

which will bring about a state of things described in very glowing colors by the author, but which he very wisely puts in the far distant future. Mr. Ruedebusch writes with much feeling, and says many sensible things in his 26 chapters; but he handles his subject in such very plain style, and takes up in some cases such unnecessary and offensive subjects (as in ch. 19), that his work will be decidedly objectionable to many people. He is a "varietist," and characterizes the present ideas of women in favor of monogamy as "a morbid craving which brings unhappiness to her and others, and of which we will try to cure her." We are inclined to think the task thus set for himself and his fellow Free Lovers is a pretty heavy one. Unquestionably, with all its drawbacks, monogamy presents for the mass of women such undoubted advantages, that the difficulty is to convince them that a change would be for their material advantage or their greater happiness. The marriage laws, too, are not felt by the well-intentioned and ordinarily sensible people to be in any way harsh or tyrannical, and with the amendments before hinted at would be acceptable to all but the anarchist, to whom all law is objectionable. The arguments in favor of "Variety" we look upon as simply the outcome of a morbid and abnormal mind.

"What the Young Need to Know; a Primer of Sexual Rationalism," by E. C. Walker (10 cts.; M. Harman, 1394 Congress St., Chicago), is another work in favor of the Free Love or Varietist view of sex relationship. It is not difficult for Mr. Walker, any more than for Mr. Ruedebusch, to show the evil effects of religious asceticism on the ideas and customs of modern nations. As a matter of fact, the arguments of these gentlemen would show that, in their ideas of modesty and chastity, the whole of the civilized world is lamentably out of date. The important fact seems to be, that to upset those notions, which are deeply rooted in the whole mentality and environments of the masses of both sexes, is a task for which the available resources appear absurdly unequal. This would not affect the validity of the arguments, of course, if it could be shown that the object to be attained was a legitimate outcome of the method advocated. Here, however, we beg leave to differ with both the writers. We advocate the utmost amount and the most rapid extension of freedom that are possible under present circumstances, but we cannot blink the fact that the great bulk of the people in every so-called civilized country are far from being fitted for self-government, and need marriage laws as well as other laws. To postulate an ultimate Utopia as the outcome of a reversal of our present marriage ideals is simply Quixotic.

But it is contended that, if all restrictions were abolished, and women and men were at perfect liberty to make or break their marital partnerships—to "go sloshing around," as friend Moore, of the *Blue Grass Blade* describes it—and to enter into temporary or permanent marriages as they chose (and this, to some extent, they can do now), the fittest couples would mate, and the race would be improved, as breeds of cattle are improved by artificial selection. The basis of