

the one to which we have the greatest devotion is that which will cut away popular errors and thereby improve the health and happiness of the human family. Unless we greatly mistake ourselves, and unless we are greatly self-deceived, we have always felt more interest in this matter than we have in making dollars and cents. Our intimate friends charge us with this and often upbraid us for not regarding more closely our maternal interests. If building up ourselves and achieving material prosperity had been our main object during the nearly thirty years of our professional career, we could have acquired a colossal fortune. Others working in this line with only this object in view have done it. But, from the very beginning of our professional life we have placed ourselves in a position to be in continual conflict with popular prejudices, and have consequently been ever rowing against the tide. We have always been the under dog in every fight, and unfortunately we seem to always have a fight of some kind on hand, for there are constantly new live issues arising to engage the attention of those disposed to labor for the general good.

Have we made a Political Mistake?

An old whilom democratic friend, whose name in this connection we hardly feel at liberty to use without his permission, in the course of a lengthy, friendly letter upon the exclusion of *THE HEALTH MONTHLY* from the privileges of the second class, says:

"It pains my heart to think that the good republican government which you worked so hard for many years to plant in this country should ripen out as one of the most illiberal governments in the world, but such is the fact. This is the proof that many a time a person plants thistles when he thinks he is putting in peas; and if I may venture to croak just a little, permit me to say that years ago when I was doing something in the way of mild criticism against republican demagogues forming the base of the party, that I was not altogether out of the way."

If in the columns of a health journal we may be for a moment permitted to touch on politics, we would say that we carried the torch for the now dominant political party when a boulder from a border democrat put out our light; we openly sympathized with John Brown on the gallows when many of those who now hold high political positions said he was crazy; our house and office during the memorable July riot was marked for destruction by the anti-Negro mob. Not being able to leave our professional work during the war for the union, we voluntarily paid a bounty of about \$1000 to a physically stronger man to represent us on the field. In every presidential canvass from Fremont to Hayes we zealously supported the republican party. We (the Senior) voted for Mr. Hayes. During the late canvass our Liberal leader, the life-long abolitionist, the veteran republican, the brave champion of free speech, free press and free mails—the Hon. ELIZUR WRIGHT—passed the watchword along the lines that our cause was safer in the hands of Gen. Hancock, and we with thousands of others among the liberal ranks cast our vote for the worthy but defeated General. We always entertained a high opinion of Gen. Garfield; freely expressed it as our opinion that the convention which nominated him could not have made a better selection, and we remembered well the position he took in 1876 against granting further powers to Anthony Comstock and the vice society when further amendments to the postal bill were under consideration. But when our worthy chief had looked the ground over and gave us his opinion that we could expect more from Gen. Hancock than we could from Gen. Garfield, we kept step with the other "high privates" in the ranks. We do not regret it. Do not indeed regret that we did all we could for the republican party when it was a party of progressive ideas. Others may now gather the fruit which ripens earlier on old and decaying trees, and we will move on with the pioneers who are more devoted

to principles than to spoils. The democratic party may never again receive our vote. Day by day the ranks of those who advocate free speech, free press and free mails are growing. Their votes will be given to the man and to the party which holds out the best promise of upholding the American idea. Had we held on to the party which has always before received our vote, we feel sure we could have brought influences to bear on the postal department which would have secured our rights as publishers. But, as our principles and votes are not in the market, and cannot be had for anything that brings money, position or even personal comfort, we are resigned if not content, and conscience approves if expediency condemns for the course we have pursued politically. "John Brown's body lies mouldering in the ground, but his soul goes marching on."

Convention at Princeton.

ON the 28th, 29th, and 30th ult., there was a convention of the Union Reform League at the Town Hall in Princeton, Mass. Princeton is the home of the Heywoods. Mr. and Mrs. Heywood were among the speakers, and all phases of progress were considered, and a demand made for the unconditional repeal of the Comstock law and all restrictions on thought.

A Censorship Impracticable.

SOMEbody in Boston has been making complaint of the immoral character of many of the novels found in the public library. He thinks these trashy things should be excluded. The trustees on the other hand reply that they must furnish such books as the public demand; that the fault is with the public; and that it is not a little difficult to decide what is a decidedly immoral book, so much depending upon the reader and so little upon the book itself. The *Tribune*, in making editorial comment upon the subject, remarks that "what might hurt one reader another might find wholesome or at least harmless." This conservative paper further says, "that as public libraries are constituted, the question of censorship once raised would blow up the whole concern," referring of course to the public library at the Hub. The same paper proceeds to comment thus: "If we are to have the libraries, we must run certain risks; and, after all, the question of moral or immoral reading, having taken care of itself ever since the invention of printing, possibly may be left safely to take care of itself at this time when we have so many public schools, to say nothing of our numerous churches."

Now this argument will apply just as well to the United States mails as to the public libraries. It indeed would be safer to undertake to institute a censorship over the libraries than to continue the present censorship over the mails. It might be urged that a community in which a library is located would have a right to say what should and what should not be admitted. But with the diverse opinions of individuals and communities scattered over the states and territories of the entire Union, it becomes a difficult matter to say what shall be refused mail facilities, the United States mail being a public carrier, supported by all the people of the United States, who have an unquestioned right to enjoy impartial facilities in the use of it.

(FROM THE "TRUTH SEEKER.")

Mr. Preston and the "Health Monthly."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRUTH SEEKER, Sir: In a recent issue of your paper our mutual friend, Mr. Preston, kindly made mention of my difficulties with the Postal Department in attempting to get the *HEALTH MONTHLY* readmitted at the rates of the second class, or, in other words, at the usual publishers' rates. In that communication he remarked that a retainer of \$50 had been paid to counsel in behalf of the *HEALTH MONTHLY* by the Defense Association, and expressed the hope that the Liberals would make up to me any losses I might sustain by having to pay the full rates of postage. In order that there may be no misunderstanding in regard to this matter, let me say:

At the outset of the trouble, when Dr. Chase, Dr. Kinget, and myself were all in the same boat, the *Physiologist* excluded entirely, and the *Health Journal* and the *HEALTH MONTHLY* thrown into the third class, it was proposed to make a test case of Mrs. Dr. Chase's, and I pledged \$25 to the Chase Fund. Of the moneys contributed to the Chase Fund \$50 were placed in the hands of an attorney as a retainer. The intention was to commence an action against the postal authorities if the order respecting the *Physiologist* should not be rescinded. Before any litigation was commenced, the postal officials, doubtless perceiving that they had overstepped the mark, re-