

to the death, and for the reason that it is the
that afflicts humanity. We have no use for the
"age" but to apply it to the world-wide, time-
tem of prostitution, rapacity and murder; we
for the term "husband" but to describe a
"ravisher and baby-stealer; we have no use
a "wife" but to describe a slave and prostitute.
part of our mission to secure facilities for coward
rites to make their married state more comforta-
did "husband and wife" in securing a better sup-
magnetism." If, therefore, the name, "Woman's
tion Society," or "Anti-marriage Society," shall
clearly to indicate this spirit and these views, we
loft it.

FREE-LOVE COMMITTEE.

A, Ohio.

LETTER TO J. P. LLOYD.

Friend—Your letter in the WEEKLY of March 8
to me. We have so long been friends and co-
in this glorious cause, so dear to us both, that I
will bear with me while I criticize some points in
er somewhat plainly.

em to think the exposing of Henry Ward Beecher a
questionable propriety. I differ with you most em-
y. It is the best thing, in my opinion, that has been
y. John Brown captured Harper's Ferry. I confess
sympathize so deeply with the distinguished victim
revelations as you seem to. Perhaps he does de-
y that he is not more a man—that dishonesty and
ee enter so largely into his composition. But my
ies are all expended upon the millions of wretched
and children, the victims of an institution the most
I damning that ever cursed our otherwise happy
and which he might do more than any other man to
did his manhood equal his opportunities.

reference to Anthony Burns seems to me particularly
nnate. I see not the slightest resemblance between
cases. You say: "Each sought what was his right."
it in the case of Beecher. He had no right in the
cept to be true to his professions and his "marriage
tions." You know I have no reverence for marriage.
my boyhood I have hated it with unutterable hatred.
I had ever taken a woman's hand in love I had de-
it as a system of legalized prostitution. Since the
fteen I have not seen a moment I would not as soon
been guilty of any other gross violation of principle as
e entered the marriage relation, accepting the power
stitute a woman at will, and giving my influence to
an institution my soul abhorred.

my then, do I speak of Beecher's "marriage obliga-
"? Because I hold every man to his own standard.
y opinion one day of the week is as good as another.
yet, if a man professes to believe in the Sabbath and
pts as obligatory, as he must, the command: "Thou
not kindle any fire in all thy habitation," he shall not,
y consent, be let off just because he wants to be con-
table and enjoy a good warm meal. He shall eat his cold
ge" and warm his shins by rubbing them, or be de-
need for a hypocrite.

o of the married man. He has made his bed and let him
in it. If Beecher or any other man has got sick of mar-
ge, he knows there is a straight way out of it. But so
g as he has promised a woman to be "true" to her, so
g that promise (till annulled) is binding. And so long as
has proclaimed to the world his belief in the sanctity of
marriage, an I his purpose to uphold it by his precept and
ample, so long is he bound to be true to his professions, or
re is no such thing as moral obligation.

t is possible that there has been an understanding be-
een Mr. and Mrs. Beecher that each was to be free from
y restraint by the other. If so, then so far so good. As I
not know to the contrary, I will give him the benefit of the

RAVENNA, Ohio, March 16, 1873.

A PART OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

One hundred and sixty-two unmarried women of Lowell,
Mass. have been sufficiently awakened to the injustice upon
them of the operations of the laws of monogamic marriage,
and become bold enough to petition the Legislature of the
State to legalize polygamy. We should have been inclined
to the belief that there is a real earnestness behind this
petition if it did not bear upon its face the evidence of its
own refutation.

Since this petition was first made public—something more
than a month ago—we have taken some trouble to inquire
into the facts that lie behind it. We do not believe that the
petition originated from a desire on the part of these women
to be placed by law where they may demand a support from
men. Lowell women earn their own support, and do not
need a man for that purpose; but we do believe that the real
motive of the petitioners is to be legally permitted to exer-
cise their functions as women and mothers, but that they
attempt to hide this behind a petition which, to us, is more
abhorrent than so-called prostitution itself. But here is the
petition:

LOWELL, April, 1873.

To the Honorable the Senate and the House of Representatives
of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

The undersigned, citizens of the State, respectfully set
forth the grievances under which they suffer as women who
are not permitted to vote, hold any and all offices, and engage
in the occupations opened to men, and are otherwise re-
stricted in the opportunity of earning a living, and herewith
beg your permission to suggest the remedy for these evils,
upon which they pray your honorable body to act.

The law which now governs society says, practically, that
women should be married, should engage in work at their
own homes, and should look to their husbands for support.
On the other hand, the census shows that it is impossible to
carry out this unwritten but recognized law, for the reason
that there is a large excess of women in the commonwealth,
and many of the men of lawful age are idle, vicious, incom-
petent, or otherwise unfit to be the heads of households. Yet
your petitioners hold that the matter is not without remedy.
Prejudice and custom have decided in favor of restricting
the husband to a single wife, yet without justice and author-
ity, as we believe. In the Book which lies at the foundation
of all law recognized in this country, there is no injunction
against a plurality of wives, while there are many examples
therein recorded in its favor. Men's wives appear to have
increased in number in proportion with their flocks and
riches. Such a rule even now holds in the land from which
the Christian nations received their religion.

Your petitioners have no desire to interfere with the regu-
lations of any existing household, but simply to present
their claims to the marriage state for your respectful con-
sideration. They deem it their privilege and their duty to
suggest the abolition of the law against the marriage of a
man to more than one wife, in cases where the first wife does
not object and where it is made evident that the man is able
to support the additional burden laid upon his resources.
They are aware that it may take years to remove prejudices,
and that those who take a second or third place in the house-
hold may be looked upon with disfavor; but, confident that
their proposed action will ultimately do away with much of
the social evil that afflicts and distresses all communities,
they are willing to be the first to engage in the work of this
reform. Society, which now insists that woman shall be
married and look to her husband for support, will, after mu-
ture reflection, countenance this effort to carry out its laws
practically.

ENOUGH!"

FRANCIS BARRY.

let them regulate themselves
the necessity for some better
tion than is now dreamed of
rated in which women will
ent of their sex and thus of
to petition men to permit
of two or more wives by one
But we are rejoiced that
the courage to ask to be
third wives of men, if for n
tion of legislators to the
marriage is a terrible organ
and upon the theories, b
defend it, which logically
compel men to support we
but in spite of their hat
than prostitution, that it
respectability blush with

WORKINGMEN'S MASS
homes! Cheap gas! Cheap
operation! In the great li
day, May 17, 1873, at eigh
Church will address the
ments: James Connolly
bly; Isaac Wood, Presid
Bliss, President Packing
W. A. Casey, Bricklaye
graphical Union No. 6
and Workingwomen are
mission free.

THE
OR, THE R
THE OFFICIALS T
THE PRESIDENT
FROM THE

George Francis Trai
Commune! "The Ch
the Damned in the
epigrams on the dow
Preacher; written in
Dictator. A bombsh
great Grant-Tweed R
Press, giving names
Mobility, Beecher, T
Ass. Conspiracy.

Working
Start the
The only
Is imm
Down i
Wake u

ONE MILLION
Agents Wom

CAN MAKE

Book sent by Ma

Remit your Sta

Began, to

any way im-
BOLITIONISTS.
We war against
n and his com-
a. We propose
that it is the
e no use for the
world-wide, time-
and murder; we
to describe a
we have no use
and prostitute.
ities for coward
more comforta-
ing a better sup-
ame, "Woman's
e Society," shall
d these views, we
VE COMMITTEE.

D.
EELY of March 8
friends and co-
o us both, that I
ise some points in

ry Ward Beecher a
with you most em-
union, that has been
s Ferry. I confess
istinguished victim
perhaps he does de-
hat dishonesty and
mposition. But my
illions of wretched
stitution the most
ir otherwise happy
n any other man to
tunities.

ns to me particularly
esemblance between
what was his right."
had no right in the
as and his "marriage
verence for marriage.
h unutterable hatred,
and in love I had de-
stitution. Since the
t I would not as soon
ulation of principle as
accepting the power
eving my influence to
d.

g "marriage obliga-
to his own standard.
is as good as another.
e in the Sabbath and
ho command: "Thou

of marriage.
burned up, and its ashes cast to the four winds of heaven.
do not want slaveholders or slaves to be happy or comforta-
ble in their slavery or slaveholding. I want them to suffer
all that violated law and justice and right require. I
would have husbands and wives shut up in the hell of cor-
ruption and misery they have chosen for themselves and rec-
ommended to others, till in their agony they cry, "Enough!"
FRANCIS BARRY.

RAVENNA, Ohio, March 16, 1873.

A PART OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

One hundred and sixty-two unmarried women of Lowell, Mass., have been sufficiently awakened to the injustice upon them of the operations of the laws of monogamic marriage, and become bold enough to petition the Legislature of the State to legalize polygamy. We should have been inclined to the belief that there is a real earnestness behind this petition if it did not bear upon its face the evidence of its own refutation.

Since this petition was first made public—something more than a month ago—we have taken some trouble to inquire into the facts that lie behind it. We do not believe that the petition originated from a desire on the part of these women to be placed by law where they may demand a support from men. Lowell women earn their own support, and do not need a man for that purpose; but we do believe that the real motive of the petitioners is to be legally permitted to exercise their functions as women and mothers, but that they attempt to hide this behind a petition which, to us, is more abhorrent than so-called prostitution itself. But here is the petition:

LOWELL, April, 1873.

To the Honorable the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

The undersigned, citizens of the State, respectfully set forth the grievances under which they suffer as women who are not permitted to vote, hold any and all offices, and engage in the occupations opened to men, and are otherwise restricted in the opportunity of earning a living, and herewith beg your permission to suggest the remedy for these evils, upon which they pray your honorable body to act.

The law which now governs society says, practically, that women should be married, should engage in work at their own homes, and should look to their husbands for support. On the other hand, the census shows that it is impossible to carry out this unwritten but recognized law, for the reason that there is a large excess of women in the commonwealth, and many of the men of lawful age are idle, vicious, incompetent, or otherwise unfit to be the heads of households. Yet your petitioners hold that the matter is not without remedy. Prejudice and custom have decided in favor of restricting the husband to a single wife, yet without justice and authority, as we believe. In the Book which lies at the foundation of all law recognized in this country, there is no injunction against a plurality of wives, while there are many examples therein recorded in its favor. Men's wives appear to have increased in number in proportion with their flocks and riches. Such a rule even now holds in the land from which the Christian nations received their religion. Your petitioners have no desire to interfere with the regulated household, but simply to present

the law, we fail to see the right.
The true remedy for the evil set terrible one we know well enough, marriage, but to divorce law and ma the law its assumed right to domi let them regulate themselves; and the necessity for some better system than is now dreamed of, will, of rated in which women will be mad ent of their sex and thus of men. T to petition men to permit the law of two or more wives by one man.
But we are rejoiced that these the courage to ask to be permit third wives of men, if for nothing e tion of legislators to the fact tha marriage is a terrible organ of opp and upon the theories by which defend it, which logically are: tha compel men to support women, no but in spite of their hate—a degrad than prostitution that it should respectability blush with shame.

WORKINGMEN'S MASS MEETING
homes! Cheap gas! Cheap food! operation! In the great hall of t day, May 17, 1873, at eight o'clock Church will address the meeting ments: James Connolly, Preside bly; Isaac Wood, President W Bliss, President Packing-Box M W. A. Carsey, Bricklayers' Unio graphical Union No. 6. Trad and Workingwomen are cordial mission free.

THE PAGAN

OR, THE RELIGION

THE OFFICIALS TO BE IN

THE PRESIDENT OF THE

FROM THE TOMES

George Francis Train in H Commune! "The Chamber o the Damned in the Tombs," epigrams on the downfall of Preacher; written in his fou Dictator. A bombshell amon great Grant-Tweed Republic Press, giving names and a Mobiliar; Beecher, Tilton, C Ass. Conspiracy.

Workingmen's P
Start the battle

The only thing

Is included in

WEEKLY of March 8
een friends and coar
to us both, that I
criticise some points in
Henry Ward Beecher a
ffer with you most em
opinion, that has been
per's Ferry. I confess
e distinguished victim
Perhaps he does de
—that dishonesty and
composition. But my
ne millions of wretched
in institution the most
our otherwise happy
than any other man to
opportunities.
seems to me particularly
t resemblance between
ght what was his right."
He had no right in the
sious and his "marriage
reverence for marriage,
with unutterable hatred,
hand in love I had de
prostitution. Since the
nent I would not as soon
violation of principle as
on, accepting the power
giving my influence to
rred.
her's "marriage obliga
to his own standard.
k is as good as another.
ieve in the Sabbath and
the command: "Thou
habitation," he shall not,
use he wants to be com
eal. He shall eat his cold
rubbing them, or be de
made his bed and let him
man has got sick of mar
ht way out of it. But so
to be "true" to her, so
binding. And so long as
s belief in the sanctity of
hold it by his precept and
e true to his professions, or
obligation.
on an understanding be
each was to be free from
then so far so good. As I
I give him the benefit of the

petition originated from
to be placed by law where they may demand a support from
men. Lowell women earn their own support, and do not
need a man for that purpose; but we do believe that the real
motive of the petitioners is to be legally permitted to exer
cise their functions as women and mothers, but that they
attempt to hide this behind a petition which, to us, is more
abhorrent than so-called prostitution itself. But here is the
petition:

LOWELL, April, 1873.

To the Honorable the Senate and the House of Representatives
of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

The undersigned, citizens of the State, respectfully set
forth the grievances under which they suffer as women who
are not permitted to vote, hold any and all offices, and engage
in the occupations opened to men, and are otherwise re
stricted in the opportunity of earning a living, and herewith
beg your permission to suggest the remedy for these evils,
upon which they pray your honorable body to act.

The law which now governs society says, practically, that
women should be married, should engage in work at their
own homes, and should look to their husbands for support.
On the other hand, the census shows that it is impossible to
carry out this unwritten but recognized law, for the reason
that there is a large excess of women in the commonwealth,
and many of the men of lawful age are idle, vicious, incom
petent, or otherwise unfit to be the heads of households. Yet
your petitioners hold that the matter is not without remedy.
Prejudice and custom have decided in favor of restricting
the husband to a single wife, yet without justice and author
ity, as we believe. In the Book which lies at the foundation
of all law recognized in this country, there is no injunction
against a plurality of wives, while there are many examples
therein recorded in its favor. Men's wives appear to have
increased in number in proportion with their flocks and
riches. Such a rule even now holds in the land from which
the Christian nations received their religion.

Your petitioners have no desire to interfere with the regu
lations of any existing household, but simply to present
their claims to the marriage state for your respectful con
sideration. They deem it their privilege and their duty to
suggest the abolition of the law against the marriage of a
man to more than one wife, in cases where the first wife does
not object and where it is made evident that the man is able
to support the additional burden laid upon his resources.
They are aware that it may take years to remove prejudices,
and that those who take a second or third place in the house
hold may be looked upon with disfavor; but, confident that
their proposed action will ultimately do away with much of
the social evil that afflicts and distresses all communities,
they are willing to be the first to engage in the work of this
reform. Society, which now insists that woman shall be
married and look to her husband for support, will, after ma
ture reflection, countenance this effort to carry out its laws
practically.

respectability dust with
WORKINGMEN'S MASS MEETING
homes! Cheap gas! Cheap food! C
operation! In the great hall of the
day, May 17, 1873, at eight o'clock.
Church will address the meeting.
ments: James Connolly, Presiden
bly; Isaac Wood, President Work
Bliss, President Packing-Box Mak
W. A. Carsey, Bricklayers' Union
graphical Union No. 6. Trades
and Workingmen are cordially
mission free.

THE PAGAN

OR, THE RELIGION OF

THE OFFICIALS TO BE IND

THE PRESIDENT OF THE A

FROM THE TOMBS TO

George Francis Train in Hell
Commune! "The Chamber of
the Damned in the Tombs." A
epigrams on the downfall of C
Preacher; written in his fourte
Dictator. A bombshell among
great Grant-Tweed Republican R
Press, giving names and anou
Mobiliery; Beecher; Tilton, Col
Ass. Conspiracy.

Workingmen! Pay
Start the battle! G
The only thing to s
Is immediate repub
Down with the Par
Wake up, people!

ONE MILLION COPIES

Agents Wanted from all

CAN MAKE TWENTY-F

Book sent by Mail—Retail 1

Fifteen Dells

C. O

Remit your Stamps for the C

Began, to

WOODH

ability between
recognize the fact
his public profes-
outside of marriage
ilty of teaching a

er has no right to
believe in the in-
in the Catholic
same as the other
no claim whatever,
e moment after she
till then, so long as
s remains, so long

at least so long as
ans upon her shoul-
t best. Her way is
oman must be tried
n, and she oftener
rs. Tilton, could my
o her in a cloud of
ting her out utterly
s world. I have an
ous woman.

's admission that she
life to make a point
ke any apology. She
one by Beecher what
o an exposure which
Until Beecher avows
l, he has no right to
edom, and deserves to
ail himself of them.
on the old rotten tree
the roots and utterly
ar winds of heaven. I
be happy or comfort-
I want them to suffer
nd right require. I
up in the hell of cor-
for themselves and rec-
y they cry, "Enough!"

FRANCIS BARRY.

PROBLEM.

ried women of Lowell,
ed to the injustice upon
monogamic marriage,
the Legislature of the
ould have been inclined
earnestness behind this
face the evidence of its
public—something more
ome trouble to inquire
e do not believe that the
the part of these women
demand a support from
yn support, and do not
e do believe that the real
egally permitted to exer-

It is far from the design of your petitioners to ask legisla-
tion in behalf of Free Love or any loosening of the marriage
bond. We ask that the marriage of the second wife shall be
made as binding and permanent as that of the first, and that
all the children of the household shall have equal honor. And
in asking this, we believe that we have taken a long step to-
ward doing away with foundling asylums, preventing anti-
natal murders and lessening the vagabond child population
of our large cities.

For the reasons enumerated, your petitioners respectfully
ask the passage of a law permitting plural marriage in the
cases above enumerated, and under such other conditions as
to your judgment shall seem wise and proper.

And your petitioners will ever pray, etc., etc.

In our view this petition bears the evidence of individual
weakness. If it be not right for these women to have what
they require without the law; if in their own proper persons
they are not entitled to make any contract with any man
whom they choose, how can the law invest them with it?
We would advise unmarried women wanting husbands, in-
stead of petitioning men to grant them what has already
been granted them by their Creator, to go forward and assert
their rights by taking them. Are any of these petitioners
simple enough to imagine that any "first wife" will not ob-
ject to there being a second? Were such a law as they ask
enacted, it would be inoperative if it contained this pro-
vision. To be of any account at all it must ignore totally
that the first or any other wife has any right to raise any ob-
jection and recognize what really is now the fact, that men
are supreme, being above all law as to marriage.

Why do not these women make arrangements without
waiting for a law, with men whose wives will make no ob-
jection? and thus assert their right to do so? The reason
undoubtedly is, that it would subject them to moral death;
but we fail to see wherein the law can have any really saving
influence when a wrong thing is involved. If it be not right
for a man to have two or more wives without the consent of
the law, we fail to see that the law can invest him with that
right.

The true remedy for the evil set forth, and that it is a
terrible one we know well enough, is not to legalize plural
marriage, but to divorce law and marriage; take away from
the law its assumed right to dominate the affections and
let them regulate themselves; and when once this is done,
the necessity for some better system of industrial organiza-
tion than is now dreamed of, will, of a necessity, be inaugu-
rated in which women will be made pecuniarily independ-
ent of their sex and thus of men. Then women will not have
to petition men to permit the law to sanction the support
of two or more wives by one man.

But we are rejoiced that these Lowell women have had
the courage to ask to be permitted to be the second and
third wives of men, if for nothing else than to call the atten-
tion of legislators to the fact that the present system of
marriage is a terrible organ of oppression, even in the sense
and upon the theories by which its apologists attempt to
defend it, which logically are: that marriage is necessary to
compel men to support women, not on account of their love,
but in spite of their hate—a degradation to us so much lower
than prostitution that it should make even the pretense to
respectability blush with shame.

WORKINGMEN'S MASS MEETING.—Rapid transit! Cheap
homes! Cheap gas! Cheap food! Government employ! Co-
operation! In the great hall of the Cooper Institute, Satur-
day, at eight o'clock. Osborne Ward and S. E.

compatibility between
recognize the fact
his public profes-
outside of marriage
guilty of teaching a

er has no right to
t believe in the in-
ve in the Catholic
same as the other
no claim whatever,
o moment after she
till then, so long as
s remains, so long

at least so long as
ens upon her shoul-
t best. Her way is
oman must be tried
up, and she oftener
Mrs. Tilton, could my
p her in a cloud of
ting her out utterly
s world. I have an
ous woman.

's admission that she
life to make a point
ke any apology. She
one by Beecher what
e an exposure which
Until Beecher avows
1, he has no right to
edom, and deserves to
rail himself of them.
oon the old rotten tree
the roots and utterly
ur winds of heaven. I
be happy or comforta-
I want them to suffer
nd right require. I
up in the hell of cor-
for themselves and rec-
y they cry, "Enough!"
FRANCIS BARRY.

PROBLEM.

ried women of Lowell,

It is far from the design of your petitioners to ask legisla-
tion in behalf of Free Love or any loosening of the marriage
bond. We ask that the marriage of the second wife shall be
made as binding and permanent as that of the first, and that
all the children of the household shall have equal honor. And
in asking this, we believe that we have taken a long step to-
ward doing away with foundling asylums, preventing anti-
natal murders and lessening the vagabond child population
of our large cities.

For the reasons enumerated, your petitioners respectfully
ask the passage of a law permitting plural marriage in the
cases above enumerated, and under such other conditions as
to your judgment shall seem wise and proper.

And your petitioners will ever pray, etc., etc.

In our view this petition bears the evidence of individual
weakness. If it be not right for these women to have what
they require without the law; if in their own proper persons
they are not entitled to make any contract with any man
whom they choose, how can the law invest them with it?
We would advise unmarried women wanting husbands, in-
stead of petitioning men to grant them what has already
been granted them by their Creator, to go forward and assert
their rights by taking them. Are any of these petitioners
simple enough to imagine that any "first wife" will not ob-
ject to there being a second? Were such a law as they ask
enacted, it would be inoperative if it contained this pro-
vision. To be of any account at all it must ignore totally
that the first or any other wife has any right to raise any ob-
jection and recognize what really is now the fact, that men
are supreme, being above all law as to marriage.

Why do not these women make arrangements without
waiting for a law, with men whose wives will make no ob-
jection? and thus assert their right to do so? The reason
undoubtedly is, that it would subject them to moral death;
but we fail to see wherein the law can have any really saving
influence when a wrong thing is involved. If it be not right
for a man to have two or more wives without the consent of
the law, we fail to see that the law can invest him with that
right.

The true remedy for the evil set forth, and that it is a
terrible one we know well enough, is not to legalize plural
marriage, but to divorce law and marriage; take away from
the law its assumed right to dominate the affections and
let them regulate themselves; and when once this is done,
the necessity for some better system of industrial organiza-
tion than is now dreamed of, will, of a necessity, be inaugu-
rated in which women will be made pecuniarily independ-
ent of their sex and thus of men. Then women will not have
to petition men to permit the law to sanction the support

last so long as
on her shoul-
t. Her way is
must be tried
and she oftener
lton, could my
in a cloud of
er out utterly
ld. I have an
man.

mission that she
to make a point
y apology. She
y Beecher what
exposure which
Beecher avows
has no right to
, and deserves to
nself of them.
e old rotten tree
oots and utterly
ads of heaven. I
ppy or comforta-
nt them to suffer
ght require. I
n the hell of cor-
emselves and rec-
ery, "Enough!"
FRANCIS BARRY.

PROBLEM.

women of Lowell,
the injustice upon
ogamic marriage.
Legislature of the
have been inclined
stness behind this
the evidence of its
—something more
trouble to inquire
ot believe that the
art of these women
und a support from
upport, and do not
believe that the real
permitted to exer-
thers, but that they
hich, to us, is more
ff. But here is the

WELL, April, 1873.
e of Representatives

te, respectfully set
uffer as women who
ll offices, and engage
d are otherwise re-
living, and herewith
for these evils.

weakness. If it be necessary, they require without the law; if in their own proper persons they are not entitled to make any contract with any man whom they choose, how can the law invest them with it? We would advise unmarried women wanting husbands, instead of petitioning men to grant them what has already been granted them by their Creator, to go forward and assert their rights by taking them. Are any of these petitioners simple enough to imagine that any "first wife" will not object to there being a second? Were such a law as they ask enacted, it would be inoperative if it contained this provision. To be of any account at all it must ignore totally that the first or any other wife has any right to raise any objection and recognize what really is now the fact, that men are supreme, being above all law as to marriage.

Why do not these women make arrangements without waiting for a law, with men whose wives will make no objection? and thus assert their right to do so? The reason undoubtedly is, that it would subject them to moral death; but we fail to see wherein the law can have any really saving influence when a wrong thing is involved. If it be not right for a man to have two or more wives without the consent of the law, we fail to see that the law can invest him with that right.

The true remedy for the evil set forth, and that it is a terrible one we know well enough, is not to legalize plural marriage, but to divorce law and marriage; take away from the law its assumed right to dominate the affections and let them regulate themselves; and when once this is done, the necessity for some better system of industrial organization than is now dreamed of, will, of a necessity, be inaugurated in which women will be made pecuniarily independent of their sex and thus of men. Then women will not have to petition men to permit the law to sanction the support of two or more wives by one man.

But we are rejoiced that these Lowell women have had the courage to ask to be permitted to be the second and third wives of men, if for nothing else than to call the attention of legislators to the fact that the present system of marriage is a terrible organ of oppression, even in the sense and upon the theories by which its apologists attempt to defend it, which logically are: that marriage is necessary to compel men to support women, not on account of their love, but in spite of their hate—a degradation to us so much lower than prostitution that it should make even the pretense to respectability blush with shame.

WORKINGMEN'S MASS MEETING.—Rapid transit! Cheap homes! Cheap gas! Cheap food! Government employ! Co-operation! In the great hall of the Cooper Institute, Saturday, May 17, 1873, at eight o'clock. Osborne Ward and S. F. Church will address the meeting. Committee of Arrangement: James Connolly, President States' Trades' Assembly; Isaac Wood, President Workingmen's Union; George Bliss, President Packing-Box Makers and Sawyers' Union; W. A. Carsey, Bricklayers' Union No. 2; John Wood, Typographical Union No. 6. Trades Unionists, Workingmen and Workingwomen are cordially invited to attend. Admission free.

THE PAGAN BIBLE:

OR, THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

FOR MURDER.