

and this, too, without any opportunity of control or check from the minority? Nay, if the schools could survive high to meet the crisis, why should not any and every measure be taken, either to maintain an existing political party, or to recover a lost one, in a school district, or in a town, which has even been taken by unscrupulous politicians to maintain or to recover an ascendancy at the polls? Into a district, or into a town, voters may be introduced from the scale. An employer may dismiss the employed, for their refusal to submit to his dictation; or make the principle to be surrendered. And, beyond all this, if the imagination can conceive any thing more deplorable than a kind of political doctrines would be administered to the children, amid the vicissitudes of party domination,—emotions of triumph and defeat? This year, under the ascendancy of one side, the constitution declares one thing: mentaries, glosses, and the authority of distinguished names, all ratify and confirm its decisions. But victory is a goddess. Next year, the vanquished triumph; and constitution, gloss, and authority, make that sound doctrine, which was error before, and that false, which was true. Right and wrong have changed sides. The children must now join in the mean time, those great principles, which, according to Cicero, are the same at Rome and at Athens, the same and forever;—and which, according to Hooker, have their seat in the bosom of God, become the fittest emblems of change.

Long, however, before this series of calamities would exhaust itself upon our schools, these schools themselves are to be. The plough-share would have turned up their foundations. Their history would have been brought to a glorious and ascending history, until struck down by the hand of political parricide; then, suddenly falling with ruin,—with death, and with ignominy. But to avoid such a catastrophe, shall all teaching, relative to the nature of government, be banished from our schools; and shall our children be permitted to grow up in entire ignorance of the history of their country? In the schools of a republic, shall the children be left without any distinct knowledge of a republican government; or only with such knowledge as they may pick up from angry political discussions, from newspapers; from caucus speeches, or Fourth of July orations,—the Apocrypha of Apocrypha? Surely, between these extremes, there must be a medium not difficult to be found. And is not this the middle path all sensible and judicious men, all patriots, and all genuine republicans, must approve?—namely, that those the creed of republicanism, which are accepted by all, believed in by all, and which form the common basis of our faith, shall be taught to all. But when the teacher, in the course of his lessons or lectures on the fundamental law, controverted text, he is either to read it without comment or remark; or, at most, he is only to say that the passage is subject of disputation, and that the schoolroom is neither the tribunal to adjudicate, nor the forum to discuss it. Such being the rule established by common consent, and such the practice, observed with fidelity under it, it will be universally understood, that political proselytism is no function of the school; but that all indoctrination into controversy between hostile political parties is to be elsewhere sought for, and elsewhere imparted. Thus, may the youth of the Commonwealth receive instruction in the great essentials of political knowledge,—in those elements without which they will never be able to investigate more recondite and debatable questions;—thus, will the only method be adopted for discovering new truths, and for discarding,—instead of perpetuating,—old errors; and that pernicious race of intolerant zealots, whose whole faith may be summed up in two articles,—that they are always infallibly right, and that all dissenters are certainly wrong,—be extinguished,—extinguished, not by proscription, but by the more copious inflowing of the light of truth.

Does Horace Mann mean when he states that education is the "great equalizer of the conditions of men"?
According to Mann, what role does education play in the overall health of the Republic?

John Humphrey Noyes and Bible Communism (1845 and 1849)

Extreme examples of religious and reform movements were the planned "utopian" communities that emerged during this period. Shakers and transcendentalists and many others sought religious or political perfection in planned communities. John Humphrey Noyes, millennialist and perfectionist, began the perfection of the Christian upon conversion started, among others, the Putney Community. His particular ideas of mutual criticism, complex marriage and male continence were practices. After much criticism, he moved his community to Oneida, New York. Seen as a new Moses, Noyes believed that the second coming of Christ had occurred in 70 AD and that exclusiveness was idolatrous. In this document Noyes compares his ideas to the theology of Finney and advances his own ideas of millennialism and perfectionism.

John Humphrey Noyes, Speech to the Convention of Perfectionists (1845)

Dear Brethren:

As I am prevented from meeting with you in person I will place at your disposal a contribution to the delitations of the convention in writing.

My attention has been turned of late to the symptoms of advancing conviction on the subject of holiness which are manifesting themselves in the churches, and I see much occasion for rejoicing and hope. . . . Charles G. Finney, center of the revival spirit, was first affected and compelled to take an advanced position. He drew after him a large number of influential followers and a theological seminary. Now Dr. Beecher, the leader that stands next after Finney in spiritual power, has submitted partially to the truth; and he too draws after him a large body of influential followers and a theological seminary.

I am well aware that Finney and Beecher have not come in line with us and with the Primitive Church on the grounds of the new covenant. Their advance is but half way; but no hope and expectation are that the work of conviction will forward to conversion.

Let us now ask ourselves, brethren, what line of conduct is marked out for us. I will briefly give my judgment on the question. In the first place I think we ought to feel that the post assigned to us is that of the body-guard of the gospel. We must stand firm for perfect freedom from sin, for security, and for confession. These are the essentials of the new covenant. If we steadfastly abide by the gospel which proclaims these victories of faith, the masses that have begun to move will surely come to it at last.

In the next place we must purge our own ranks of semi-Perfectionism. I have seen many indications within the year, that there is a class bearing the name of Perfectionist claiming fellowship among us and even assuming to be independent leaders and teachers, who exert their influence more or less openly and directly against justification, security and confession of salvation from sin. Such men have no right to a place among us. They are not with us in spirit, but with the converted masses that are moving toward us. Let us draw the line between them and us, that we may fully discharge our responsibilities as God's banner-guard in the coming conflict.

Finally it behooves us to take away all stumbling-blocks from the path of those who are approaching the gospel to put away childish things; to frown on disorder, fanaticism and licentiousness; to give place among us as fast as possible to the order and discipline of the Primitive Church.

In the Kingdom of God, marriage does not exist. On the other hand there is no proof in the Bible nor in nature that the distinction of sex will ever be abolished. Matt. 22:29-30.

John Humphrey Noyes, "Bible Communism" (1849)

In the Kingdom of God the intimate union that in the world is limited to the married pair extends through the whole of communicants; without however excluding special companionships founded on special adaptability. John 17:21.

The situation on the day of Pentecost shows the practical tendency of heavenly influences. "All that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, as every man needed."

Communism on the day of Pentecost extended only to goods, it is true. But the same spirit that abolished property in goods would, if allowed full scope, abolish property in persons. Paul expressly places property in goods and property in persons in the same category, and speaks of them together as ready to be abolished by the Kingdom of God.

The Communism of the day of Pentecost is not to be regarded as temporary and circumstantial. The seed of heavenly unity fell into the earth and was buried for a time, but in the harvest at the second coming of Christ it was reaped and became the universal, eternal principle of the invisible church.

The abolishment of appropriation is involved in the very nature of a true relation to Christ. Appropriation is a branch of egotism. But the grand mystery of the gospel is vital union with Christ, which is the extinguishment of egotism at the center.

The abolishment of worldly restrictions on sexual union is involved in the anti-legality of the gospel. It is incompatible with the perfected freedom, toward which Paul's gospel of "grace without law" leads, that a person should be allowed to love in all directions, and yet be forbidden to express love except in one direction.

The abolishment of marriage is involved in Paul's doctrine of the end of ordinances. Marriage is a worldly ordinance. Christians are dead to the world by the death of Christ. The same reasoning which authorized the abolishment of the Jewish ordinances makes also an end of marriage. . . .

The plea that marriage is founded in nature will not bear investigation. Experience testifies that the human heart is capable of loving more than one at the same time. It is not the loving heart but the green-eyed claimant of the loving heart that sets up the one-love theory.

A system of Complex Marriage will open the prison doors to the victims both of marriage and celibacy: to the married who are oppressed by lust, tied to uncongenial nature separated from their natural mates; to the unmarried who are withered by neglect, diseased by unnatural abstinence, plunged into prostitution by desires that find no lawful outlet. . . .

The chain of evils which holds humanity in ruin has four links: first, a breach with God; second, a disruption of the sexes, involving a special curse on woman; third, oppressive labor, bearing specially on man; fourth, death. The chain of redemption begins with reconciliation with God, proceeds to a restoration of true relations between the sexes, then to a reform of the industrial system, and ends with victory over death.

It was the special function of the Apostolic Church to break up the worldly ecclesiastical system and reopen full communication with God. It is the special function of the present church, availing itself first of the work of the Apostolic Church by union with it and a re-development of its theology, to break up the worldly social system and establish true sexual and industrial relations.

From what precedes it is evident that no one should attempt to revolutionize sexual morality before settlement with God. Holiness, communism of love, association in labor, and immortality must come in their true order. . . .

Sexual shame is factitious and irrational. The more reform that arises from the sentiment of shame attempts hopeless war with nature. Its policy is to prevent pruriency keeping the mind in ignorance of sexual subjects, while nature is constantly thrusting those subjects upon the mind. The only way to elevate love is to clear away the false, debasing associations that usually crowd around it, and substitute true, beautiful ones.

The foregoing principles furnish motives for Association. They develop in a larger partnership the same attractions that draw and bind together a marriage partnership. A Community home, where love is honored and cultivated, will be much more attractive than an ordinary home as the Community outnumbers a pair. . . .

The men and women are called to usher in the Kingdom of God will be guided not merely by theoretical truth but by direct communication with the heavens, as were Abraham, Moses, David, Paul. This will be called a fanatical principle. But it is clearly a Bible principle, and we must place it on high above all others as the palladium of conservatism in the introduction of the new social order.

1. Summarize and explain Noyes' views regarding love and marriage?
2. How would Noyes' redefinition of human relations revolutionize society and industry in his opinion?

11-13 Sojourner Truth, Address to the Woman's Rights Convention, Akron, Ohio (1851)

Frances D. Gage, a pioneer in the Women's Rights Movement during the early nineteenth century, recorded her impressions of Sojourner Truth's speech at the Woman's Rights Convention in Akron, Ohio in 1851. Gage wrote this reminiscence some twelve years after the fact, and tried to capture Truth's speech as she remembered it, complete with what Gage perceived to be Truth's manner of speech and actions before the audience.

Source: E. C. Stanton, S. B. Anthony, and Matilda Joselyn Gage, eds., *History of Woman Suffrage*, vol. 1 (Rochester, NY: Charles Mann, 1881), pp. 115-117.

Reminiscences by Frances D. Gage

The leaders of the movement trembled upon seeing a tall, gaunt black woman in a gray dress and white turban, surmounted with an uncouth sun-bonnet, march deliberately into the church, walk with the air of a queen up the aisle, and take her seat upon the pulpit steps. A buzz of disapprobation was heard all over the house and there fell on the listening ear, "An abolition affair!" "Woman's rights and niggers!" "I told you so!" "Go it, darkey!" . . . When, slowly from her seat in the corner came Sojourner Truth, who, till now, had scarcely lifted her head. "Don't let her speak!" gasped half a dozen in my ear. She moved slowly and solemnly to the front, laid her old bonnet at her feet, and turned her great speaking eyes to me. There came a hissing sound of disapprobation above and below. I rose and announced "Sojourner Truth," and begged the audience to keep silence for a few moments. . . .

"Wall, chilern, whar dar is so much racket dar must be somethin' out o' kilter. I tink dat 'twixt de niggers of de Souf and de woinin at de Norf, all talkin' 'bout rights, de white men will be in a fix pretty soon. But what's all dis here talkin' 'bout?"

"Dat man ober dar say dat woinin needs to be helped into carriages, and lifted ober ditches, and to hab de best place everywhar. Nobody eber helps me into carriages, or ober mud-puddles, or gibs me any best place!" . . . "And a'n't I