for which men ought in common justice to pay"—which is about as real and direct as the value that a lot of thieves would pay for the key to a safe that was filled with an immense quantity of valuables? Now if this value of the use of money does not result from the privilege of speculating, will Mr. Abbot please tell us on what it is based? And will he justify speculation?

If Mr. Abbot's remarks refer to the sale of "merchandise," "services," and "time," which are never returned, we fail to see how much sale can govern the rent for money, or in any way be connected with it. To explain why men should

not charge for the use of their money would require more space than is left me; but I will say that interest is wrong, for the reason that it not only takes from the borrower, but that it is the channel through which all purchasers or consumers contribute through merchants of all classes to the possession of those that have, increasing their incomes without earning it, and taking from those who do no borrowing without giving any equivalent. For every property-holder demands his *per cent.*, which must, if possible, be equal to the value which speculation gives to money.—*Wm. L. Heberling in The Index, Oct. 9th.*

## THE SIN OF USURY.

The sins of livery-stable keepers must not be allowed to serve as a shield for those of usurers. The real question at issue, I take it, is not whether this class or that class take more than cost, but whether taking more than cost is morally right. To quote Adam Smith in this connection is of no avail. The first two paragraphs of the fifth chapter of his *Wealth of Nations* contains a statement of principles which the profit-making system directly violates, and which is, in fact, a clear and complete refutation of all the rest of his book. He says: "The real price of everything, what everything really costs to the man who wants to acquire it, is the toil and trouble of acquiring it. What everything is really worth to the man who has acquired it and who wants to dispose of it, or wants to exchange it for something else, is the toil and trouble which it can save to himself, and which it can impose upon other people." This plainly conflicts with the profit-idea. After basing the right to take interest on the justice of profit and rent, you turn about, and base the latter on the former. The average rate of interest at any time is regulated by the average necessity of the borrowing class, which is just as cruel as to base it in any individual case upon individual necessity. But education you say is the proper remedy for poverty. To put the cart before the horse is anything but conducive to progress. People can't obtain education until they have something to buy it with. Any system which educates my neighbor's children at my expense, bears injustice on its very face.

We should exchange equal burdens, not equal benefits. If I possess an article which cost me only one day's labor, and which would be of great benefit to my neighbor, and he has another which he was a year in producing, and which would be of equal benefit to me, am I justified in making the exchange? In accordance with what code of morals can I justly claim one year of his time in return for one day of mine? To lose control over one's own labor is to become a slave. By what right may I subject him to three hundred and sixty-four days of slavery? *The right of might and that alone.* That compensation for risk is strictly equitable is certainly true, but that it forms any part of the ground on which interest *strictly defined* is based, is certainly not true. Webster defines interest as the "premium paid for the use of money." Pray, what has use to do with risk? Finally, you defend interest on the ground that a man has a right to charge for foregoing any use which he may have for the money he lends, *whether that use be legitimate or illegitimate.* O tempora! O mores!! What could be more barbarous than this? To commit highway robbery by means of a revolver is an illegitimate use to which to put that article, but, by such a principle as yours, the possessor of the revolver has a moral right to charge, when

lending it for sacrificing an opportunity of committing that crime. If *this* be Free Religion, put me down as a slave to the religion of the Bible, which, however tyrannical in its pretension, intolerant in its dogmas, and inhuman in its precepts, possesses at least this one redeeming virtue—that it does not justify human beings in owning more than they earn.—*Benj. R. Tucker in The Index Oct. 23rd.*

Before proceeding to answer your reply to my letter of Oct 10th, allow me to thank you for the many words in which it is couched, and to ask your acceptance of my apology for allowing my temper to get the better of my courtesy.

I know of none save the communists (and I think Mr. Heberling does not belong to that class) who oppose interest on any other ground than that it is a violation of the cost principle. If I am correct in this, your statement of the "question at issue" agrees with mine in spirit, if not in letter. If I am incorrect I acknowledge the force of your criticism.

Having reconsidered my thought, I fail to see that my interpretation of your language was an unfair one. I have often reflected on the proposition which you mention, but could never believe in it. I am anxious to become acquainted with the logic which says that the denial of one's right to own more than he earns, disestablishes his title to what he does earn.

I do oppose the public school system with all my heart. I oppose it as a communistic institution, and communism I utterly disbelieve in. If true republicanism is based on this institution (and I think it is), then true republicanism is destined and ought to die; and I shall be among the first to bid a most cheerful "farewell" to a system which seems to me the worst, because least responsible, of tyrannies (that of the majority), and which is only valuable as an indication of, and a stepping stone to, better things to come.

If my neighbor was in a position where he must make the exchange or die, then the "right of might" would plainly come in. Most business transactions differ from this only in degree, not in kind.—*Mr. Tucker in The Index Nov. 6th.*

**THE WORD,**  
PRINCETON, DECEMBER, 1873.

**THE INTEREST FRAUD.**

Our readers may think we have a malicious pleasure in reprinting, in its appropriate place, Mr. Abbot's elaborate defense of usury; for it is a damaging exposure of the intellectual and moral condition of the writer. Genius itself must fail in attempting to vindicate fraud while truth wins by the feeblest advocacy enabling "weak things to confound the mighty." So Messrs. Tucker and Heberling must not feel too much flushed with their victory. That Mr. Abbot has genuine ability his wrestlings with intrusive ecclesiasticism and his grand impeachment of Christianity give abundant evidence. Though otherwise he now defers to custom and authority he will ere long be loyal to equity and see his way to the defense of liberty as a principle.

It will be news to political economists that *profit is the basis of property*; for not one, from Aristotle to Amasa Walker, but would blush to be quoted in defense of this truly original idea. Since Adam Smith has been conscripted to appear on both sides we think he would like us to reprint another passage: "Labor was the first price the original purchase money paid for all things \*\*\* and is alone the ultimate and real standard by which their values can be estimated and compared" (*Wealth of Nations Vol. I Page 44, 48.*) Of course most modern writers on political economy, swayed by the vices of their times, have defended profits; but they have done so, as Mr. Tucker intimates, in direct violation of the essential principles of the science. Mr. Tucker is right in saying that our set do not believe in compulsory methods. While usury laws are inconsistent with

liberty and inoperative in practice, interest and profits, as did chattel slaveholding, exist by monopoly and coercion, being upheld by special legislative devices subversive of our Massachusetts Bill of Rights and the Common Law.

There never was a clearer indication of natural right than our demand for absolutely free trade in money. Granting Mr. Abbot's right to take interest, by what authority does he compel me to pay interest? For this is precisely the object of existing systems in forbidding competition by their merciless penalties. I do not believe he can find it in his heart or reason to continue to support what, by pure monopoly, hinders free enterprise and subjects the whole material interests of the people to the plundering instincts of the stock exchange. Mr. Abbot shares the common misapprehension of the great French labor reformer's property ideas which we shall explain in our next, by asking Proudhon to speak for himself.

The NEW BEDFORD CONVENTION reported on 4th page owes its decided success largely to our friend BENJ. R. TUCKER, at whose suggestion it was called, and without whose material and moral support so full a publication of labor reform ideas could not have been secured in that city. *The Springfield (Mass.) Republican* says the League "Marched up the hill and down again with no reported casualties"; but that smart daily may learn sometime that we are dealing with issues a little too serious to be trilled with. *The Evening Bulletin* the only (acknowledged) child of the *Providence* (R. I.) *Journal* concedes the truth of our main point in saying that "all property is founded on labor because all property is the result of labor," but thinks our deductions therefrom are fanatical and incendiary. Gov. Anthony called abolitionists "fanatics" until jumping to the winning side he floated into the Senate on the Anti-slavery wave. That all property not founded on a labor title is robbery is as logical a deduction from the generally admitted premise, that labor is the source of wealth as were Garrison's conclusions from "all men are born free and equal."

The *Journal* sees the point but will continue to slander us and our ideas as long as it pays to do so. *The Workingman's Advocate* of Chicago thinks the discussions of the League "are not without their advantages" but sees no "unity of purpose." Better acquaintance with its meetings, ideas and purposes will enable Mr. Cameron to criticize the League intelligently. Rejecting the majority swindle it declines to coerce the minority by votes, and rarely calls for a show of hands on its resolutions. If truth "makes us free" why browbeat others into accepting it? Seeking education, the agitation of thought which is the beginning of wisdom, the League has sufficient confidence and "unanimity" in its views to welcome all opponents to its platform and secure to them a respectful hearing. Its work, but just begun already indicates beneficent overturn in comparison with which all former revolutions are insignificant. Its members think it worth while to continue to stake time and money on the advocacy of ideas which, however radical they may seem to Mr. Cameron's trades-union constituency, are essentially true and becoming settled moral convictions in steadily increasing numbers of the American people.

In admonishing his friend Timothy to regard "the love of money as the root of all evil" it is not to be supposed that Lieutenant Christian Paul thought it bad to have cash in hand to pay one's debts; or that, having worked and earned value, loving to own the symbolic money representative of that value, is bad; for however much this first great expounder of Jesusism may have erred in matters theological his writings show a lively sense of equity and intelligent business habits which forbid us to put a foolish construction upon the above memorable passage. He probably meant to imply that to have, or to wish to have money without giving an honest equivalent for it is the source of perennial evil.

The Annual meeting of the Penna. Peace society was held Nov. 12th.

We print elsewhere notice of a National Free Love Convention to be held in Ravenna, Ohio, Dec. 7th. Our Methodist brethren and sisters who call sighs and groans and pious boo-hooing "love feasts" should go and listen to Francis Barry's explanation of the true thing. The one slave state, which Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation did not reach—the state of matrimony—will he brought to the bar of reason. We hope there will be a general attendance, for the questions of love and marriage demand intelligent and courageous examination.

—Thomas Haskell the late veteran reformer of West Gloucester Mass. was an old line antislavery worker who did not belittle himself into being an abolitionist merely. Retaining to the last an active interest in all phases of useful work he escaped the moral mummyhood which has befallen Garrison and lived until he died. We hope that he will verify his faith in spirit intercourse by letting us hear from him from the other side of Jordan.

—Joseph Arch, the reformed clergyman came to America as an emigrant agent seeking to locate English farm laborers here. Better export the royal family, the aristocracy and the clergy; and keep useful Englishmen at home. Mr. Arch is related to labor reform somewhat as Colonizationists were to negro emancipation.

—H. N. Powers of Leominster Mass., recently set for us one of Babcock's Wooden Pumps. It works so admirably well that we confidently recommend it to all. Letters by mail to Mr. Powers will receive prompt attention. He sets pumps on 30 days trial and asks no pay unless they give entire satisfaction.

—Count Chambord, the Bourbon aspirant to the French Throne says France will "survive because Christ loves her." This looks a little "promiscuous" because the Count loves her too, and then Jesus Christ is a Communist. We hope this love affair will not come to pistols between J. C. and the Count.

—Sir Charles Dilke is reported to have said that Mr. Bradlaugh does the thinking of more people than any other man in England. What he has said on the labor question since he came to this country indicates that Mr. B. seriously needs to do some thinking for himself.

—A CURSE FOR "PANICS"—Col. Greene's Mutual Banking advertised in another column. He shows that liberty and equity applied to finance would not only abolish interest on money but give the suffering millions now denied work useful and remunerative employment.

Morse's medallion of Josiah Warren is a fine work of art of especial value to those conversant with Mr. Warren's views, and also an admirable head for anybody to look at. Handsomely framed it is sold for \$5.00 by S. H. Morse 25 Bromfield St. Boston.

Attention of subscribers whose terms are about to expire is called to the advance payment clause of our Prospectus. We are so well pleased with existing patrons that we wish all to continue, and each one to bring a friend or two also.

The Co-operative Publishing Co. have issued a new edition of J. K. Ingall's "Land and Labor" advertised in another column. It is an able and scholarly work which needs only to be better known to be in general demand.

The *Boston Herald*, for a long time has headed its best remarks on this world's affairs "Men and Things"; the improvement of the Editor's daily sermon would be more lively if he should try "WOMEN and THINGS" a while.

O. B. Frothingham has taken to patronizing God who was in a sufficiently tight place before, having "indiscretions" enough to answer for without being made to father the pious abortions of this liberal priest.

—Ir. Rev. Mr. Talmage of Brooklyn, N. Y. says Jay Cooke is "one of God's picked men"; probably, for the Devil shows better judgement in selecting his partners.

**FORCED CONSENT.**

Abraham Lincoln did not cause the death of so many people from a more love of slaughter, but only to bring about a state of consent that could not otherwise be secured for the government he had undertaken to administer. When a government has once reduced its people to a state of consent—that is, of submission to its will—it can put them to a much better use than to kill them; for it can then plunder them, enslave them, and use them as tools for plundering and enslaving others. And these are the uses to which most governments, our own among the rest, do put their people, whenever they have once reduced them to a state of consent to its will. Andrew Jackson said that those who did not consent to the government he attempted to administer upon them, for that reason, were traitors, and ought to be hanged. Like so many other so-called "heroes," he thought the sword and the gallows excellent instrumentalities for securing the people's consent to be governed. The idea that, although government should rest on the consent of the governed, yet so much force may nevertheless be employed as may be necessary to produce that consent, embodies everything that was ever exhibited in the shape of usurpation and tyranny in any country on earth. It has cost this country a million of lives, and the loss of everything that resembles political liberty. It can have no place except as a part of a system of absolute military despotism. And it means nothing else, either in this country, or in any other. There is no half-way house between a government depending wholly on voluntary support, and one depending wholly on military compulsion. And mankind have only to choose between these two. In a government not depending wholly upon voluntary support, the people must always necessarily be divided into two classes—the class that governs, and the class that is governed or enslaved. In this case, the government rests wholly on the consent of the governors, and not at all on the consent of the governed. And whether the governors are more or less numerous than the governed, and whether they call themselves monarchists, aristocrats, or republicans, the principle is the same. The simple, and only material fact, in all cases, is, that one body of men are robbing and enslaving another. And it is only upon military compulsion that men will submit to be robbed and enslaved, it necessarily follows that any government, to which the governed, the weaker party, do not consent, must be (in regard to that weaker party), a merely military despotism. Such is the state of things now in this country, and in every other in which government does not depend wholly upon voluntary support. There never was and there never will be, a more gross, self-evident, and inexcusable violation of the principle that government should rest on the consent of the governed, than was the late war, as carried on by the North. There never was, and there never will be, a more palpable case of purely military despotism than is the government we now have.—*Lysander Spooner.*

—A. T. H. "has the culture shrug in his shoulders"

S. H. M., "Oh, no, you see that in business men."

A. T. H., "No we do not; business men have no time to be fixing up their shoulders. Emerson's manners are spontaneous and so well enough for him; but imitative manners are sillifying to people's intellects."

—Mr. & Mrs. A. R. TUCKER of New Bedford, have the especial thanks of E. H. & A. T. H. for generous hospitality during their stay in that city.

The Oneida Community are becoming converted to Spiritualism. The chief Jonah on board their ship, Jesus Christ, will go overboard ere long.

—In the Wallingford (Conn.) branch of the Oneida Community, girls are married "complexly," at fourteen, and boys at fifteen.

—Interest is most reasonably detested.—*Aristotle.*

WORKING GIRLS.

A bleaker and harder lot can hardly be pictured than that of the working girls of our city. They cannot dress according to the fashion or their own tastes. They cannot even make their own rooms neat and comfortable. They cannot choose their own associates. They are pushed and crowded together in the shop; they are herded together in unclean lodgings. Their food is often unwholesome. Good people shun them and the vulgar jeer at them on the street. They are made to feel that they belong to a pariah class, and every effort they make to rise in the world is met with obstacles hard to overcome. They need recreation, but cannot afford the time to take it. They want amusement but can afford none that is suitable. They naturally crave the society of the other sex, but this is full of perils, and such companionship subjects them to suspicion when it does nothing worse. There seems to be no bright and cheering outlook: nothing to make their hearts glad and their burdens easy; nothing for them but steady grind of toil that wears into the very bone and marrow of existence and consumes their life. And yet these young women have all the instincts and yearnings and possibilities of womanhood, and under other circumstances would be devoted wives and mothers, ornaments of society, benefactors of the race. Go into any of our lower streets between five and six o'clock at night and you shall see girls come from their long toil, weary and worn out, hungry and lonely, craving a sympathy and affection there is none to give them, who, under slightly altered conditions, would be the pride and ornament and joy of almost any household in the land. It is not surprising that, now and then, one of these girls is enticed and pushed across the line of virtue. The wonder is that so many keep themselves above reproach, and bloom and fade, like lilies in a pool, pure in the midst of corruption as the heaven that bends serene above their heads while they labor, and over their graves when they sleep.

The question is not one of gallantry, but of justice and humanity. The appeal is backed by every reason of policy, of health, of virtue, of good feeling. It is made for daughters and sisters, who cannot speak for themselves and have none to speak for them. It is made for future mothers, whose children will pay the terrible penalty of their overwork in weakened constitutions and premature death. The future of the world lies almost entirely with the women. Humanity depends upon motherhood. Somebody has said that those who are well born need no second birth. The mother class, the world over, is the working class.—*New York Daily Graphic.*

BLACKMAIL is the grand panacea for the responsible ills of male prostitution. Let us look at this bugbear, blackmail. If a woman appeals to a man to share but ever so lightly, the burden of his offspring the deeply injured creature brays out—blackmail! If a woman who has sacrificed family and friends for a base betrayer, finds herself on the verge of starvation and asks from him the clarity of a dollar, the unsuspecting innocent rushes to his friends for protection from blackmail! If a woman, in the strength of duty, strips the mask of hypocrisy from a clerical adulterer, newspaper men and their pack of libertines howl—blackmail! If the honest indignation of a noble woman nerve her to hold up for the malediction of society a christian cannibal, a thing who absolutely fattens on youth and innocence, and boasts that he gloats on female loveliness; a fiend blacker and more damnable than the devils of the infernal pit, we are told this brave woman is "an obscene huzzy," and the whole weight of the United States government is brought to bear to suppress a black-mailer! If an attempt to enforce the payment of a debt by a threat of a suit at law, I am a black-mailer! If I tell my neighbors there is a savage beast abroad who feeds on human flesh, I am a black-mailer!

A man to become the subject of black-

mail must have money; must have a respectable reputation which he prizes; must have some generosity and nobility of character, for it is only the noble and generous who are imposed on—you mean, unprincipled people, never. He cannot be wholly innocent for innocence affords no blackmail. Somebody must know of his frailties. Who are the ones likely to know? Women who keep assignation houses and brothels. Do you ever hear of their blackmailing? Clergy men, deacons and church members are in the power of these women, but do they ever betray these hypocritical sinners? It would be better for society if they did. It is only now and then, one, out of a thousand of men's victims, more cruelly treated than the rest, trodden on until even the worm turns, attacks the wretch who has rui ed her. There is no recorded instance of a woman's blackmailing a man on whom she has had no claim. If blackmail can force men to even a little right dealing with women then let us have blackmail. This blackmail dodge is the finestest sham ever held up as a cloak for vice. It has served the purpose of bad men to crush women long enough.—*Josephine McCarty.*

MOXEY is God, and all the people obey. Acquisitiveness rules, and all the powers of the being obey. Love, tenderness, charity, religion, all are the bond servants to this money-God, chained to his chariot wheels, crushed by his relentless tread, if they dare to put themselves in his way. So long as the money power is in the ascendancy, woman must of necessity be mercenary in her love; and if not naturally so, must be made and held so by force of circumstances; and in no way could this have been done so effectually as it has by making her subject to man in the matter of sex, and dependent on him for support and protection. Woman's whole being is subject to man, in the present order of society, just so far as that which constitutes her woman, affects her life or happiness. She must wait till man asks her to be his wife. She must not herself make a movement looking in that direction, or she is considered unwomanly; so she must wait her natural life alone, or accept something short of that which is recognized by society as marriage; and, if the latter then she is ostracized—shut up to the merchandise of herself for support. Man has control of the avenues of wealth, and will hold woman's wages to the lowest point possible; that is the wages of labor, while he uses the money that has been wrung from the virtuous woman's toil to pay for sexual gratification. We are rebels in the fullest sense of that word. We are determined to overthrow the ruling power, to dethrone it and to place the Christ of love, existing in woman's soul, upon the throne. That Christ who has worn the crown of thorns and had the wormwood and the gall pressed to the lips, through the ages of the past—has been crucified between the two thieves of marriage and prostitution till the very heavens are black with agony, and the veil of the temple of hypocrisy is being rent in tawin from the top to the bottom.—*Lois Waisbrooker.*

FREE LOVE. Time was when I had certain philanthropic ideas about relieving the condition of prostitutes, those who have been turned out of your homes and we must deal our heaviest blows at that condition of society which makes prostitution possible. All that we can do today is to open the doors of our houses of prostitution and say, "O, sisters, come forth and take your places by the bank directors, the men in the stock exchange and on Wall street, and in your business streets of Chicago; take your places by ministers in the pulpit, by the pew-openers in the church, by the sanctimonious hypocrite who fills the pew, ay, take your place as equal beside the man who visited you last night. I have no sympathy with vice, but right society—and when you have righted society, prostitution will cease, and the houses of prostitution will; with the churches and the priests, the prison, and the gallows be consigned to oblivion, or duly preserved

as relics of ignorance and darkness and beastial stupidity of the present hour. Never mind what they call you; what does it matter? If they call you a Free Lover, they couple together two of the divinest words in the English language—freedom, for which our forefathers fought and bled; love, the divinest element in humanity. Free Lovers should wear the name as a badge of the legion of Honor. I care not what men call me whether they call me prostitute or chaste because I have that in my soul that lies so high above the consideration of human approbation or disapproval that no word that you can hurl at me will ever make me less than I am to-day—the lover of humanity, whose soul is consecrated to the service of the hour, and sworn to work until every man and woman stands free from the miserable bondage of a false educational system.—*Laura Cuppy Smith.*

Our agricultural implement-makers to some extent, our makers of school-books, to a large extent, are apparently organized, and systematically overcharge and tax the farmer, who buys their products.

The sewing-machine manufacturers appear, either by agreement or an exorbitant royalty, generally assessed, to rob the whole commonwealth of vast sums in the shape of exorbitant profits. Our rail-road managers meet twice a year, or oftener and agree how much they will make the producer or consumer pay for the favor of freight. Our traders agree that one shall do the wholesale, and another the retail business; what the commission for selling shall be, and what the profits of each. Thus nearly every class of labor has a combination, more or less censurable, among its members, to arrest the free trade of supply and demand.

From capitalists to working men, combination succeeds combination, each looking to selfish ends. Beyond, and more powerful and dangerous than this, you will find nearly every man, be he insurance agent, railroad employe, mechanic, or runner, is part of a great corporation or company that strives to reach its powerful hand into every state and county of our land. He is part of a machine that commands his allegiance, not only in business, but in public influence, and often in votes.—*A Granger.*

Spiritualists and Free thinkers, believers in the doctrines of social freedom, are not followers of Victoria C. Woodhull, nor of Tennie C. Claflin, nor of Col. Blood—I don't wear their shoulder-straps, though I walk barefooted through hell for it. We are not following them but the idea of progress.—*Cephas B. Lyon.*

SOCIAL FREEDOM is one of the issues of Spiritualism, belonging to it for this reason; that society belongs to life, and life in society has a right to its natural instincts and to its upward growth. Years ago I walked on the suffrage platform before the Legislature, and have seen the legislators turn away, refusing to take notice. They told us you are only women; you have no right to vote. The mission of maternity is a most sacred and glorious one, and I believe that woman's life during the period that she is giving her offspring to the world, should be sacredly devoted to that mission as the nun devotes herself to the Church and her religion.—*Anna M. Middlebrook.*

It is impossible for me to live in the small compass of my own existence. I would be happier in living out the religion of Spiritualism than I could be in only serving God's premature angels. As I trace back the history of criminals, I reach the conclusion that their misfortunes were, in a great measure, owing to the characters that were born with them—to the ante-natal laws, of which we still know so little, and of which we ought to know so much. No longer will I be restrained in my discussion or researches into questions affecting the welfare of human souls by any feeling of false respectability.—*Addie L. Ballou.*

The time will soon come when to confess to shame at the mention of anything connected with sexuality will be virtually confess to having at some time committed some sexual act of which to be ashamed of.—*Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly.*

EMANCIPATION CONVENTION.

We invite all who desire the emancipation of Woman from the slavery of all institutions, laws or customs, which interfere in any manner or degree with her absolute freedom in any department of life, or in any sphere of activity, to meet at

RAVENNA O., on SUNDAY DEC. 7th 1873 TO ORGANIZE AN

AMERICAN WOMAN'S EMANIPATION SOCIETY.

Seward Mitchell, Maine, Parma W. Olmstead, Vt.; E. H. Heywood, Angela T. Heywood, Benj. R. Tucker, Moses Hull, Jennie Leys, A. B. Davis, J. S. Tilton, Mass.; Anna M. Middlebrook, C. S. Middlebrook, Conn.; Joseph Treat, Austin Kent, N. Y.; Anthony Higgins, Elvira Hull, N. J.; Annie E. Higby, Pa.; Lewis Morris, Md.; Sarah L. Tibbals, J. Q. Henck, Mary H. Henck, G. W. Gore, Va., C. M. Overton, Mary Overton, Oliver Stevens, V. F. Stevens, J. H. Philco, Helen Nash, Orson S. Murray, Ianthe P. Murray, Wm. A. Poor, L. M. R. Pool, A. Bailey, Sarah M. Day, Ann B. Spink, Frances P. Sutliff, Francis Barry, Ohio; Addie L. Ballou, Ind.; Sada Bailey, J. W. Ewarts, Franc P. Ewarts, J. F. Hollister, Ill.; Jonathan Walker, George Roberts, Mich.; Juliet H. Severance, C. L. James, Wis.; Warren Chase, Mo.; J. H. Cook, Kan.; Frances Rose Mackinley, Eleanor L. Lindsay, Cal.

Henry Ward Beecher astonished the Evangelical Alliance recently by uttering this pleasing little sentiment, "Now I had rather have been the prodigal son than his brother. He was too stung to get drunk. He was too cautious, too cold to sin lasciviously. He was going to heaven as a mummy." Make the very most of Woodhullism you can and Beecherism is bound to be ahead. Beecher declares in so many words that he would sooner be the man that spent his substance with harlots and in riotous living than the man who served with his father and avoided all these excesses.—*Morrison Ill. Independent.*

Thoreau seems to us a pert egotist, Hisconceit is something fearful. It is only met by the conceit of Margaret Fuller. "I now know all the people worth knowing in America, and I find no intellect comparable to my own," remarks the modest Margaret; whilst the placid Henry is satisfied with the prayer, "May I love and revere myself above all the gods that man ever invented." "God, I think thee that I am not as other men are, industrious, prosperous, humane," appears to be the burden of all his sayings and doings.—*B. in Commonwealth.*

Man alone will never give us an airline route out of hell. Thank heaven, the real Eve was born in the Spiritual paradise of twenty-five years ago. And oh, how a sense of justice filled my soul, and quickened it, even as a Frenchman's ear to the sound of the Marseillaise, as I saw my sisters upon the platform, hurling their broken chains back in the faces of the tyrants, bullies and pimps of society.—*Anthony Higgins Jr. in W. and C's Weekly.*

New York is heaving on the subject of holiness and of money. As money goes down holiness goes up. This great people among whom I circulate is full of the elements of heaven and hell. Those elements cannot long remain together. Heaven must begin on earth soon, or hell will.—*J. H. Noyes in 1837. GARD.*

I would warn all persons against believing the assertions contained in D. W. Hull's leader in no. 1 of HULL'S CAUCHE. The charges there made are false and unjust in every particular.

A. BRIGGS DAVIS, Formerly Ed. Baltimore Crucible. —A banker deserves death if he makes issues without having sufficient security to answer all demands.—*John Law.* —Charles Sumner thinks the science of government is immensely indebted to the old Greek dramatist Euripides. —E. D. Linton of Charleston, Mass. announces a Tract on the Money Question. —Owen Moore has run away Owing more than he can pay.

