

WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY.

PROGRESS! FREE THOUGHT! UNTRAMMELED LIVES!

BREAKING THE WAY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

VOL. 4.—No. 12.—WHOLE No. 90.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 3, 1872.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

JOHN J. CISCO & SON, BANKERS, No. 59 Wall Street, New York.

Gold and Currency received on deposit, subject to check at sight.

Interest allowed on Currency Accounts at the rate of Four per Cent. per annum, credited at the end of each month.

ALL CHECKS DRAWN ON US PASS THROUGH THE CLEARING-HOUSE, AND ARE RECEIVED ON DEPOSIT BY ALL THE CITY BANKS.

Certificates of Deposit issued, payable on demand, bearing Four per Cent. interest.

Loans negotiated.

Orders promptly executed for the Purchase and Sale of Governments, Gold, Stocks and Bonds on commission.

Collections made on all parts of the United States and Canada.

RAILROAD IRON, FOR SALE BY S. W. HOPKINS & CO., 71 BROADWAY.

CALDWELL & CO., BANKERS, 27 Wall St., New York.

Order for Purchase and Sale of United States Securities, Stocks, Bonds and American Gold promptly executed at the usual commission.

Collections promptly made in all parts of the United States and Canada.

Interest, 4 per cent., allowed on deposits, subject to sight draft.

NATIONAL SAVINGS BANK. THE FREEDMAN'S SAVINGS AND TRUST COMPANY.

(Chartered by the Government of the United States.)
DEPOSITS OVER \$3,000,000.

185 BLEECKER STREET, NEW YORK.

SIX PER CENT. interest commences first of each month.

Four per cent. allowed from date of each deposit for full number of days, not less than thirty, on sums of \$50 and upward, withdrawn before January.

DEPOSIT CERTIFICATES, as safe as Registered Bonds, and promptly available in any part of the United States, issued, payable on demand, with interest due.

Accounts strictly private and confidential.

Deposits payable on demand, with interest due.

Interest on accounts of certificates paid by check to depositors residing out of the city if desired.

Send for Circular.

Open daily from 9 A. M. to 5 P. M., and MONDAYS and SATURDAYS from 9 A. M. to 8 P. M.

JOHN J. ZUILLE, Cashier.

NEW YORK SAVINGS BANK, Eighth Ave., cor. Fourteenth St. SIX PER CENT. INTEREST allowed on all sums from \$5 to \$5,000. Deposits made on or before August 1 will draw interest from August 1. Assets, \$2,473,303 05. Surplus, \$300,272 95.

S. J. & F. BEEBEE, BROKERS, IN GOLD, STOCKS & BONDS No. 7 NEW STREET, NEW YORK.

OSBORN & CAMMACK, BANKERS, No. 34 BROAD STREET.

STOCKS, STATE BONDS, GOLD AND FEDERAL SECURITIES, bought and sold on Commission.

BANKING HOUSE OF HENRY CLEWS & Co., No. 32 Wall Street, N. Y.

Letters of Credit for travelers, also Commercial Credits issued, available throughout the world.

Bills of Exchange on the Imperial Bank of London, National Bank of Scotland, Provincial Bank of Ireland, and all their branches.

Drafts and Telegraphic Transfers on Europe, San Francisco, the West Indies and all parts of the United States.

Deposit accounts received in either Currency or Coin, subject to check at sight, which pass through the Clearing-House as if drawn upon any city bank; 4 per cent. interest allowed on all daily balances; Certificates of Deposit issued; Notes, Drafts and Coupons collected; advances made on approved collaterals and against merchandise consigned to our care.

Orders executed for Investment Securities and Railroad Iron.

CLEWS, HABIB & Co., 11 Old Broad street, London.

TANNER & CO., BANKERS, No. 11 WALL STREET, NEW YORK. DEALERS IN STOCKS, BONDS, GOLD AND EXCHANGE.

ORDERS EXECUTED AT THE STOCK AND GOLD EXCHANGES.

INTEREST ALLOWED ON DEPOSITS SUBJECT TO CHECK AT SIGHT.

Buy and sell at current market rates, the FIRST MORTGAGE EIGHT (8) PER PER CENT. GOLD BONDS of the ST. JOSEPH AND DENVER CITY RAILROAD COMPANY.

Interest, payable August and February, in New York, London, or Frankfort-on-the-Main, free of United States taxes. Present market quotations, 97 1/2 a 98 1/2 c. and interest.

TANNER & CO.,
No. 11 WALL STREET.

Rail Road Bonds. Whether you wish to Buy or Sell write to CHARLES W. HASSLER, No. 7 WALL STREET, New York.

WOODHULL, CLAFLIN & CO., Bankers and Brokers, No. 44 BROAD STREET, New York.

NEW YORK STATE RAILROAD BONDS.

A First-Class Home Investment.

FIRST MORTGAGE GOLD BONDS

OF THE RONDOT & OSWEGO RAILROAD.

Principal & Interest Payable in Gold.

Seven per Cent. Semi-Annually

This Road covers 100 miles of the most direct possible line, between the Great Lakes and deep water navigation on the Hudson River, the whole line of which will be completed and in operation on or before October 1st, 1872, and give a new line of road to Lake Ontario and the West, 25 miles shorter than any line that can be found.

It passes through the Cement, Flag-Stone and Lumber regions of Ulster County, and the rich, agricultural bottoms of Delaware and Greene Counties, all of which have not heretofore been reached by railroad facilities, and from which sections, the formation of the country prevents the construction of a competing line.

The 36 miles of road operated for three months is already paying net earnings equivalent to 7 per cent. gold, on its cost of construction and equipments. The issue of Bonds is limited to \$30,000 per mile of COMPLETED ROAD, the coupons payable in gold in this city.

PRICE OF THE BONDS, 90 IN CURRENCY.
Full particulars of the above may be had of, and the Bonds for sale by

Edward Haight & Co., 9 Wall Street, NEW YORK CITY, Financial Agents of the R. & O. Company.

MARKET SAVINGS BANK, 83 NASSAU STREET, N. Y., Six Per Cent. Interest Allowed.

Interest commences on the 1st of each month.

HENRY R. CONKLIN, Secretary. WM. VAN NAME, President.

THE NEW DISCOVERY

In Chemical and Medical Science.



Dr. E. F. GARVIN'S
SOLUTION & COMPOUND ELIXIR

TAR

FIRST AND ONLY SOLUTION ever made in one mixture of **ALL THE TWELVE** valuable active principles of the well known curative agent.

PINE TREE TAR.

UNEQUALLED in Coughs, Colds, Catarrh, Asthma, Bronchitis, and consumption.

CURES WITHOUT FAIL

A recent cold in three to six hours; and also, by its VITALISING, PURIFYING and STIMULATING effects upon the general system, is remarkably efficacious in all

DISEASES OF THE BLOOD, including Scrofula and Eruptions of the skin, Dyspepsia, Diseases of the Liver and Kidneys, Heart Disease, and General Debility.

ONE TRIAL CONVINCES!

Volatile Solution of Tar

For INHALATION, without application of HEAT. A remarkably VALUABLE discovery, as the whole apparatus can be carried in the vest pocket, ready at any time for the most effectual and positively curative use in

All Diseases of the NOSE, THROAT and LUNGS.

THE COMPOUND

Tar and Mandrake Pill.

for use in connection with the ELIXIR TAR, is a combination of the TWO most valuable ALTERNATIVE Medicines known in the Profession, and renders this Pill without exception the very best ever offered.

The SOLUTION and COMPOUND ELIXIR of

TAR

is without doubt the Best remedy known in cases of

CHOLERA AND YELLOW FEVER.

It is a Specific for such diseases, and should be kept in the household of every family, especially during those months in which

CHOLERA AND YELLOW FEVER

are liable to prevail. A small quantity taken daily will prevent contracting these terrible diseases.

Solution and Compound Elixir, \$1.00 per Bottle
Volatile Solution for Inhalation, \$5.00 per Box
Tar and Mandrake Pills, 50cets per box.

Send for Circular of **POSITIVE CURES** to your Druggist, or to

L. F. HYDE & CO.,
SOLE PROPRIETORS,
110 E. 22d St., New York.
Sole by all Druggists.

85.

11.

LYRIC HALL, SUNDAY EVENING DISCOURSES

By CORA L. V. TAPPAN,

EVERY SUNDAY, AT 7:30 O'CLOCK, P. M.

COMMENCING DECEMBER 31, 1871.

Introductory Addresses by Mrs. Mary F. Davis and Mrs. C. B. Wilbour.

AT TRENOR'S LYRIC HALL,

Sixth Avenue, Reservoir Square and 42d Street, N. Y.

The friends of Mrs. Tappan will be glad to learn that she has accepted an invitation to deliver a series of discourses in this city; (where among so many pulpits and rostrums not one is occupied permanently by a woman,) it is known to all familiar with the progress of liberal ideas, that she is one of their most advanced, as well as eloquent representatives, spiritual, exalted and humane. Of her wondrous powers, the distinguished poet, critic and scholar, N. P. Willis, wrote and published fifteen years ago, with other equally approving words: "I am perhaps, from long study and practice, as good a judge of fitness in the use of language as most men; and, in a full hour of close attention, I could detect no word that could be altered for the better—none indeed (and this surprised me still more) which was not used with strict fidelity to its derivative meaning. The practical scholarship which this last point usually requires, and the earnestly unhesitating and confident fluency with which the beautiful language was delivered, were critically wonderful. It would have astonished me in an extempore speech by the most accomplished orator in the world."

The attendance and co-operation of yourself and friends respectfully solicited.

By order of Advisory Committee,

H. M. RICHMOND, 13 Clinton Place,

Chairman and Treasurer.

JAMES M. FARNESWORTH, Organist.

New York, December 25, 1871.

MRS. M. D. TRACY,

CITY EMPLOYMENT BUREAU,

GENERAL BUSINESS EXCHANGE,

517 WASHINGTON ST

BOSTON.

"THE BLEES"

NOISELESS,

LINK-MOTION,

LOCK-STITCH



Sewing Machine

Challenges the world in perfection of work, strength and beauty of stitch, durability of construction and rapidity of motion.
Call and examine. Send for circular. Agents wanted.

MANUFACTURED BY

BLEES SEWING MACHINE CO.,
623 BROADWAY, New York.

THE LAW OF MARRIAGE,

AN
EXHAUSTIVE ARGUMENT
AGAINST MARRIAGE LEGISLATION,

By C. S. JAMES,

Author of "Manual of Transcendental Philosophy."

For Sale by the Author, post paid, for 25c.

Address

Alma, Wis.

75

JUST ISSUED!

The Most Elegant Book of the Season.

ENTITLED

Poems of Progress.

BY LIZZIE DOTEN.

Author of

"POEMS FROM THE INNER LIFE,"

Which have been read and admired by thousands in Europe and America.

In the new book will be found all the new and beautiful inspirational poems

GIVEN BY MISS DOTEN

Since the publication of the previous volume. The new volume has a

SPLENDID STEEL ENGRAVING

Of the talented authoress.

EVERY SPIRITUALIST!

EVERY FREE-THINKER!

EVERY REFORMER!

Should have a copy of this new addition to poetic literature.

NO LIBRARY IS COMPLETE WITHOUT IT.

Orders should be forwarded at once.

PRICE—\$1 50, postage 20 cents. Full Gift, \$2 00.

WM. WHITE & CO.,

Publishers,

158 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Trade Supplied on Liberal Terms.

DESIRABLE HOME SECURITIES.

The First Mortgage

7 Per Cent. Gold Bonds

OF THE

WALLKILL VALLEY
RAILWAY COMPANY

ARE OFFERED FOR SALE AT 90 AND ACCRUED INTEREST IN CURRENCY,

BY

MEAD & CLARK,
Financial Agents,

NO. 141 BROADWAY,

AND

ERASTUS F. MEAD,
BANKER,

Cor. Twenty-fifth Street and Third Avenue.

By exchanging U. S. Bonds for the Bonds of the WALLKILL VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY, you increase your income over 40 Per cent., and your Principal about 25 Per Cent., and get a security EQUALLY safe.

MUTUAL BENEFIT SAVINGS BANK,

SUN BUILDING,

166 Nassau street, New York.

DIVIDEND.—A semi-annual dividend at the rate of six per cent. per annum, on all sums of \$5 and upward which have been on deposit for one or more months next previous to July 1, will be paid on and after July 21, 1871.

INTEREST not called for will remain as principal, and draw interest from July 1.

BANK OPEN daily from 10 to 3; also Monday and Saturday evenings, from 4½ to 6½ o'clock. Interest commences on the 1st of every month following the deposit.

CHARLES K. GRAHAM, President.

G. H. BENEDICT, Secretary.

A REMARKABLE WORK

BY

ROBERT DALE OWEN.

Just published,

THE DEBATABLE LAND

BETWEEN THIS WORLD AND THE NEXT.

By Robert Dale Owen. Author of "Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World," etc.

A large handsome volume, beautifully printed and bound. Price \$2.

CONTENTS.

Prefatory Address to the Protestant Clergy.
Book I. Touching communication of religious knowledge to man.

Book II. Some characteristics of the Phenomena.

Book III. Physical manifestations.

Book IV. Identity of Spirits.

Book V. The Crowning Proof of Immortality.

Book VI. Spiritual gifts of the first century appearing in our times.

The scope of this book is broad. One-fourth of it is occupied by an Address to the Protestant Clergy, reviewing the present attitude of the religious world in connection with modern science and with modern ideas touching the reign of law, human infallibility, plenary inspiration, miracles, spiritual gifts. It sets forth the successes and reverses of early Protestantism and asks their explanation. It inquires whether it is Protestant theology or Christianity that has been losing ground, for three hundred years, against the Church of Rome. It discusses the effects on morality and civilization and spiritual growth of such doctrines as vicarious atonement, original depravity, a personal devil, an eternal hell. It inquires whether religion is a progressive science. It contrasts Calvinism, Lutheranism, Paulism, with Christianity. Inspiration it regards as not infallible, yet an inestimable gift of God and the origin of all religions—a gift for all ages, not confined to one century nor to one church; a gift pre-eminently appearing in the Author of our religion.

But the main object of the book is to afford conclusive proof, aside from historical evidence, of immortality. It shows that we of to-day have the same evidence on that subject as the Apostles had. More than half the volume consists of narratives in proof of this—narratives that will seem marvelous—incredible, at first sight, to many—yet which are sustained by evidence as strong as that which daily determines, in our courts of law, the life and death of men.

This book affirms that the strongest of all historical evidences for modern Spiritualism are found in the Gospels, and that the strongest of all proof going to substantiate the Gospel narratives are found in the phenomena of Spiritualism, rationally interpreted: Christianity, freed from alien creeds, sustaining Spiritualism; and enlightened Spiritualism sustaining Christianity.

Finally, the author gives his conception of the foundation motive of Christian morality and Spiritual progress, as set forth by Christ himself.

It is a book eminently suited to an era like the present, when the debatable land of morals and religion is freely explored, and when men are disposed to prove all things ere they hold fast to that which is good.

G. W. CARLETON & Co., Publishers.

Madison Square, New York.

MAXWELL & CO.,

Bankers and Brokers,

No. 11 BROAD STREET,

NEW YORK.

CHICKERING & SONS' PIANO-FORTES.

The Best Pianos at the Lowest Prices.

And upon the most favorable terms of payment.

We invite the attention of persons intending to purchase Pianos to our New Illustrated Catalogue, giving full description of Styles and Prices, and the terms on which we sell to those desiring to make

EASY MONTHLY PAYMENTS.

SEND FOR A CATALOGUE.

CHICKERING & SONS,

NO. 11 EAST FOURTEENTH ST., NEW YORK.

LEO MILLER,

OF NEW YORK.

Will present to the public

THE WOMAN QUESTION IN A NEW LIGHT.

SUBJECT:

"WOMAN, AND HER RELATIONS TO TEMPERANCE AND OTHER REFORMS."

Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, in a letter to Gen. Jordan, of Pennsylvania, says:

"I had the pleasure of canvassing with Leo Miller, Esq., in New Jersey, and I most cordially recommend him to our friends in your State as a gentleman of rare talent and character and a most effective and eloquent speaker."

CHARLES H. FOSTER,

TEST MEDIUM.

16 East Twelfth street, N. Y.

PATENT

STOCKING SUPPORTER

AND

LADIES' PROTECTOR.

NO MORE COLD FEET—NO MORE DEFORMED LIMBS.

MRS. DANIELS takes pleasure in offering the above articles to ladies, with the assurance that they will give satisfaction.

The trade supplied at a discount.

No. 63 Clarendon Street,

BOSTON.

OR MRS. C. A. GAYNOR,

824 Broadway, New York.

SYMPHER & CO.,

(Successors to D. Marley.)

No. 557 BROADWAY, NEW YORK,

Dealers in

MODERN AND ANTIQUE

Furniture, Bronzes,

CHINA, ARTICLES OF VERTU.

Established 1836.



A BEAUTIFUL

SET OF TEETH,

With plumpers to set out the cheeks and restore the face to its natural appearance. Movable plumpers adjusted to old sets, weighted Lower Sets, fillings Gold, Amalgam, Bone, etc.

TEETH EXTRACTED WITHOUT PAIN,

With Nitrous Oxide Gas.

No extra charge when others are inserted.

SPLendid SETS, \$10 to \$20.

L. BERNHARD, No. 216 Sixth Avenue, Between Fourteenth and Fifteenth streets east side.

ROYAL HAVANA LOTTERY.

\$330,000 IN GOLD

DRAWN EVERY 17 DAYS.

Prizes cashed and information furnished. Orders solicited and promptly filled.

The highest rates paid for Doubloons and all kinds of Gold and Silver and Government Securities.

TAYLOR & CO., BANKERS,

No. 16 Wall Street.

WM. DIBBLEE,

LADIES' HAIR DRESSER,

854 Broadway

HAS REMOVED FROM HIS STORE TO THE

FIRST FLOOR,

where he will continue to conduct his business in all its branches TWENTY-FIVE PER CENT. CHEAPER than heretofore, in consequence of the difference in his rent.

CHATELAINE BRAIDS,

LADIES' AND GENTLEMEN'S WIGS,

and everything appertaining to the business will be kept on hand and made to order.

DIBBLEEANIA for stimulating, JAPONICA for soothing and the MAGIC TAR SALVE for promoting the growth of the hair, constantly on hand. Consultation on diseases of the scalp, Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, from 9 A. M. to 3 P. M. Also, his celebrated

HARABA ZEIN,

or FLESH BEAUTIFIER, the only pure and harmless preparation ever made for the complexion. No lady should ever be without it. Can be obtained only at

WM. DIBBLEE'S,
854 Broadway, up-stairs.

SAM'L BARTON.

HENRY ALLEN

BARTON & ALLEN,

BANKERS AND BROKERS,

No. 40 BROAD STREET.

Stocks, Bonds and Gold bought and sold on commission.



The Books and Speeches of Victoria C. Woodhull and Tennie C. Claflin will hereafter be furnished, postage paid, at the following liberal prices:

The Principles of Government, by Victoria C. Woodhull.....	\$2 00
Constitutional Equality, by Tennie C. Claflin.....	1 50
Woman Suffrage guaranteed by the Constitution, speech by Victoria C. Woodhull;	
The Great Social Problem of Labor and Capital, speech by Victoria C. Woodhull;	
The Principles of Finance, speech by Victoria C. Woodhull;	
Practical View of Political Equality, speech by Tennie C. Claflin;	
Majority and Minority Report of the Judiciary Committee on the Woodhull Memorial;	
Each per copy.....	10
per 100.....	5 00

POST OFFICE NOTICE.

The mails for Europe during the week ending Saturday, Jan. 27, 1872, will close at this office on Tuesday at 11 A. M., on Wednesday at 11½ A. M., and on Saturday at 4 A. M.
P. H. JONES, Postmaster.

THE INTERNATIONAL.

It ought to be known that this association is not secret—it does not aspire to the honor of being a conspiracy. Its meetings are held in public; they are open to all comers, though only members are permitted to speak (unless by special invitation), and none but members are allowed to vote. The several sections in this city and vicinity meet as follows:

Section 1 (German).—Sunday, 8 P. M., at the Tenth Ward Hotel, corner of Broome and Forsyth streets.

Section 2 (French).—Sunday, 9:30 A. M., at No. 100 Prince street.

Section 6 (German).—Thursday, 8 P. M., at No. 10 Stanton street.

Section 8 (German).—Sunday, 3 P. M., at No. 53 Union avenue, Williamsburgh, L. I.

Section 9 (American).—Wednesday, 8 P. M., at No. 35 East Twenty-seventh street.

Section 10 (French).—First Thursday and third Saturday in each month, 6 P. M., at No. 650 Third avenue, between Forty-first and Forty-second streets.

Section 11 (German).—Thursday, 8 P. M., West Thirty-ninth street, between Eighth and Ninth avenues, at Hessel's.

Section 12 (American).—The second and fourth Sunday in each month, 8 P. M., at No. 15 E. 38th street.

Section 13 (German).—The first and third Tuesday in each month, 8 P. M., at No. 301 East Tenth street.

Section 22 (French).—The second and fourth Friday in each month, 8 P. M., at Constant's, 68 Grand street.

Section 35 (English).—Meets every Friday evening at Myers', 129 Spring street, at 8 o'clock.

THE U. S. FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE I. W. A.

We give below the proposed constitution of this body referred to the sections, which they must act upon on or before the 3d of next March:

CHAPTER I.—COMPOSITION OF COUNCIL.

ARTICLE 1.—The Council shall be composed of one delegate from each Central Committee, group or section of the I. W. A., and one delegate from each trades union affiliated with the Association.

CHAPTER II.—OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES.

ARTICLE 1. The officers of the Federal Council shall be a Corresponding Secretary for each language, a Financial Secretary, two Recording Secretaries, Treasurer and Archivist, who shall be elected by ballot semi-annually, on the first meeting in January and the first meeting in July.

ART. 2. It shall be the duty of the Corresponding Secretaries to conduct the correspondence according to their respective languages, and attend all meetings of the Committee on Correspondence.

ART. 3. It shall be the duty of the Recording Secretaries to record the proceedings of every Council meeting.

ART. 4. It shall be the duty of the Financial Secretary to receive all moneys and place them in the hands of the Treasurer; also to attend all meetings of the Committee on Finance.

ART. 5. It shall be the duty of the Treasurer to keep all moneys placed in his hands, and to report to each meeting of the Committee on Finance.

ART. 6. It shall be the duty of the Archivist to collect and preserve all documents concerning the I. W. A., and to use all means in his power to obtain papers of all kinds bearing upon the social and political condition of the people of all countries, to translate and furnish copies of such to any committee of the Federal Council desiring the same. He shall attend all meetings of the Committee on Propaganda.

CHAPTER III.—STANDING COMMITTEES.

ARTICLE 1. The Council shall be divided into five Committees, viz.: 1st, Committee on Correspondence; 2d, Committee on Finance; 3d, Committee on Propaganda; 4th, Committee on Labor; 5th, Committee on Propositions.

ART. 2. Each of these Committees shall consist of one-fifth of the Council.

ART. 3. Delegates on being admitted shall be assigned on the different committees.

ART. 4. Each committee shall appoint a Reporting Secretary at each meeting.

ART. 5. These secretaries must always include in their reports the opinion of the majority and minority on all questions submitted for their consideration.

ART. 6. All reports must be in writing and as brief as possible.

ART. 7. Each committee shall regulate its action in conformity with the general rules of the I. W. A.

Committee on Correspondence.

ART. 8. The Committee on Correspondence shall have charge of the correspondence with the General Council, Federal Councils, Central Committees, Sections, affiliated societies and personal requests for information.

ART. 9. The Corresponding Secretaries shall form part of this committee.

ART. 10. New sections asking admission and trades unions seeking affiliation shall be referred to this committee.

ART. 11. The report on application of a new section for admission or trades union for affiliation shall be made to the Federal Council within eight days after application.

ART. 12. Every month this committee shall present a detailed report of the labors of the Federal Council, of the number of sections and trades unions received, of propositions from the Council, sections and affiliated societies, and of the resolutions adopted.

ART. 13. The monthly report shall be signed by the Corresponding Secretaries and sent to the General Council in accordance with the general statutes of the I. W. A.

ART. 14. This Committee shall file all correspondence and keep a record indicating the purport of letters received and a synopsis of their answers.

ART. 15. The Committee on Correspondence shall give to the Archivist every month a list of the new members admitted to each section, with their professions, age, birthplace, present residence, whether married or single, and numbers of family.

Committee on Finance.

ART. 16. The Committee on Finance shall receive all assessments, subscriptions and donations, and give receipts therefor countersigned by the Treasurer and Financial Secretary.

ART. 17. The Treasurer and Financial Secretary shall form part of this committee.

ART. 18. This committee shall pay all moneys voted by the Federal Council and take receipts therefor.

ART. 19. At each session of the Federal Council a condensed account of the receipts and disbursements shall be given.

ART. 20. Every month this committee shall present a detailed account of the receipts and disbursements for approval.

ART. 21. The books of the Committee on Finance shall be accessible to all members of the I. W. A. for inspection.

Committee on Propaganda.

ART. 22. The Committee on Propaganda shall draw up all papers and documents intended for publication.

ART. 23. They shall publish all papers and documents ordered by the Federal Council.

ART. 24. They shall distribute all papers and documents which the General or Federal Councils have published for the information of the working people.

ART. 25. They shall defend the principles of the I. W. A., and propagate them by speeches, writings, manifestoes, etc.

ART. 26. They shall attend to all communications to the press ordered by the Federal Council.

ART. 27. The Archivist shall form part of this committee.

ART. 28. The committee shall make a monthly report of its labors to the Federal Council.

ART. 29. This committee shall have power to correct misstatements made through the public press, as to the objects and principles of the I. W. A.

Committee on Labor.

ART. 30. The Committee on Labor shall establish a Bureau of Labor, in order to seek the most practical means of ameliorating the condition of the working people.

ART. 31. All sections shall make special monthly reports on labor to this committee.

ART. 32. All affiliated societies are invited to make monthly reports of the condition of their trade to this committee.

ART. 33. This committee shall issue on the first meeting in each month a report on the condition of labor in North America.

ART. 34. The monthly report of this committee shall be sent to the General Council and to all sections and affiliated societies in North America.

Committee on Propositions.

ART. 35. This committee shall report on all questions coming from bodies or members of the I. W. A. that have reference to amendments of the rules of the General or Federal Council of the I. W. A.

ART. 36. This committee shall receive and consider all propositions for reunions, picnics, assemblies, banquets, etc.

ART. 37. In case of emergency this committee can convocate an extraordinary meeting of the Council.

CHAPTER IV.—ADMISSION OF SECTIONS AND TRADES UNIONS.

ARTICLE 1. Sections asking for admission or trades unions seeking affiliation must conform to the following conditions:

First. Acknowledge the principles adopted by the Congresses of the International Workingmen's Association.

Second. Accept the rules and regulations of the General Council and of the Federal Council of North America.

Third. Choose a delegate from among the active members of the I. W. A.

Fourth. Pay an annual assessment of 15 cents in advance for each member.

Fifth. Furnish their delegate with credentials signed by the officers of the section or trades union.

ART. 2. On the fulfillment of these conditions the delegates shall be admitted on report of Committee on Correspondence, provided that a majority vote of the Federal Council be cast in their favor.

ART. 3. Delegates on being admitted to seats shall be furnished with copies of the Principles and regulations of the I. W. A. and the Constitution and By-laws of the Federal Council for North America, with the stamps of the General Congress and of the F. C. N. A. to be affixed thereto.

ART. 4. The Sections alone have the power to change their delegates.

ART. 5. The General Congress of the I. W. A. alone has

the power to exclude definitely any Section or affiliated society.

ART. 6. In case of a demand for the suspension or exclusion of a Section or affiliated society, the Federal Council shall make a report to the General Congress, stating the vote of each section and affiliated society.

ART. 7. A Committee of Arbitration shall be instituted, composed of one delegate from each standing committee, to hear the statements of the interested parties, and make a report to the next General Congress in conformity with this Constitution.

CHAPTER V.—DELEGATES.

ARTICLE 1. Delegates shall make a report of the Section or affiliated society they represent at least once a month.

ART. 2. All reports must be submitted in writing.

ART. 3. The delegation to the Federal Council being personal, no delegate can send a substitute without the consent of the Section, expressed in writing and signed by the officers thereof.

ART. 4. If a delegate absent himself for two consecutive meetings, his Section shall be informed of it.

CHAPTER VI.—REVENUE.

ARTICLE 1. An annual contribution of fifteen cents per member shall be levied from all sections and affiliated societies for the use of the Federal Council. This contribution is intended to defray the expenses of the Federal Council, such as costs of correspondence, publications, rents and dues to General Council, etc.

ART. 2. The Federal Council shall cause to be made adhesive stamps representing the value of fifteen cents each to be supplied, in numbers wanted, to every section or affiliated society.

ART. 3. These stamps, with that of the General Congress, are to be affixed to the copy of the rules, which every member of the I. W. A. is held to possess.

ART. 4. At the end of the fiscal year the sections and affiliated societies shall return all unused stamps, and receive in return those of the new issue.

ART. 5. These stamps, representing the value of the individual contributions, shall bear the date of the current year.

ART. 6. No moneys shall be expended by the Federal Council excepting for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the proletarian class.

CHAPTER VII.—OF MEMBERSHIP.

ARTICLE 1. All persons are eligible to become members of the International Workingmen's Association on subscribing to the following declaration:

I, ———, do hereby pledge myself as an individual at all times to uphold, acknowledge and defend the principles of the International Workingmen's Association, subscribing to the principles of truth, justice and morality as the basis of my conduct toward all mankind, without regard to creed, color or nationality.

ART. 2. Any member of the I. W. A. has the right to the floor in any section (except on questions of finance), regulated by the local rules governing the members of such section.

ART. 3. The previous article (Art. 2, Chap. VI.) has no bearing upon affiliated societies, who upon entering the I. W. A. preserve their own laws intact.

ART. 4. In order to prevent abuses, no member of a section that is represented in the Federal Council of North America is eligible for membership in any other section represented in the F. C. N. A.

CHAPTER VIII.—AMENDMENTS.

ARTICLE 1. All propositions for amendments to this Constitution shall be presented to the Council and referred to the Committee on Propositions two weeks before any action shall be taken by the Federal Council. After the action by the Federal Council it shall be referred to the sections for their final approval or rejection.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION OF THE U. S. FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE I. W. A.

To the Members of the several Sections:

CITIZENS: In another column of this issue of the WEEKLY you will find the above-named document. In calling your attention to it let it be understood that my utterances thereupon are my own, and nobody is responsible for them but myself. If there be seeming egotism in this, thirty-five years of unceasing labors, culminating finally in the nucleus of a world's organization, may well excuse it. Younger men have yet to learn that ways of freemen only are compatible with freedom, and that those methods of transacting business that have served the purpose of subduing the working class can never be made instrumental in effecting its emancipation. I advise you, therefore, to reject the document in question, for the following among other reasons:

1. It indirectly ignores the rights of the Sections through the appointment of Committees, to which all business must be referred. Both in Legislative and Executive bodies the practice of appointing permanent, or what are called "Standing Committees," is a perpetual nuisance, and a constant source of corruption and oppression. Out of this practice in legislative bodies have proceeded the "lobby," "special legislation," and "privilege." There should be no lobby, nor special legislation, nor privilege in the I. W. A. Out of this practice in executive bodies has proceeded the "circumlocution office," with its unlimited peculations and endless law suits. There should be no such office, with its inseparable surroundings, in the I. W. A. The excuse for such "Committees," namely, that they facilitate the transaction of business, is the biggest blunder of the ages. Of this there could be no better proof than the proceedings of the very Committee that reported this Constitution. Every amendment acted upon in the Council was either at once adopted or rejected, while every amendment referred to the Committee was utterly ignored, never acted upon, never even recorded, never reported. Among these amendments were one proposed by the delegate of Section 6, looking toward the embodiment of the principle of the Referendum in the Constitution, and another, proposed by the delegate of Section 12, providing for a political organization of the I. W. A. in conformity to the political status of the

citizens of the Republic. But each amendment met the same fate; they were both quietly buried. If the Constitution were in all other respects perfect, this defiant action of the Committee should be promptly rebuked by the rejection of their work.

"But surely there should be some division of labor," it may be objected, and as men are educated the objection carries great weight with it. Nevertheless, there is no more ruinous economical principle applied to the laboring classes, both in their industrial and their legislative concerns. The simple truth is, that man should never delegate to another anything that he can do for himself. If a representative body gets so large that it cannot directly transact its own business, the ratio of representation should be increased. So, likewise, if the primary association becomes too large, some of the members should split off and colonize elsewhere. A limitation as to numbers is essential, both to the purity and efficiency of any organization.

2. It permits the Council to usurp the office of a legislative body, by enacting laws for, and imposing conditions upon, the sections. If the I. W. A. the sections are supposed to take the initiative. Councils are but the executors of the will of the sections. But this so-called Constitution bravely reverses all this. The sections must report to this or that committee that are thus virtually made inquisitors; among others, to the Committee on Correspondence, for instance, which may demand a "list of the new members admitted to each section, with their professions, age, birthplace, present residence, whether married or single, and numbers of family; and what the Committee on Labor charged with the duty of establishing a Bureau of Labor may assess the sections for that purpose leaves considerable room for the exercise of a lively imagination."

Citizens! Reject this document, or at least so amend it that its most objectionable features may be excluded. The business of the Council should be transacted directly by the delegates in open session, and no committees should be appointed other than special committees for a special purpose, instructed to report within a limited period. Above all, the principle of the Referendum, including the Popular Initiative, without which the Referendum itself is a fraud, should be embodied in its provisions.

It may be said, indeed, that if the instrument were so altered the Council might as well have no Constitution. Which is true. The Council has a right to make rules of order for its own government, but it has no right to make laws for its constituents. The Council has prescribed that the sections must vote for or against this thing on or before the third day of March, and that those sections not heard from should be considered to have voted affirmatively. Could anything be more absurd? If the sections should happen to withdraw their delegates where would then be the Council? There was a despotism in the old C. C. Its intelligence and its evident sincerity inspired a certain degree of respect. The despotism in the new Council excites only the opposite feeling.

Yours, fraternally,

WILLIAM WEST.

[We think that our earnest and zealous friend, than whom there is no member of the International more honored by us, in his desire for the individual, has been hasty in his judgment of the proposed constitution. And that word "proposed" is the proof we offer for our opinion. Whether it be good, bad or indifferent, it is only proposed for the consideration of the sections. In referring it to the sections the principle of the referendum was strictly adhered to. If the sections reject it, it will not be the constitution of the F. C. of the I. W. A. of U. S. We are not fully prepared to say that the usual attention was given to the amendments proposed, to which our friend refers. We are inclined to think the action taken on them was not such as their importance demanded. And we are glad that this opportunity has come to call the full attention of the sections to the actual state of the case, as well as to a careful consideration of the real merits of the constitution as a whole. We hope if the constitution shall be adopted it will be with the addition of the propositions for political organizations, since what can the I. W. A. ever accomplish unless it act in harmony at the polls?]

[From the American Spiritualist.]

Proceedings of the Woman's Suffrage Convention.

In this issue will be found a complete digest of the proceedings of the late Woman's Suffrage Convention recently held in Washington.

One of the most noticeable facts connected with this convention were the out and out declarations of Victoria C. Woodhull, at the very opening of the proceedings, regarding Spiritualism. Her first address was upon the subject of the "relations of Spiritualism to political reform." This is the first time any Spiritualist has had the opportunity, and perhaps the courage, to present the claims of Spiritualism before a convention in this country not called for that special purpose. It is of much significance also, considering the high objects of those thus meeting, as well as the distinguished character of the leading spirits of the convention for ability and intelligence, that its sessions were held at the Capitol of the Government, and that the logical results of the Spiritual movement were thus clearly stated. No one proposed to stop Mrs. Woodhull, because she was presenting that subject. Nay, instead of pro-

hibiting her speech, they heard her with respectful attention, and if the applause she evoked from the audience is any evidence, they evidently heard her gladly.

All honor to the brave hearted women, who in demanding their own rights, make their platform so broad that every earnest worker is welcomed upon it, without regard to creed, color, sex, or condition. Such was the platform upon which Jesus stood. He scorned to occupy any other, and it was from such a platform that his grand spiritual teachings were given. We hope every Spiritualist in the land will carefully read Mrs. Woodhull's utterances upon that occasion. That we are fast approaching a time when the dividing line will be drawn and Spiritualists be called upon, nay *compelled*, by the inevitable logic of events to act in an organized, systematic manner politically, there can be no doubt.

That Spiritualists may differ, as to the policy of that action and the best course to pursue to accomplish the best results, there can be little doubt. But, either in favor of organized political action, or in opposition to it, every Spiritualist will soon have to decide. The importance of such action cannot be too earnestly considered by those who desire to see Spiritualism permanently established. We are for organization, political, social and religious, in the sense that organization, as a power, shall secure to the individual the largest liberty compatible with justice and the perfect equality of all citizens before the law. Then will freedom and order, liberty and law, equality and justice obtain in government, by the force of progress, constantly answering the demands of humanity, in the highest and best forms possible for religious, social and political life.

[From the American Spiritualist.]

The Fisk Tragedy.

The sudden taking off of such a man as Col. Fisk by the hand of an assassin, is suggestive of the causes that lead to such tragedies. The comments of the New York daily press, with the exception of the *Tribune*, show a reasonable conception of the social condition of the community where murders of this sort are not only possible, but multiplying.

Disguise, cover it, or attempt to answer the sad, sickening premonitions of this volcano of social corruption, lying underneath all civilized society to-day, by special pleading of special circumstances, and we have not reached the cause of this putrid sore, whose frequent bloody running fills the world with such a stench!

The sanctimonious, long-faced, orthodox saint will shriek aloud about the immorality of Fisk, even intimating, as some do, that Providence must have had a hand in the matter, if his finger did not absolutely pull the trigger of the assassin's pistol. More lamentations about "total depravity," and groanings over "original sin," will be about all we shall get from that quarter.

The mass of humanity will give it only a passing thought. Except the chill of horror, which all feel at the perpetration of such a bloody, dastardly deed, it will only linger in the memory of a majority of men as a cowardly act of a premeditating villain.

But this does not solve the problem. Col. Fisk and his murderer were both married men—men of wealth, and it is said both are most respectably connected! If this be true, it only increases astonishment. The student of nature, the honest soul that desires to know the *real* cause and the *whole* cause of such bloody tragedies, can but inquire if these men were *married*—had wealth and respectable connection—of what avail is all that if it keep them not true to *their marriage* obligations, and permits a quarrel unto death about a woman, which neither had the slightest claim to, or business with, according to the Christian teaching of the law of marriage?

If it be true, as the Bible declares, that "if a man look upon a woman to lust after her, he has already committed adultery," etc., and if the old law of punishing that offense could obtain now, doubtless both Fisk and Stokes would have been "stoned to death" long before the bullet with one and probably the halter with the other will have settled their earthly careers.

How many others in the community, as fully deserving to be "stoned" as they, but who shield their *lust* with a mixed garment of piety and respectability, the unsuspecting world little knows. But that corruption, foul and deep, exists in the sense that disregarding marriage obligations is considered corruption, and that among those who, like Fisk and Stokes, are respectably married—respectably wealthy, and have respectable relations, none will pretend to deny.

That these things horrify us from that supposed elevation called "high life" in society is also true. The middle or laboring classes seldom have an exercise of that kind. What are we to conclude then? Has marriage, or wealth, or respectability of the class rule, anything to do with engendering the bad practices and bad blood, which so frequently results in murder by assassination?

A truthful and complete answer to the enquiry brings us to a consideration of the "social question," wherein, we affirm, will be found the real cause of such fearful tragedies. While it may not be justly said that true marriage produces any such result, yet the *fact* should not be overlooked, that in the very idea of *ownership*—a possession of the person of a being in *law*, without that person having the legal right and power to dissolve such relation,—lurks the devil of discord, which produces untold misery, and in many instances ends in a fatal, bloody record of shame and crime, as in the case of which we write.

Victoria C. Woodhull has had the courage to sound the key note of a true reform on this great social problem. In a fuller comprehension, and true practice of the principles of "social freedom," will be found the only cure for the deep damnation which oppresses society in this respect.

Not that freedom means unbridled license, or impurity, but just the reverse. In truth, there can be no real purity, only in absolute freedom. The condition of society to-day gives abundant proof of this. Men and women find themselves in the bondage of marriage, when they supposed it was to be one endless honey-moon of married felicity. What are the results? Dissatisfaction, estrangement, deception, crime, bloodshed! By whom? Men and women who are or have been married. Unmarried people seldom give the world any cause for sensation on that score. Whoever heard of one old bachelor shooting another, because jealous of some attractive old maid? No one. It is only when the idea of *ownership* takes form in the mind, connected with the possibility of power to hold the object as such possession, that jealousy, hatred and revenge in the social relations become possible.

Let the basis of true marriage be absolute freedom in love, and there will be far less jealousy, hatred, peception and unfaithfulness than now. No external, legal obligation can make a man or woman faithful against the interior longings and desires of their own souls. The body, unless forced, only acts as the soul dictates—or should. If it do otherwise, it is false to its own. And being false to itself, how can it keep faith with another?

It is far from answering this question, to raise a hue and cry about the immorality of the murdered or the murderer. What the influences, however subtle, that moved them on step by step? It may be true that an overreaching selfishness, a desire to possess great wealth may have added fuel to the flame of jealousy and passion that raged but to destroy, still, it is not likely that the murder would have been committed had there not been a woman in the case.

Therefore, for the main, moving cause, we are thrown back upon the "social question" at last. It is *the* question of all questions to-day. Affect to ignore the matter, as some do, through fear of what its consideration may bring to the light, or because of an educated veneration for certain forms, it is, nevertheless, constantly forcing itself upon public attention, and like Banquo's ghost, it *will not* down, no matter who commands, but frequently presents a cold and bloody front with a murderer's revenge and an assassin's cowardice as its executioner!

While then, love should be cultivated in purity and freedom; while we should venerate *true* marriage, based upon the monogamic principle of its legitimate relations, thereby avoiding the damning maelstrom of promiscuity and sensualism; we should not forget to enquire *what constitutes true marriage*, and that too, before rushing blindly into it, as the vast majority of people do, finding as too many have, that the hymeneal knot is not only a legal bond not easily broken, but that it becomes a bondage from which those who suffer cannot easily escape, while society, utterly indifferent to the suffering thus caused and the family hells and brothels thus made, demands that the relations continue until one of the "happy married pair" shall commit a *crime* of sufficient magnitude to release them from their wedded slavery.

Certain self-constituted manufacturers of "standards of morality," (for other people) recount the immoral practices and "sharp practices" of Col. Fisk, as though that was any answer to this fatal affray and its cause. We are no admirers of the vain, vulgar display Fisk made of his wealth. The well-remembered "Black Friday," when men gnashed their teeth on his account, is doubtless the best instance of his "sharp practice," but we suppose Fisk was paying back the sharks of Wall street in their own coin! His *sin* there, seems to have been, that he was the shrewdest *gold thief* of them all! What is the difference between money obtained without a just equivalent in Wall street or a Pulpit? We have no more respect for big thieves than little ones; and when society, and especially professed Christians, "learn to read the law of life aright" and *practice* accordingly, there will be neither little thieves or big ones.

Doubtless Col. Fisk had "grievous faults"—so

have we all—but he had grand virtues also. It is said that the last act of his life, with his pen, was a generous gift to the needy and deserving poor! Let not these croakers about "morality," according to their little specious idea, think for an instant that any honest, generous emotion, or benevolent deed, will go unrecorded in the great hereafter in the interest of such a man as James Fisk, Jr., any more than the loudest professing saint on earth.

Generous noble deeds are the only commodities ever weighed in God's balances. "According to the deeds done in the body," is the unfailing law by which all must stand or fall, here and hereafter.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[Our correspondence column admits every shade of opinion; all that we require is that the language shall be that current in calm, unfettered social or philosophical discussion. It is often suggested that certain subjects should be excluded from public journals. We think that nothing should be excluded that is of public interest. Not the facts but the style to determine the propriety of the discussion.

We are in no wise to be held answerable for the opinions expressed by correspondents.

N. B.—It is particularly requested that no communication shall exceed one column. The more concise the more acceptable. Communications containing really valuable matter are often excluded on account of length.]

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL ON SOCIAL FREEDOM.

MRS. WOODHULL: Under the above heading I find an article by Hudson Tuttle in the *American Spiritualist*. I think it due to yourself that you should answer it, and I respectfully suggest that course.

I have watched your course with an interest superior to that of mere curiosity in the signs of the times, of which I take you to be one of the most prominent. Whether you can ever accomplish all that you strive for; whether it can, indeed, be accomplished at all in this phase of existence, I very much doubt. Not that I would seek to limit your activity—all free thought is beneficial, and the very striving after perfection is self-elevation, even if the full measure of hope be unattainable.

If I apprehend your Free Love argument, and I think I do, you intend only to claim the right of selection, the right of continuance and the right of separation in the marriage relation, free from the interference of third parties, whether friends, neighbors, Mrs. Grundy or the law.

I have not understood you to say that there are no moral duties of the parties to each other, or that inclination or instinct alone is to be on the part of either without reference to the other. As I understand, you leave the moral obligation, whatever that may be, protesting only against personal, social or legislative interference.

I understand you to object with all your might to "promiscuity." Indeed, I have read as much both from your own pen and in the reports of your speeches. I have understood you to assert your conviction that monogamic relations were the only relations sanctioned by moral law, by physical law, and by the law of public convenience.

"I am a Free Lover. I have an inalienable Constitutional and natural right to love whom I may, to love as long or as short a period as I can; to change that love every day, if I please, and with that right neither you nor any laws you can frame have any right to interfere."

These memorable words are the text on Mr. Tuttle's discourse. I think, with him, that there is a little ambiguity. But I think that the exercise of reasonable charity in construction, having regard to the context of your other declarations, would clear up all obscurity.

I take these words to be the continuous affirmation of a right—totally, absolutely distinct from the uses of that right, thus: I have a right to vote for President, but as I have a right to vote for the candidate so also have I a right to vote against him or not to vote for all. Consequently, if you have a right to change "that love every day if you please," that by no means implies that it will be either agreeable, convenient, or expedient so to do.

By the remainder of the proposition you only affirm that the exercise or non-exercise of the right is your own business, and it is nobody else's funeral.

Now I think the ambiguity lies in your not having asserted a moral duty, absolute or relative, expedient or imperative, affectional or spiritual—"the do as you would be done unto" duty—the reciprocal duty of justice and equity between Mary and George which would instigate them, and each of them, to sacrifice his or her own inclinations for the welfare and happiness of the other. This self-sacrificing spirit is the spirit of true Christianity, unperturbed by creeds and dogmas, forms of faith and the practice of daily life. I don't understand you to object to this spirit—indeed, from what I have heard and read of your life, I understand you to be one whose practice bears witness to the truth of this spirit—but I still apprehend that, this being a moral obligation, you object to interference by law or otherwise with its application. John Thomas and Mary Jane, or the collective John Thomases and Mary Janes, are to have no say in the domestic relations of George and Mary. You are not alone in this objection. It is already pretty generally accepted—and sometimes receives illustrations that would be laughable if they were not so infinitely wretched; for instance, a man or a woman may drink to the death—who has a right to interfere? This is the contention between the temperance

people who claim the right of benefiting a man against his will and the great mass of society who affirm the right of going to the bad each in his own fashion. Again, what is there better understood than the right of a man to beat his wife or of a wife to row her husband free of interference by third parties? "The injured party resents the intrusion:

"Ods! Bourne, my life,
But you mustn't beat your wife—
It is both a sin and disgrace."
"You fool!" says Mrs. Bourne,
"It is no business of your'n,"
And she slapped a cup of tea in his face.

Here we have the impregnability of the Anglo-Saxon home asserted. Even the police, the guardians of the public peace, must not interfere while murder is doing, though they may raise Cain when Cain's work is all done.

Thus we see that this doctrine of non-interference is as old as society. It is not by any means a new idea.

The term Free Love is perversely misunderstood. Free to come and free to stay away. Free to do is free to abstain from doing. Nothing but the most willfully stupid blindness, the ignorance of the proverbial fool, which is held by all humanity as a sin beyond excuse, can so misapply the word free. Prejudice will have its day, and as Christian, once a term of reproach and ridicule, has come to be a word of honor when rightfully used, so Free Lover may some day come to be accepted in your sense.

I hope I have rightly apprehended your position in this matter. There are, of course, difficulties in the way of any departure from established usage, even in the way of amendment; with these it is beyond my province to treat, though by your permission, should this communication be acceptable to you, I shall perhaps repeat the dose.

Toledo, O., Jan. 14, 1872.

MAXWELL.

[Our correspondent mistakes us upon two points. I would not be understood to say that "monogamic relations were the only relations sanctioned by moral law, by physical law and by the law of public convenience." But I would be understood to say that every condition is entitled to be governed by its own law, and that all conditions are inevitable results of pre-existing causes. The morals of a New Zealander are his own, to be judged of by his own law. Neither you nor I have any right to attempt to legislate our ideas of morality into, nor to enforce them upon him. His morals are his own, and so also are his physical powers. And our moral and physical powers are ours, and nobody can rightfully dispossess us of them. It is, after all, simply a question of the general fitness of things to the purposes ordained by the laws of the Universe; and whether we can enforce better conditions than God can evolve. We may assist in, but we cannot compel the evolution. But a paragraph from our speech on Social Freedom will cover this point, as well as that to which ambiguity is attached:

"Promiscuity in sexuality is the anarchical stage of development, where the passions rule supreme. When spirituality comes in and rescues the real man or woman from the domain of the purely material, promiscuity is simply impossible. As promiscuity is the analogue to anarchy, so also is spirituality to scientific selection and adjustment. Therefore I am fully persuaded that the very highest sexual unions are those that are monogamic, and that these are perfect in proportion as they are lasting. Now if to this be added the fact that the highest kind of love is that which is utterly freed from, and devoid of, selfishness and whose highest gratification comes from rendering its object the greatest amount of happiness, let that happiness depend upon whatever it may, then you have my ideal of the highest order of love and the most perfect degree of order to which society can attain."

It seems to us that the whole matter is thus summed up. Those who find fault with us must do it upon that paragraph.]

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES.

Tax-payers are rapidly learning, much to their disgust, that specific favors involve something more than mere profit to the recipients of this favoritism.

The inexorable logic of facts is teaching them that it is impossible for one section of the community to gather wealth from such a source without entailing an equal or greater loss upon the other or unfavored portion of the nation.

It matters not what form these exclusive prerogatives may assume—whether it be a direct embezzlement from the public Treasury, as by Tammany, or an indirect legalized despoiling through the instrumentality of a tariff—they are equally a robbery of the people for the enrichment of an exclusive few.

With Tammany the transfer from the pockets of the people and from thence to the pouches of the unblushing Tweedites was so direct that no doubt could arise of the actuality of the fraud; but when mammon invokes the instrumentality of a tariff, so many intermediate agents are employed, such a platitude of words concerning the competition of European pauper labor with free American-born citizens, so many patriotic disguises are poured forth from the government and capitalistic organs detailing the ulterior benefit which must accrue, that few of the people realize the verity of the robbery until their eyes are opened by impoverishment.

If the whole world were absolutely free from any special legislation, with no restraint upon production nor any creation at the public expense, each division of the earth would

naturally employ its labor in the growth or fabrication of those results for which it has peculiar endowments by nature.

All production being thus at a minimum, an infinitely greater proportion of the human family would be enabled to enjoy the good things of this world than is possible under our present class legislation, which injures only to the benefit of a few.

Our Government, when it yielded to the blandishments of capital by imposing a tariff, virtually said to every consumer in the land: You can only deal with these legalized monopolists; for the bargain with them is that every producer in the world outside of our boundaries who sells in this market must pay a certain amount before he can bring his cheap goods into the country; so if you persist in dealing with this foreigner, you will have to pay not only the original price of his goods, but the tax he pays us, the interest on the increased capital he now requires owing to the duties; but you must also pay the army of officials who line ten thousand miles of land and sea border, as well as the revenue fleet that is required to prevent these fellows from flooding the land with their low-priced articles. So you see it is much better to deal with the home producer and say nothing about the price.

Unfortunately the consumer has had heretofore no choice but to pay the extra price demanded by these licensed-to-plunder monopolists, though it has deprived many a toiler from gracing his fireside with those little comforts which so enhance the joys of life; but it has not curtailed a single luxury from the rich. It has widened the gulf which separates the rich from the poor, and like all unequal legislation, tends to ultimate revolution.

Our ancestors recognized the wisdom of free trade when they mutually agreed that the States otherwise sovereign should never impose any restraint upon the absolutely free interchange of products; and the time will come when men, rising above paltry national boundaries, shall recognize that all mankind are of one flesh and blood, and will sweep away these old selfish restrictions that have hampered the growth and marred the joy of the human family.

C. BRINTON, JR.

THE FRUITS OF OUR CHSISTIANITY.

BUFFALO, Jan. 7, 1872.

MESDAMES WOODHULL & CLAFLIN: There is abundant evidence to the thoughtful mind that the world was never more in need of a Saviour than now. Without admitting that vice and crime are on the increase, it is nevertheless lamentably true that the gangrene of corruption is outcropping in all the departments of society. Truth is truth wherever found, and as a principle never changes. What was true ten thousand years ago is true to-day. "The wages of sin is death," "the way of the transgressor is hard," "the soul that sinneth, it shall die," "as a man soweth, so shall he reap," are declared truths that cannot be gainsayed, and are as applicable to the present condition of man as in any past age of the world. The religious, social and political sins of the American people are great, and sooner or later must be atoned for, as there is no escaping punishment for violations of God's laws, the sins of the parents being visited upon the children. As a religion, Christianity is preached extensively and expensively all over the so-called civilized world, and yet it is well known and acknowledged by all calling themselves orthodox Christians that the teachings of the great founder of their religion are comparatively but little practiced, and that all are the "chief of sinners" and fall far short of the "glory of God." "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets," is the veritable teaching of Jesus. Yet the State prisons, penitentiaries, jails and poor-houses of the country are full of believers in his teachings. There is no doubt but what the brothels of New York now contain women who are indebted for their present degraded condition to the tender, loving kindness of professed Christian clergymen.

Christianity has elevated, advanced and brought great good to humanity, but after nearly nineteen hundred years of its existence, do not the results show that, as yet, man is the only animal ever created by God that has never been tamed, and if all the teachings and experiments that have been tried thus far have been failures to make him what he should be, does it not follow that he now needs a Saviour more potent to secure his salvation than any ever known only through faith? "By their fruits ye shall know them," and the world now wants a Saviour that will empty its prisons, poor-houses and brothels, and fill the hearts of all men with free love and sympathy for the poor downtrodden and oppressed of all lands, and suffering humanity everywhere. Is not the Saviour so much desired that that will induce men to act up to their highest convictions of right as acknowledged by the Spirit within? Does not the Spirit within, of every man in this country, tell him plainly of the infamous injustice now exercised by society toward women? May not the elevation of woman from her present social and political slavery and degradation hasten the coming of the desired Saviour, and bless humanity with the long hoped for millennium, when wars will be known no more, when spears and swords shall be beat into plow-shares and pruning-hooks, and peace on earth and good-will to man universally prevail? Who will answer these questions? SELAH.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

NO. IV.

No doubt there is a social problem to be solved. A problem at all events of which the public mind of to-day possesses no solution, yet one the solution of which is very pressingly needed, and the real solution not a sham.

A sham solution, were it ever so specious—a solution that would leave all the agitation and the struggle and the agony and the mitrailleuse murders to be done over again—is a thing we do not want at all, but it is just that which we are all busily engaged with all our might striving to bring about, unconsciously, no doubt, for the most part, but all the more surely.

Most unquestionably the working classes have much to complain of. Their situation is in many regards a disgrace and an infamy—a disgrace to our modern civilization, an infamy to our rulers, spiritual and temporal. No man, who is a man, can look upon this mass of wrong—say, for example, the condition of the population of Spitalfields or Bethnal Green, or even the treatment of the slaves of our horse railroads here in New York city, without quivering from head to foot with indignation.

But then, how to right this wrong? Are the demagogues, with their labor reform parties and panaceas, going to help us? Is everything in the industrial sphere going to be made lovely by taking away from the capitalist class the functions of the direction of industry and the administration of its products in order to confer them upon the nominees of caucuses or primary meetings, or any other officials ground out of a balloting mill?

We have tried this experiment of grinding governments out of balloting-mills pretty thoroughly here in the United States. We really ought—especially those of us who pretend to be *par excellence* progressives—to have learned something from our experience in this line. It is time, at all events, that we began in earnest to con over the lessons offered us by this experience. Now, no doubt the function of the direction of our modern industry, and especially that of the administration of its products, are to-day vilely ill performed. Naturally enough, when the social character of these functions is on all hands utterly ignored. But surely the man must be crazy who would dream of finding any real remedy in the transference of these indispensable functions, especially that of the administration of the products of the social industry, including the conservation of the stores of provisions and materials, to any such "government" forsooth as can issue from our American (or, indeed, any other) electioneering processes.

Only to think, for instance, of trusting our stocks of wheat and flour to the fostering care and very safe keeping of a Tammany Ring!

The social problem is urgent no doubt. But, then, it is also very wide, and very complicated.

HENRY EDGER.

A VOICE FROM THE NORTHWEST.

MAZEPPA, Minn., January 6, 1872.

Miss TENNIE C. CLAFLIN: Bravo, my common-sense sister. A thousand hearts throughout our land will rise up and crown you with imperishable honor for the truly brave and noble spirit that has enabled you to handle stubborn facts, in open day, with ungloved hands. Your "Virtue, what it is and what it isn't," was to the point, and I have long contended that the world needed a new dictionary, or fuller explanations added to the old, and since your "Seduction, what it is and what it isn't," I propose (since I have the floor) that we have Webster Unabridged supplemented and amended (or awoman-did) by Tennie C. Claflin, who is equal to the emergency. Bravo! Your noble utterances are carrying conviction to the minds and the reason of all who, while they read, lay aside their educated prejudices.

What is noble? That which places
Truth in its enfranchised will,
Leaving steps, like angel traces,
That mankind may follow still.
E'en though scorn's malignant glances
Prove her poorest of her clan,
She's the noble who advances
Freedom and the rights of woman.

MRS. M. I. WASHBURN.

JUVENILE CRITICISM.

"O, you young rascals, come right down out of that tree. Can it be possible that this is the way you disregard your Sunday-school lessons; coming out here to steal cherries, ough! ye young Sabbath breakers? Hemp'll catch ye yet. Come right down out o' that tree."

Startled into nervous alarm the truant Sunday-school boys, at sound of the sturdy yeoman's threatening voice, hurried in from many of the richly laden branches toward the main trunk of the large tree, and down to the ground.

But one of the urchins venturing far out on a thin, frail branch, in his haste to return, it broke beneath him, when both fell to the ground together.

Greatly alarmed now, he cried out, "O, please, mister, let me go this time. I didn't mean to do it—neither to break the Sabbath nor the tree."

Gathering himself up hastily he hurried after his compan-

ions, less hurt than alarmed. He was soon murmuring to the others, "Tush, breakin' the Sabbath! 'tain't much account nohow, if it's so easily broke as that, just goin' up that tree and eating a few cherries. Anyhow, us fellows must be pretty strong to break the old day so easily; eh, Joe?"

"Ha, ha, I was just thinking, Charlie, that your fall for 'low' was a perfect success. Guess, though, we've done no harm, Charlie. Better the tree be broke, and even the Sabbath, than your arm."

"Thank you for your kindly consideration, Joe. But it is really too bad that we must give up our afternoon pastime so."

Is liberal thought on the increase? Yes, free thought, liberal construction is borne by the atmosphere to the minds of almost every phase and age. The young are learning to think and reason for themselves on life's best logic, and we have been charmed with some of their happy conclusions. Hence the late commotion in the orthodox press. Editors and preachers are culturing and taxing all their ingenuity and powers of scheming to counteract this rising tidal wave of religious freedom in its purest, most absolute sense.

Just as the child Jesus confuted with the doctors in the temple, so youths are now teaching gray-haired doctors of divinity the utter impossibility of breaking, or even violating any immutable law, and such we deem all nature's laws.

We may place ourselves in adverse, hurtful, inharmonious relation with them, but we can never violate them.

If a man casts himself from an eminence and is hurt, broken or killed, the law of gravity is simply vindicated, never violated.

But another incident of juvenile criticism.

"Now, boys, you must not slide on the Lord's day. If you slide on the Lord's day, the Lord will not love you." Deacon Hardshell admonishes a group of rosy-faced youngsters indulging in this healthful exercise on their way to Sunday-school.

"Ha, ha! Clear the way, old acid!" laughed one of the same class. "We don't slide on the day, we slide on the ice. Whew! ain't it smooth and splendid, though?"

And away he glided, tripping the ascetic deacon nearly to the ground.

REICHNER.

MR. TILTON AND MR. SUMNER AGAIN.

It is one of the compensations of nature that those who advance a general principle, and at the same time attempt to limit its application in a single direction, are always falling into the pits dug by themselves. No more notable example of the fact exists than Mr. Greeley. But no more pointed one than the case presented below. We do not see how Mr. Sumner can well evade this direct thrust from an old and long-trying friend, with whom he fought the slavery fight, and still maintain a consistent position. This present issue is upon the country, and as much as the slavery issue demanded, demands solution, and that cannot be in opposition to the general tendency of reform. It cannot advance backward. We await with no inconsiderable interest, we may almost say anxiety, to see if Mr. Sumner has the cowardice to attempt to dodge the point, or the courage to maintain his principles in favor of Equal Justice to all persons:

MR. SUMNER'S UNEQUAL EQUALITY.

To Charles Sumner, Senator of the United States:

SIR: In common with many of your friends, I have been somewhat bewildered by your recent speech, entitled, "Equality before the Law."

You therein uttered doctrines which, if applicable to negroes, are equally applicable to women. And yet (unless your habitual and intemperate silence on the woman question has misinterpreted your views) you still deny to women those very rights which for years you have eloquently demanded for negroes.

But tell me by what process of reason, by what instinct of justice, by what high statute of ethics can you withhold from one class of American citizens that same "equality before the law" whose very essence is, that it belongs alike to all classes?

There is no ground in reason or equity for such a discrimination.

Have you weighed your words? Undoubtedly you have, for you are a grave-minded man. But I beg you to weigh once again the following words which you uttered last week in the Senate:

"The precise rule," you say, "is equality before the law; nor more nor less; that is, that condition before the law in which all are alike—being entitled, without any discrimination, to the equal enjoyment of all institutions, privileges, advantages and conveniences created or regulated by law, among which are the right to testify and the right to vote."

In uttering the above noble words—worthy to be graven in adamant over the entrance to the Capitol—you have apparently (yet perhaps unwittingly) confessed that all citizens, and therefore women, are entitled to "equality before the law;" that all citizens, and therefore women, ought to stand in "a condition before the law in which all are alike;" that all citizens, and therefore women, must be accorded an "equal enjoyment of all institutions, privileges, advantages and conveniences created or regulated by law;" that all citizens, and therefore women, must possess "the right to testify," and, finally, that all citizens, and therefore women, should enjoy "the right to vote."

Women's right of suffrage fellows, therefore, as a necessary conclusion from your own logic. Why, then, do you not accept this conclusion, and acknowledge that, as all these rights justly belong to negroes, so also they justly belong to women.

My interest in your public career is disturbed at remembering (as I must) that John Stuart Mill of England, for his advocacy of woman suffrage, is wearing the laurel that ought to crown the brow of Charles Sumner of America. I grieve to hear reformers say (as they do) that the chief of American Senators, after hav-

ing been a life-long champion of negroes, at last fails in chivalry of statesmanship toward women. Having spent thirty years of eloquence on the rights of the one class, how can you now sit dumb concerning the rights of the other?

For the sake, therefore, of your own fame as a consistent statesman, as well as for the sake of the good cause of woman suffrage, I respectfully urge you to make a clear answer to each of the following questions, all of which are suggested by your last speech:

First, You hold that all citizens should stand in that "condition of the law in which all are alike." In saying this, do you mean to exclude women?

Second, You hold that all citizens are justly "entitled, without any discrimination, to the equal enjoyment of all institutions, privileges, advantages and conveniences created or regulated by law." Do you deny these to women?

Third, You hold that all citizens must have "the right to testify." Do you refuse this to women?

Finally, You hold that all citizens should enjoy "the right to vote." Do you accord this to women?

I beg you to answer these questions, whether it be as the friend or foe of woman suffrage; for, on this subject, your non-committal silence—so unlike your accustomed frankness on public questions—is leading many of your old and best friends (including some who have been your life-long comrades in the anti-slavery struggle) to feel annoyed at your inconsistency, to accuse you of vacillation, and to suspect you of cowardice.

Meanwhile I remain, as ever, your unchanged admirer,

THEODORE TILTON.

THE GOLDEN AGE, Jan. 20, 1872.

SKIN GRAFTING.

Dr. Chambers, of London, in his late admirable Hunterian oration, thus alludes to this interesting subject: "We have to deal with, let us say, an unhealthy, stagnant ulcer. We strip out a bit of clean skin, not as big as a mustard seed, from the patient or a friend, and we plant it among the torpid granulations; it sticks, it unites, it lives, it feels and becomes, with its new home, one flesh, not to be put asunder. John Hunter had taught us to expect this; but, better still, it becomes a center of new growth; healthy skin begins to form around its edges. Praise to the All Merciful! Not only disease but health, also, is contagious; better still, it is infectious; it has stepped over the gulf of festering stagnation and is sowing growth along the neighboring margin, throwing out peninsulas and promontories to join the parent-piece of grafted skin. One who has experienced in his own person what up-hill work cicatrization of a large surface is, must be pardoned some exultation at the surgical promise, and may be allowed an Utopian dream of restoration which would thus present success far into the shade. Even the practitioner upon others' ailments cannot but feel enthusiasm at the revelation of this important law of nature."—*Journal of Chemistry*.

Mrs. Cora L. V. Tappan, on March 27, 1870, replied, under spirit control, to the inquiry, "Who should be healers?" substantially as follows: "All are healers, slayers, or both. * * * Every one you meet is benefited or injured by your magnetism. Medicines differently affect, according to those by whom they are administered. The great study of healers should be to endeavor to cure only those to whom they are medicinal."

Mark this: "Not only disease, but health also is contagious;" "all are healers, slayers or both (i.e., healers to some, slayers to others). Every one you meet is benefited or injured by your magnetism." Thus seer and surgeon, science and spiritualism, unite in asserting that congenial relations involve health, all that health embraces, while uncongenial relations equally involve disease and its accompaniments. Therefore the vanguard of humanity exclaims: "Avaunt, theological fiends and Grundian nightmares! Let our relations with each other be natural and spontaneous, therefore invigorating and pure."

And now comes Mrs. Partington, with her mop and pail, to drive back this onward movement, this Atlantic ocean of science and spirituality, and pen people up, compelling them to slay each other under penalty of social and ecclesiastical excommunication, and preventing likewise those who could heal and invigorate each other from forming relations accordingly.

But the Mrs. Partingtons of press, pulpit or parlor may as well save their brooms. Their victims are numberless, the martyrs not few; but the race must march onward to victory purity, life, love!

ANTI PROCURSTES.

"AND SOME FELL ON GOOD GROUND."

CAMDEN, Maine, Jan. 15, 1872.

MRS. VICTORIA C. WOODHULL:

Dear Madam—Pardon me for expressing to you in this manner my hearty sympathy with your ideas of constitutional equality and social freedom.

My own personal experience, and that which I have gathered from others during a long medical practice, has long since convinced me of the true state of social conditions, and that it needed just such outspoken advocacy as you are giving it.

I earnestly hope you will publish your lecture on social freedom in pamphlet form, that it may be widely circulated. I have already put to silence two by showing them your lecture as published in the *Banner of Light*, who had caught the spirit of abuse from an unjust press.

God and the angels guide you, and let not the hisses of serpents, nor the howling of curs prevent you from speaking boldly, is my prayer.

J. P. COWLES, M. D., Camden, Maine.

DRAMATIC AND MUSICAL.

The past week has been rendered memorable by the complimentary testimonial to Matilda Heron, at Niblo's, on Wednesday afternoon, 17th inst. The bill presented was wonderful in length, diversity and the number of prominent artists who assisted, and the house was jammed from pit to dome—the aisles, staircases and lobbies being filled with human beings. Two acts of Miss Heron's favorite play, "Camille," were given, introducing Miss Burnside and Miss Oliver, two pupils of the beneficiary, who made their debut on this occasion. Miss Burnside, who is slight in figure, self-possessed and a promising actress, appeared in the title role in the third act, giving place to Miss Oliver in the succeeding one. The latter has a very attractive face and figure, but was dreadfully frightened and gave little evidence of talent. Edwin Booth and Bella Pateman put the audience in thorough good humor by their sprightly acting in "Katherine and Petruchio," and the third act of "Divorce" was given by Mr. Daly's company. Laura Keane gratified her many friends by appearing in a scene from "School for Scandal" with John Jack, and Master Percy Roselle thrilled the vast audience with his fervent acting as *Prince Arthur* in the tower scene from "King John." Charley Backus, Sheridan and Mack and Rollin Howard appeared in their specialties, and the performance concluded with the Terrace Scene from the "Black Crook," introducing the Majiltons and the Infant Ballet Troupe. Prior to the fall of the curtain Miss Heron delivered quite a lengthy address to the audience, thanking them for the splendid ovation they had given her and frequently alluding to her private woes. The beneficiary will receive, as the result of this testimonial, over four thousand dollars, which, in the present state of her finances, will prove very acceptable.

AT BOOTH'S THEATRE.—"Julius Caesar" continues to draw crowded houses. No word of praise is necessary from us, of either scenery or acting, and the piece is likely to have a long run. Mr. Booth and Mr. Barrett will shortly exchange characters, when the former will enact *Cassius*.

AT THE ST. JAMES THEATRE.—Mr. Durivage's romantic play of "Monaldi" has met with sufficient success to warrant its continuance for another week. Mr. Mackaye's efforts to portray emotion in a purely mechanical manner have brought forth a flood of unfavorable criticisms, but it is by no means certain that his enterprise will not achieve a measure of success after all. While looking at him we often wonder how he can calculate to a nicety just when to use the five hundred and forty-third or the seven hundred and eighty-sixth motion of the eye, and when it comes to legs, the effect is perfectly overwhelming. Miss Griswold is destined to become a favorite if she does not imbibe too much *Delsarte*, and Mr. Bartlett has so far overcome the influence of mannerism as to act his dual part quite nicely. After the present week a new society comedy entitled "Marriage" will be produced.

AT DAN BRYANT'S OPERA HOUSE the "Black Brigands," "Shoo-Fly" and "Divorce," in combination with the usual singing, dancing and joking, make up a very entertaining programme.

AIMEE'S OPERA BOUFFE continues its career of success, notwithstanding much bad singing; but the little lady herself is so thoroughly bewitching, and the acting of all the members of her company is so good, that one cannot but look leniently upon their musical deficiencies and enjoy the various operas as produced at her house.

The delightful Sunday Night Concerts of the Ninth Regiment Band have been resumed at the Grand Opera House. We could ill afford to lose them.

The first public rehearsal of the Church Music Association, preparatory to the second concert of the season, took place at Steinway Hall on Thursday afternoon. Mrs. Guler, Mmc. Ackermann-Jaworska, Miss Antonia Heune, and Messrs. Wm. S. Leggat, Franz Remmerz and Rembold Hermann were the soloists. Mozart's Requiem Mass and selections from Wallace's "Lullaby" were rehearsed. Meyerbeer's overture to *Struensee* will complete the programme for the concert which will take place on the thirteenth of February.

NEW MUSIC.

Wm. A. Pond & Co. have lately published M. W. Balfie's exquisite romance, "Did'st thou but know" (*Si tu Savais*), which is worthy of a place in the portfolio of every vocalist. It is showy, melodious, and not very difficult. We also note "Marjorie's Almanac," by Mmc. Sainton-Dolby, which Miss Edith Wynne sang so charmingly at the Dolby concerts; and "Sweet Black-Eyed Flirt," a song by Frank Wood. For instrumental music they have published "Break of Day," by Julius E. Miller, a brilliant and pleasing "Summer morning's reverie," with an attractive descriptive title-page; and the "B. P. & C." polka by Henry Kleber.

J. L. Peters has just published "The Ne Plus Ultra," a collection of over seventy popular glee, trios, quartets and choruses arranged from the works of various American, French, German and Italian authors. It is neatly gotten up and, like most of Mr. Peters' publications, is reasonable in price.

The *Musical Bulletin* for January, contains an article on the various vocal societies of New York, a notice of the Church Music Association concert, in which Dr. James Pech is highly lauded, the usual amount of interesting musical items and correspondence, and three pieces of music.

According to traditional belief long held sacred in Japan, women have no souls. Very recently the more progressive Japanese have conceived the idea that by bare possibility a woman may have a soul. It is thought this mission to the United States may throw some light upon this important subject.—*An Exchange*.

WOMAN ITEMS.

Madame Massena, a Creole lady, conducts the *Weekly Magnolia* in New Orleans.

The Turkish Government has opened a school for girls. Pretty well for a religion whose women have no souls.

Charlotte Cushman has had a school named after her by the Bostonians. It is built on the site of her birth place.

For a lady to understand how to keep up an intelligent and interesting conversation with more than one man at a time, has become one of the lost arts.

Howard Glyndon (Miss Redlen) says she adopted a male pseudonym because when she was young people attached no significance to what a woman said.

Miss Margaret A. Macconnish was first in the prize list of students who attended Professor Huxley's recent course of instruction in biology for teachers of science.

Miss Minnie F. Austin, a Yankee girl, is now associate principal of the San Francisco Female Seminary, and member of the California State Board for the examination of teachers.

A female art academy has been established in Berlin by the wife of "Our Fritz." The Princess and her pupils are engaged on a series of pictures illustrating the war.

"Do be frank," said young Mr. Smith to Miss Francis, who had been quizzing him for an hour. "But, Edward, I have been Frank twenty-five years, and I should like to try some other name just for a change," was the arch reply. "No cards!"

A number of ladies in the Treasury Department at Washington have recently been designated by the Secretary for promotion, and the disposition of that department is to give its female employees as prominent positions as they may be competent to fill, taking the usual chances of promotion as those to which the male clerks are subjected.

Marion V. Churchill very sensibly says: "I would rather see a policeman, club in hand, marching an offender to punishment than to see that same woman marched to punishment by a policeman for lack of money which would have been her honorable salary in the police service. There are women in the world better fitted for police than for parlor duty. Let them do it."

A Danbury, Conn., man saw his daughter into the cars and passed round to her window for a parting look at her. While he was passing out the daughter left the seat to speak to a friend, and at the same time a prim-looking lady, who occupied the seat with her moved up to the window. Unaware of the important change inside, our venerable friend hastily put his face up to the window and hurriedly exclaimed: "One more kiss, sweet pet." In another instant the point of a blue cotton umbrella caught his seductive lips, followed by the passionate injunction, "Seat, you gray-headed wretch!" and he scattered.

The St. Paul Press seems to feel badly over the election of a woman—Miss Alice Webster, "of Wisconsin"—to the office of Enrolling Clerk of the Senate; says it is a great Miss-take to choose an obscure woman in preference to "a man of education, a prominent Scandinavian, a member of the State Central Committee, an effective" politician, and so forth. Now we think that if Miss Webster's competitor possesses all these high attributes and accomplishments he should be above quarreling with a woman for a petty government office which no man of any business capacity would care to accept. But Mr. Johnson had "labored" as a party politician, and this petty office was to have been his pay. The Press does not display its usual sagacity in abusing a woman whose "only qualification is the clerical ability to write" (what are the other special talents required in an Enrolling Clerk?) because she happens to distance a professional politician in a race for office.—*Austin (Minn.) Register*.

"SERVANT GIRLS."

The very name expresses the servile position which this class of our sisters are forced to occupy. How would the term sound applied to men? Words rarely get out of place in their application. Consult Webster for the meaning of the word servant.

To be a servant is to be little better than a slave. To be a "servant girl" is to be worse than were the common run of black slaves in the South. They were fed, clothed, housed, nursed in sickness, doctored and decently buried. Nothing of this kind is done for the generality of servant girls among us, and no provisions made for it through their wages. What can be done with a dollar and a half or two dollars per week in the way of clothing, comforts, food for mind and soul, the accidents of sickness, etc.? Is it not the pittance of a slave? This is strong language, but the disgraceful facts will more than sustain it.

No class among us are so mercilessly trodden under foot as these defenseless, hopeless girls and women who wear out their cheerless lives in dismal kitchens and foul basements. The brave Irish or German girl who, by dint of energy and frugality, secures a passage "to the land of the free," soon learns the bitter lesson that the women of America who "boss establishments," or tyrannize by proxy in comfortable kitchens, are more to be dreaded than the hard fare of Ireland or the narrow opportunities of Germany. They fled from a noble aristocracy to find themselves ground down by a contemptible shoddy, one whose supercilious dictations and tyranny is "sharper than a serpent's tooth."

These vixens, who have nothing to recommend them to respectability but their nasal twang and good clothes, who pride themselves on keeping "servants" and ruling with a sway of iron over their perhaps hired domain, crush every hope and aspiration of

their God-made sisters who work in their kitchens, as remorselessly as they tread the dirt beneath their feet. These poor and oppressed menials are unworthy of their slightest consideration or regard. What is it to them if the "girl" is tired or sick, or pines for her foreign home and longs once more to hear the voices of her friends or kindred? What is it to them for the "girl" to work sixteen hours a day and then go to her attic or cellar, and steep her pillow in hopeless tears? What is it to them if she does the work of two women and breaks down under the shameful load? When she is used up she is as ruthlessly thrust out of doors as the butcher thrusts his victims into the slaughter pen. And these women, as heartless as Nero, adorn "good society," are members of churches, and very much interested in foreign missions, and their "dear pastor." Shame on them!

Think of two dollars a week! Not enough to buy a calico dress! Seven days' work for two dollars? Twenty-eight cents a day for clothing, for books, for papers, for comforts? What else do they receive? The treatment of a dog. Are they recognized by the mistress? No. Are they allowed to eat with the family? No. Have they any privileges of thought or intelligence? No. Are they allowed to have an opinion of their own? No. Are their womanly natures allowed a single tithe of respect? No. Their feelings are continually outraged; their womanhood thrust into the mire of contempt; their finer sensibilities trampled upon, and the whole fabric of their lives crushed into the miserable shapelessness of a menial servile drudge.

Twenty-eight cents for sixteen hours of weary, disheartening toil, loaded with unspeakable bitterness, and crowded with that sharp and burning abuse which a woman can only conceive and execute. How can the lot of a slave be worse? Is it any wonder that American girls would sooner sell their souls to damnation than to go into a woman's kitchen? Is it any wonder that they wear out their lives in stitching in garrets and cellars rather than bear the unbearable indignities of working in the kitchen for these ban-tam Negroes?

Only those girls who are forced by the direst necessity, and those who have lost their self-respect and womanhood by the wretched demoralization of the kitchen, will submit to the exactions, indignities, petty tyranny and slavery of doing "housework" for ladies. We admit that there are ladies who are such in the kitchen as well as parlor, whose souls are alive with sympathy and love to their sisters, whether in their kitchen or on the street; but we regret to say, for the honor of womanhood, that they are the exception and not the rule.

A pseudo-aristocracy, supercilious pride and dictatorial affectation have poisoned the hearts and brains of a large portion of American women; and instead of being what God made them—ministering angels of love and good-will—they are transformed into monstrosities of ugliness, and disgrace the name they bear.

When will women who employ servant girls remember that these girls are women as well as themselves, and that they are entitled to womanly treatment? Their lot at best is one of peculiar hardships and burdens; why will women make it more dismal, yet unbearably wretched, by unnecessary abuse and gratuitous indignities? It is lamentable that women should be such tyrants when they have the opportunity, yet we remember that women are incomparably the worst enemies of their sex.

There is no class of laborers among us so poorly paid as are servant girls; is it not most lamentable that they should as well be the most abused? If any class of laborers need a vigorous trades' union, it is servant girls. Why will they not try the experiment? We are satisfied they would have much help and encouragement from men.—*Penn. Labor Journal*.

NEW DEPARTURE LECTURES

LYRIC HALL,

Forty-Second Street and Sixth Avenue,

FIRST COURSE TO CONSIST OF FOUR LECTURES.

FIRST LECTURE

BY
LAURA CUPPY SMITH,
OF CALIFORNIA.

SUBJECT:

The Social Problem Reviewed; Fashionable Morality Exposed; The Woman Side of the Fisk Tragedy.

Popular Speakers on Popular Subjects for the whole Course.

Tickets for the Course, with Reserved Seats, \$1
Single Tickets, 25 cents.

OLIVIA FRELOVE SHEPARD

will answer calls to Lecture on

A Free Womanhood

Address, O. F. SHEPARD,
Foxboro, Mass.

SPIRITUALISM;

ITS PHENOMENA AND PHILOSOPHY;

At SAGESSE HALL, No. 220 East Thirty-fourth street (near Third Avenue). Seances every evening. No admittance after 8 o'clock. Tickets, \$1.

Sunday discourse at 10½ A. M. Conference, 2½ P. M.

IN PRESS.

Be Published Saturday, Jan. 20.

MEISTER KARL'S SKETCH BOOK.

BY CHARLES G. LELAND.

(HANS BREITMANN.)

Author of "Hans Breitmann's Ballads."

When the first edition of "Meister Karl's Sketch Book" was issued, Washington Irving wrote to the author: "I trust your work has met with a wide circulation, for such it merits by its raciness, its quaint erudition, its graphic delineations, its veins of genuine poetry and true Rabelais humor. To me it is a choice book to have at hand for a relishing morsel occasionally, like a Stilton cheese or a *pate de foie gras*."

There is not perhaps in the English language a more delightful work than this. Mr. Leland's sketches are as crisp, dewy and refreshing as a tender salad in early summer. One can open the book anywhere and enjoy delicious reading at a moment's notice. In "Meister Karl" there is genuine instruction as well as delightful and innocent entertainment. Mr. Leland possesses a large stock of profound erudition, and scatters it through this charming book with a lavish hand. Not like a pedant, however, does he air his learning; but gives his readers the benefit of it in the most natural manner, making it seem as a savory relish to the solids so abundant in the quaint sketches of "Meister Karl."

This edition is an entire new one of "Meister Karl's Sketch Book," and is printed from a new set of stereotype plates, just made from the author's manuscript, received from him from London, and is entirely different from the first edition, Mr. Leland having carefully revised all the matter, canceling some, and adding new sketches to this edition. It is printed on the finest tinted plate paper, bound in morocco cloth, with beveled boards, gilt top, gilt back and sides, and is one of the handsomest volumes ever issued.

Complete in one large Octavo Volume. Bound in Morocco Cloth. Price \$2 50.

UNION HOUSE,

Green Cove Springs, Florida.

This House is situated on the St. John's River, thirty miles south of Jacksonville, at the flourishing village of Green Cove Springs, one of the healthiest and most attractive points on the river.

The House has lately been enlarged, and now has ample accommodations for one hundred guests; and the rooms are all large and neatly furnished throughout.

A short distance from the House is the celebrated White Sulphur Spring, the water of which is highly valuable for its medicinal properties. The Spring has lately been fitted up with a fine Swimming Bath and comfortable Dressing-Rooms, for the accommodation of bathers, and the temperature of the water (78 deg. at all seasons) renders bathing pleasant the entire winter.

The table will be supplied with all the delicacies afforded by Northern and Southern markets, and an abundance of fresh vegetables from a garden connected with the House.

Persons traveling for pleasure or health will find all the comforts of a Northern house.

TERMS.—\$3 50 per day, and from \$15 to \$25 per week.

Liberal terms made to families desiring to spend the winter.

REMINGTON & REED,

J. R. ADAMS,

Proprietors, late of the Magnolia House.

LAURA DE FORCE GORDON,

Of California,

Will make engagements to lecture upon the following subjects:

- I. "Our Next Great Political Problem."
- II. "Idle Women and Workingmen."
- III. "A Political Crisis."

Terms made known on application. Address,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

AUNT PATTY'S SCRAP BAG. By Caroline Lee Hentz. With illustrations by Darley. This gifted and deservedly popular writer has written so many good books, indeed she never produced an indifferent one, that it would be a thankless task to compare the present fascinating story with any one of her other charming literary efforts. It may in justice, however, be said, that "Aunt Patty's Scrap Bag" is one of the most absorbing and best told stories in the whole range of American literature. The plot is contrived and worked out with rare artistic ability, the characters are individualized with a vivid distinctness, reminding one of the admirable pictures of those masters of English prose fiction, Dickens, Bulwer and Disraeli. Then not only is the story well told, but it conveys a moral, not a dry kernel ostensibly and offensively held up between thumb and finger, as a tail-piece to the last chapter; but pervading the whole absorbing story, and improving while entertaining the reader. No better argument, if any were needed, against the reading of novels, was ever made than the production of this interesting, pure and absorbing story of "Aunt Patty's Scrap Bag," by Mrs. Caroline Lee Hentz. It is published by T. B. Peterson & Brothers, Philadelphia, and is complete in one large duodecimo volume of nearly four hundred pages, printed from large type, headed, and beautifully illustrated by Darley, and bound in morocco cloth, full gilt back, gilt side, etc. Price \$1 50. It will be found for sale by all booksellers, or copies will be sent, post-paid, by the publishers, on receipt of price.

D. W. HULL,

PSYCHOMETRIC AND CLAIRVOYANT PHYSICIAN,

will diagnose disease and give prescriptions from a lock of hair or photograph, the patient being required to give name, age, residence, &c. A better diagnosis will be given by giving him the leading symptoms, but skeptics are not required to do so. Watch the papers for his address, or direct to Hobart, Ind., and wait till the letters can be forwarded to him.

Terms, \$3. Money returned when he fails to get in rapport with the patient.

F. H. BEEBEE,

No. 78 Broadway,

BROKER IN STOCKS, GOLD AND BONDS.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

One copy for one year -	\$2 00
One copy for six months -	1 00
Single copies -	5

FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTION.

CAN BE MADE TO THE AGENCY OF THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY,
LONDON ENGLAND.

One copy for one year -	\$3 00
One copy for six months -	1 50

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Per line (according to location) - From \$1 00 to 2 50

Time, column and page advertisements by special contract.

Special place in advertising columns cannot be permanently given.

Advertiser's bills will be collected from the office of the paper, and set in all cases, bear the signature of WOODHULL, CLAFLIN & Co.

Specimen copies sent free.

News-dealers supplied by the American News Company, No. 121 Nassau street, New York.

All communications, business or editorial, must be addressed

Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly,

44 Broad Street, New York City.



VICTORIA C. WOODHULL and TENNIE C. CLAFLIN,
EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.

CARPENTER AND CARTER REVIEWED.

We desire to call special attention to the speech delivered before the Suffrage Convention in Washington, January 10, in which every possible objection to the legality of our position upon the Constitution is, we think, fully answered. It will be found on page 10.

THE NEW DEPARTURE COURSE OF LECTURES.

In another column is an announcement of the first of a course of popular lectures upon radical issues, now for the first time in the history of the world coming before the people, as the natural sequence of Human Rights, and as the logical sequence of individual freedom, the theory of which is the foundation of all democratic government.

It is a simple exhibition of ignorant superstition, intolerant bigotry and pharisaical godliness for people who have never investigated the social problem to cry out against the advocates of reform in the social relations, on the study of which they have spent all their lives. As well might the ignorant and untutored cry out against scientific inventions simply because they know nothing about them, and because they will revolutionize present customs of labor.

It would be waste of time for us to attempt to show the stupid folly, the ignorant presumption of those who attempt to stifle the spread of already discovered truths involved in the construction of society, or to hinder further investigations in the same direction.

It is with peculiar pleasure, therefore, that we make the present announcement, and especially that Mrs. Laura Cuppy Smith, of California, who made such a decided impression at the recent Suffrage Convention at Washington, will open the course upon "The Social Problem Reviewed; Fashionable Morality Exposed; The Woman Side of the Fisk Tragedy!"

The entire course is already filled by popular speakers who will treat popular subjects from the standpoint of radical reform, utterly regardless of Fashionable Morality or Fashionable Religion; but with a supreme regard for Humanity as a Common Brotherhood, which doctrine Christ taught, but which Fashionable Religion, clothed in purple and fine linen and faring sumptuously every day, sees fit to ignore.

Let everybody who is interested in the cause of Human Rights, and in spite of hoary-headed authority, or of authority of whatever kind, go and see for themselves, and if truth be found, sustain it with unflinching zeal and true moral courage.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WASHINGTON CONVENTION.

Up to the present time the general tendency of all reform has been diffusive. Its incidents have been of a disintegrating character. Nothing constructive has ever yet been attempted with much general success. All movements have been instructive—for education. Even the Republican principles, upon which the party in power build, were not integral. They were simply destructive to certain existing things and forms.

Nevertheless all reform primarily begins from a common cause—the effort of humanity to attain to the full exercise of human right by the possession of Freedom, Equality and Justice. These words are large enough to take in all the various movements of the people.

Since all branches of reform have common origin, when the process of education is completed their natural tendency must necessarily be to unity. And in the Washington Convention almost the first evidence of the beginning of this process was had. At least three of the leading reform movements were there represented, each joining in the grand demand for the recognition of woman's political equality; and whatever differences of opinion there may have been in minor points, all were agreed as to the real unity of their several movements.

And this feeling was not a forced one. It sprang spontaneously from the hearts of all. Never was there a Convention for political designs more harmonious; and never one more enthusiastic. Personality seemed for once to have been left at home, and each vied with the other in expressions of general good-will.

The Convention was a grand success also as to its attendance. Not less than fifteen thousand persons attended its several sessions, and every audience manifested a most remarkable degree of enthusiasm and approval of the designs of the Convention.

Following that of the Boston wing of suffragists so quickly, it might have been supposed that its success would probably be indifferent. But we believe it was even greater than was that of a month previous. We think the general opinions gathered from the press expressions warrant us in this position. But we are glad to be able to announce that both were successes.

We are aware that the Boston people have no admiration for the proposition that women, as citizens, are also voters; and especially that they could not think of having anything to do with anything in which we are interested. But the prophecies of the last convention are, that before we shall obtain what, in common, we desire, we shall be obliged to consolidate our forces, since there is some force upon both sides.

We do not care how suffrage comes, only we want it the most speedy way. And when we see the men of such a State as Minnesota denying women the ballot by a vote of six to one, we are compelled to the conclusion that there is little hope for us, in depending upon our masters and rulers to grant us equality. We hope our Boston friends may be able to induce the Legislature of their State to propose an amendment to the State Constitution. But if they should succeed in that we fear for its success when it goes to the men for their approval. Especially does the prospect seem unflattering when we remember Lowell, Lawrence and Fall River, with their large disproportion of women citizens, who, if once admitted to the ballot, would outvote the men—and that is what men fear. They always keep a sharp outlook for any class or party who can outnumber them at the polls.

But the more important outlook of the convention is quite in another and altogether new direction. There was a very important resolution introduced, requesting the National Labor Union, which was to hold its convention to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency in February, to postpone their action until efforts could be made to call a convention of all branches of reform at a later day.

The same resolution has also been adopted by several sections of the Internationals, and will undoubtedly be adopted by every section, as well as by the Federal Council of North America.

The significance of this movement will begin to become evident when we state, as we are now able to state, that the Executive Committee of the N. L. U., by a large vote, have agreed to postpone the February Convention. Thus the first efforts at consolidation are successful. What may be the outcome of what has been thus auspiciously initiated, it may be difficult to determine. But if it be properly continued, with the sole object of the general welfare constantly in view, and sufficiently strong to sink personal cliques and ambitions, it may revolutionize the government.

No one doubts but that the entire Radical element of this country could carry a political canvass to a successful issue. It is their duty to make use of every possible means to be successful. And to that end should, at as early a day as practicable, unite in a common Convention and determine to overthrow the party who seeks to perpetuate itself by the means of official patronage.

And the battle-cry of this new party should be—
Equality for the laboring classes;
Equality for women;
Legislation by the people—the referendum.

CARPENTER AND CARTER.

THE ADVOCATE AND THE JUDGE.

The sole point to which opponents to Woman Suffrage cling, is that which was advanced by Senator Carpenter in his reply to Mr. Tilton, and more recently enforced, or rather attempted to be enforced, by Justice Carter's decision in Washington. Every other ground has been abandoned and the opposition centered upon this. So far as argument is concerned, if these gentlemen can be shown to be

in error, our case is won. Indeed, it is already won. It only remains that the Highest Court shall consider the issue to end the struggle in favor of woman.

If there are any people remaining who are not yet convinced that women are citizens and voters, we earnestly request their careful examination of the review of this question made in the speech published in this number. Some of the best judicial minds of the country have analyzed it and pronounced it complete and unanswerable. If anybody find anything that is not perfectly clear, or anything that is incomplete as to law or logic, we hope they will lose no time in making it known. When the case goes before the Supreme Court, if it go there at all, it will go upon the points examined in this speech. Everybody should study and thoroughly understand every point involved, and thus be prepared to show the folly of further opposition, even though it come from the general antidote to woman suffrage—the baby argument, advanced with so much apparent candor even by so clear a head as Oliver Johnson. Make sure you comprehend the fallacy of the baby antidote, and our word for it, you are competent to meet and successfully answer any opponent.

MISS BATES AND THE NEW YORK LIBERAL CLUB.

The question has always remained an open one, since the formation of the New York Liberal Club, a body of increasing popularity devoted to scientific and progressive ideas, whether women were or were not eligible to membership. Some weeks ago the question came up and was virtually settled by the election to a life membership of Mrs. Elizabeth Thompson, of this city, who, however, it was understood, had at the same time liberally endowed the club by a subscription for the founding of a library and otherwise.

The question was, therefore, still not fairly met of admitting women on their individual qualifications as parties interested in the objects of the club and somewhat versed in science—the same qualifications, in a word, upon which men are elected.

Three weeks ago Miss Redelia Bates, of Brooklyn, a young lady having in a high degree just those attributes which, were she a man, would entitle her without hesitation to immediate admission among the members of the club, made application. At the meeting of the club the following week the question of her election was voted upon, but became complicated with various questions of order in the parliamentary treatment of the question, and the effort resulted in a failure to elect, which found its way into the newspapers as a decision on the part of the club adverse to her election. This however, it seems, was a misapprehension; and the question was called up again at the last meeting of the club, on Friday, December 29, when, after several explanatory speeches, and the certifications of members in respect to the standing of Miss Bates as a thinker and a scholar, she was unanimously elected as a member of the club. That question is therefore definitely and rightly settled, and women will be hereafter equally eligible with men as members of this important and growing institution.

SUFFRAGE AND JOURNALISM.

The following letter was a reply to an editorial inquiry in the New York Times, but it was not considered of sufficient importance to have space in that journal:

To the Editor of the Times:

The Impartial Suffragists of the United States will rejoice to find one great metropolitan journal, and especially that one which brought Tammany to bay, a candid inquirer about woman suffrage, not admitting "that this is a fit subject for ridicule," but admitting that it deserves fair "inquiry and discussion."

It appears to me, however, that the objections which you raise, or rather surmise and hint at, are, even in your own mind, more fanciful than real, and that if any such objections are at issue, you have answered them yourself.

You say: "It is bad enough to deal in this city with the gangs of ignorant ruffians which Tammany has always had at its beck and call; add to them the inhabitants of Greene street and similar localities, and we much fear we should be taking a long step backward in the work of government." All of this you answer when you say: "Although the women could not vote, they worked very hard at home in the cause of honesty and good government, and if they could have gone to the polls, the blow delivered at the Tammany thieves would have been even more overwhelming than it was."

That such would have been the result there can be no doubt. Indeed, if we are to take the results of woman suffrage in the only place where they have been permitted to vote, the evidence is complete. Governor Carpenter, of Wyoming, says of them:

In this Territory, women have manifested for its highest interests a devotion strong, ardent and intelligent. They have brought to public affairs a clearness of understanding and a soundness of judgment which, considering their exclusion hitherto from practical participation in political agitation and movements, are worthy of the greatest admiration and above all praise. The conscience of women in all things is more discriminating and sensitive than that of men; their sense of justice not compromising or time-serving, but pure and exacting; their love of order not spasmodic or sentimental merely, but springing from the heart. All these—the better conscience, the exalted sense of justice, and the abid-

won. It
the issue

yet con-
nestly re-
this ques-
Some
try have
and un-
perfectly
logic, we
When the
e at all, it
Every-
very point
of further
antidote
with so
as Oliver
acy of the
mpotent to

LIBERAL

e, since the
of increas-
sive ideas,
membership.
as virtually
s. Elizabeth
understood,
b by a sub-
wise.

et of admit-
as parties
at versed in
upon which

lyn, a young
butes which,
hesitation to
e club, made
flowing week
but became
n the parlia-
rt resulted in
e newspapers
her election.
ion; and the
g of the club,
explanatory
in respect to
a scholar, she
club. That
settled, and
men as mem-

M.

itorial inquiry
dered of suffi-

es will rejoice
especially that
ndid inquirer
his is a fit sub-
erves fair "in-

ons which you
n in your own
any such objec-
yourself.

is city with the
has always had
ants of Greene
r we should be
government."
Although the
rd at home in
d, and if they
red at the Tam-
overwhelming

ere can be no
of woman suf-
n permitted to
r Carpenter, of

for its highest
telligent. They
t understanding
dering their ex-
in political agi-
tatest admiration
men in all things
at of men; their
serving, but pure
asmodic or senti-
All these—the
ce, and the abid-

ing love of order—have been made by the enfranchisement of women to contribute to the good government and well-being of our Territory. To the plain teachings of these two years I cannot close my eyes.

But even admitting all you hint at as likely to be true when women vote, the argument still remains in favor of their suffrage. Nobody ever deluded himself by the idea that the "ignorant ruffians" of whom you speak compose the majority of New York voters. Indeed, the real blame for all the atrocities which this city has suffered does not lie at their doors at all, but rather at the doors of the "learned and respectable" who voted with them. This is clear, since when the issue came these last voted against, while the "ignorant ruffians" voted *en masse* for Tweed and his gang. Suppose that to them had been added all of the class who live "by the most shocking of trades," and that to the other side had been added all the other classes of women, have you any doubts as to what the result would have been in comparison with what it was?

It also appears to me that if your surmises about that class of women should be entitled to any weight in the solution of the question, you should also bring into the consideration the concomitant fact that "these women" could not "live by the most shocking of trades" unless at least an equal number of men were their partners in it, but of whom you make no mention. By this omission would you be understood as holding them blameless? If not, then why have you not made some movement to deal with them—some movement as to "what restriction can you place upon the suffrage so as to guard against this danger?" After you have shown women what you propose to do with your male prostitute voters by some action against them, it will be an easy matter for women to tell what they will do with their side of the question.

What women demand as citizens are equal rights and privileges with men. They want no favors or immunities that men do not have. They do not care so much what qualifications are required for electors, or who is excluded from suffrage, so that men and women are excluded for the same reason, and a like qualification required of both. If men become voters at twenty-one, or by a year's residence after removal; by education, by property qualification, by a virtue test, or whatever other invention men choose to make, women only demand that they shall become voters by the same means and qualifications. If every woman is to be excluded on account of sex, they demand that every man shall be excluded for the same reason. They want the same equality that Madison advocated. Suppose women were in authority, and numbering, as they do, more than men, should vote to exclude men from suffrage, would you stand that sort of tyranny? No, sir, I know you would not for a single day. And you ought not to stand it. Do you then expect women to always suffer, getting insult when they ask for justice? Now I do not hold that men are so much better than women as to entitle them to all the power over women. I have found as much intelligence among women as among men, and more honor; and I do not think you will assume that, as a whole, women are less virtuous than men in any respect, or less to be trusted in grave affairs. And if you do not, you cannot refuse to admit that politics would, taken as a whole, be elevated rather than debauched by the advance of woman.

But all of this is completely outside of the real issue. This is a republic in which every citizen is entitled to equal rights. The Constitution was lately amended, making this so plain that it is the most preposterous quackery to attempt to escape it. In fact the only escape there was, when pressed to the wall, and Congress was made to confess that women had been made citizens by the amendments, was to revive the theory of States rights, which the late war was waged to destroy. The only way to escape woman suffrage is to argue that the States have the right to deny suffrage to any citizen for any cause except for being a male negro; against which stupidly arrogant assumption women oppose the argument that if male negroes were made voters by the Amendments, so also were women; since they, equally with them, are citizens. This is not only the letter of the law, but it has been repeatedly confirmed by the Supreme Court and placed forever above and beyond question. I will call attention to a single case. In the Dred Scott case, Justice Daniels, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

"There is not to be found in the theories of writers or governments, or in any actual experiment heretofore tried, any exposition of the term citizen which has not been considered as conferring the *actual possession*, and *enjoyment*, or the *perfect right of acquisition* and *enjoyment*, of an *entire equality of privileges civil and political*."

I am aware that this, at the time it was made, excluded negroes from equal civil and political rights, since they were not citizens; but having, with women, been made citizens by the supreme law of the land, this decision holds good in favor of the negro; but not more so than in favor of women, and every unprejudiced mind must admit it.

Women also claim that the idea of a republican form of government is entirely adverse to the existence of any such power on the part of either the government of the United States or of any State, since it must be all the people governing themselves through the representatives elected by them, or it may be one governing all the rest. To admit that discrimination may be made against any class of citizens is to admit that all classes may be the objects of discrimination; and to deny any class of citizens a right exercised by

other classes is to admit the right to deny all rights to all classes.

Now, if a government would not be a republican form in which all rights are denied to all classes, how can a form be held to be republican which, under any circumstances, will permit of such denial. Senator Carpenter may be able to enlighten us upon that point. I think light is needed upon it. At least, I need it before I can be persuaded that such a government would be republican in form, and I believe every logically-inclined citizen also needs it before conviction can supervene.—Yours very respectfully,

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

44 Broad street, December 29, 1871.

THE SITUATION.

[We commend the wise words below to the calm consideration of all who fear Social Freedom. They come from one of the first and best women in this land, whose name, if we were free to give it, would carry dismay into the ranks of our defamers.]

In government, religion, education and social custom, each generation is inclined to accept the conditions into which it is born as fixed and final. The change in men's minds is so very slow and imperceptible that the less active are unaware that any movement is taking place, until some one idea is ripe for expression and embodiment in actual life, then this class of non-thinkers is suddenly aroused to astonishment and opposition at the changes proposed. Thus in every marked movement toward greater freedom or greater intelligence, cowardly conservatism, which always distrusts the qualities and capacities of human nature, shrieks its horror, hurls its anathemas, and hastens to stand guard over its whitewashed sepulchres, which represent to it all the poor virtue possible to humanity. "No taxation without representation!" shout derisively the established rulers. "How can the laborer understand anything about government or law? We the aristocracy, the owners of property, alone may decide what laws shall be enacted. The masses must be governed."

"The individual is no judge of what is truth. The private conscience is no proper guide," says the Catholic Church. Yet Protestantism can point to her more intelligent and energetic peoples, to her scientists, philanthropists, poets and statesmen, who throw the meagre merits of priest-ridden communities far into the background. And republicanism has held her own, in spite of the hordes of the ignorant cast on her shores by monarchy. So far, it is proven that freedom in politics and religion has been a success, has fulfilled the prophecies of the saints and martyrs over whose bleeding forms we have walked to reach the desired goal. Now the time has arrived, and thousands read the signs distinctly, when no farther progress can be made, no higher development be attained until social freedom is proclaimed and the pure sunlight and generous air be admitted into that system of respectable misery and legalized vice called "marriage," into the distracted and desolate places we are accustomed to call our "homes" (a word which now has a beautiful significance only to the children, whose relation to it is more true and natural than is often that of their parents). We do not wonder at the shout of rage and derision which greets the messengers who would inaugurate the reign of purity and peace. Every social reformer in the past was charged with licentious motives, and can we, with our social evil, our labor slaves and whisky palaces, be expected to take a wiser course? Socrates, Jesus, Luther, Garrison and all other saints and martyrs had to endure this base suspicion.

Socrates undermined virtue in Athenian youths. Jesus associated with sinners. Luther, the sworn celibate, married a nun, and while he was happy in the company of wife and children, tens of thousands of Catholics, in their ignorance, held him to be an incestuous demon. Those who gave themselves to the work of liberating the chattel slave of the South well remember the ever-ready taunt, "So you want to marry a nigger, do you?" Cohabiting with helpless slave women and selling your own children at the auction-block, was *customary*, and hence not impure, while the interfering with this state of things was *prima facie* evidence of sensuality. So, at this time brothels and disease, broken hearts and debased minds are *accustomed* evils, and any attempt to probe or prescribe for this cancer in the body politic is met with insane reviling from the lineal descendants of the ancient conservatives I have before alluded to. It is an inevitable disadvantage that nearly all social reformers have to be born in *managers* since ease, luxury and deference are unfavorable to incite sympathy, power and broad investigation. We are, therefore, doubly grateful when one of the class having position, like Phillips or Tilton, give the prestige of their antecedents to the unpopular truth which the time-serving, unreasoning and pharisaical condemn without examination. Mill and Conway, in England, advocating a limited marriage law, traveled well and carefully over the field of misery, before presenting so decided a report as this, we may be sure. The hour for the criticism of this institution has fairly arrived. It is arraigned before the bar of experience and pronounced not only a failure, but an injury to the cause it is supposed to sustain. We want the life-long bond annulled that the life-long affection may continue, since there is now no

longer a doubt but the external fetter acts unfavorably to the real union. Woman in marriage is virtually the slave of man, and if we should alter the laws and make her in all respects his equal, there would be virtually no law operative.

What a fearful mystery until now has been the nearly total failure of happiness in the legal marriage. A very few who are affected only by the higher law, live serene and happy in spite of it; a few, affectionate and tenacious in the sphere of the senses happily escape temptation; but to an immense majority of the whole, the bond is destructive of love and all the finer and purer sentiments allied to it. It is the "you shall," which is defied in every possible way. We can easily imagine how the life-long bond would operate in the case of business partners. I think of two men in my neighborhood, who have done business together for years, though utterly uncongenial in temper and ideas. Let the partnership be entered into for life and murder would be the result before six months. How much more damaging the bond must be in the case of those so much nearer allied!

From time immemorial it has been the belief of women that man was, for some inscrutable reason, endowed with a fearful amount of animal passion to which nothing in a well-constituted woman was found to compare. The unfaithfulness of men to their married partners is proverbial. Indeed, among men generally the worth of self-control and faithfulness is denied and even ridiculed. Marriage is admitted on every hand to be "the grave of love." Moralists have accounted for this through the theory of innate evil. Philosophers have rather inclined to consider love as a delusion planned by nature for the continuance of the race; and yet there was Dante—and Petrarch? Well, it is understood now that if Dante had been married to Beatrice, a hundred chances to one he would have snubbed her before a year; and if Petrarch had married Laura he would have written sonnets to some other woman. So does the earthly, legal bond vitiate the spiritual tie. So is the high ideal swamped in the actual misery. "Abandon hope all ye who enter here" should be written on the ring. Yet with what tenacity women cling to this bright ideal is evidenced in the scores of novels written by them, in which they discover their dismay and desolation by portraying what alone would satisfy their hearts—*i. e.*, a sentiment the very opposite of the vulgar common-place passion into which love sinks after the law of the land interferes.

Then authorities on prostitution* tell us that "owing to an invincible necessity in man"—mark that, owing to an invincible necessity in the sons of us mothers—a certain number of our daughters, and those the most beautiful and often the most generous and affectionate, *must* be prostituted—must be made, either through poverty or seduction or some other foul means, to abandon their naturally true instincts and principles, otherwise ruin would overtake every household! (Only "one woman in a thousand" is moved to an abandoned life by the same sensual motives which lead men to seek relations with abandoned women*); and furthermore, it is a fully authenticated fact that it is the *married men* who are the chief supporters of the women in question, for the young men have not sufficient means for such expensive living, and let us hope they still for awhile have faith in a pure marriage of heart and soul.

If anything were needed to prove the blindness and worthlessness of mere masculine legislation, the "Contagious Diseases Act" in force in Great Britain, and now introduced into some of our cities, would be amply sufficient. Instead of going to the root of the matter and ascertaining as we see that only when left quite free does a man continue a lover—only when his beloved is held by no chain does he see in her his ideal mate, and for her, without effort, can he still entertain the reverence, delicacy and tenderness proper to the true lover. Instead of thus trusting that he may have instituted conditions unfavorable to his best life, he makes himself out to be an uncontrollable beast, who preys upon the weak and trusting and then makes laws to punish *them* for his doing so. How can they look each other in the face while enacting such a cruel farce? For our part, we refuse to accept their low estimate of their own natures. We predict marriages which will be permanent, pure, happy, improving, when the chain of the law is removed. When the charm which first attracted shall remain and deepen, when, in fact, loving and beloved of free choice, a man would no more be moved to prostitution than he would to abandon his children to the storms of the world and take in their place a herd of swine. But until they are free to love, they will be fickle because unsatisfied. The woman who is forever free to refuse is the only one who will continue to hold the head and heart of a true man.

S. B. S.

* Sanger.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

If our readers had noticed our remarks in No. 87, they would have found our explanation about mistakes in bills sent. We repeat that one of our subscription books was nearly destroyed, much of the memoranda explanatory of subscription being effaced, consequently if some receive bills whose subscriptions are not yet expired, they will please accept this apology and not decide that we intentionally ask payment twice.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL'S SPEECH,

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON CONVENTION, LINCOLN HALL, JANUARY 10, 1872.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Such, my friends, are the propositions which resulted from that famous Philadelphia Conference, in which Washington, Franklin, Rush and Adams, when hesitating and undecided, called on Tom Paine to solve their difficulty. Rising from his seat when he had attentively listened to their doubts and queries, and, towering high above them, Mr. Paine answered them: "We want independence, and I mean revolution."

And our wants to-day are what their wants were at that time. We want independence; and if we can't get it without it, we mean revolution. Do you doubt that we are in slavery? Franklin himself said: to be enslaved is to have governors appointed over us by other men. Women have governors appointed over them by other men, and, according to Franklin, are absolutely enslaved. Freedom has been the watchword which has echoed through the centuries, and to-day it rises higher, and touches the souls of mankind with a profounder meaning than ever before. With each succeeding year it has gathered in volume, and expanded its boundaries, until every human soul leaps with a new pulsation when touched by its magnetic power.

Something more than a year ago I went before Congress with a simple petition, setting forth that I was a citizen of the United States and of the State of New York, under the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that the State of New York unlawfully deprived me of one of the dearest rights of a citizen, in direct contravention of that Amendment, and asking for the necessary legislation to prevent the continuation of such tyranny.

I adopted that course because I believed myself aggrieved as set forth, and because I believed I had just as good a right to participate in government as most men had, and because I was not willing to await the willingness of men to graciously say, "We will now consent that you shall vote." I did not ask any other woman whether she believed as I believed, or if she felt as I felt. I acted of my own accord, scarcely realizing that my demand would grow into the great National Question it since has.

But why did I go to Congress with my demand? I will tell you. I had carefully watched the legislation of Congress following the war, which was fought and won upon the very idea upon which all that legislation was founded—and that was the sovereignty of the United States over that of the States. It was held by all Republicans, up to the time of my demand upon Congress, that that was the result of the war and the effect of the Amendments.

I saw that all the qualifications for electors, of which use had been made by the States, were wiped out by the Amendments and the Force Act; I saw that the provisions of race, color, and previous condition of servitude, removed all restrictions upon the right of negroes to vote, although, as in the State of New York, they were not prevented from voting because they were negroes, but because they did not have the property qualification; I saw all these restrictions and obstacles melt away before the potent concentration of power, by which the sovereign people of the whole country forbid the sovereign people of any people to discriminate against citizens who owed their first allegiance to the United States.

I saw that I was first a citizen of the United States, and, by virtue of so being, also a citizen of the State of New York, and that the State had no right to even require me to conform to any of its regulations in order to be entitled to be recognized as a citizen.

But the State of New York did assume to interfere with my rights as a citizen of the United States, by depriving me of the right to participate in the government of the United States. Therefore, as a citizen of the United States, I appealed to the Government of the United States for redress. Was I right or was I wrong? But how was I met? By the flat contradiction of my whole demand. It was denied that I was a citizen. I was simply a woman—not even a person, since to be a person was to be a citizen.

That was a year ago. How does the question stand to-day? Then, the Republican Party claimed to have demolished—aye, destroyed—the doctrine of States' rights. Now they are compelled either to acknowledge that my demand was a legal and just one, or themselves become the champions of those very doctrines to purge the country from which they murdered hundreds of thousands of their brothers. Thus, what required rivers of blood and years of severest struggle to gain, my simple demand has caused them to abandon. Verily, there must be a mighty power behind that demand, to cause the Republican Party to even hesitate to grant it. While not to grant it is to enter up a verdict of condemnation against themselves, which time even will never be able to efface.

I hold, then, that I was right in going to Congress to demand redress; and I further hold that everything that has since occurred, connected with this question as relating to women, proves that I was right—proves that we have no hope whatever for redress by any other means. In a State where men specially desire to invite the immigration of women, they were denied an amendment to the state constitution by a vote of six to one. If that is to be taken as a sample of what men will do where they should be specially favorable to women on account of their scarcity, what may we expect in States where women predominate? Do you, my friends, see any hope that way? I confess I do not.

Turn you to Wyoming, and what do we see there as a result of the theory that citizens may be enfranchised and disfranchised at will simply because they don't choose to vote as it is desired that they should vote? Is that the kind of Republicanism under which you want to live? Do you want your State to grant you suffrage one day, and take

it away the next? Have men ever undertaken to play that game with their own sex? Not a bit of it. And, were it ever attempted, I think I can name a hundred Congressmen who would launch their oratorical thunder, till the whole country should ring with its echoes. And it would be right. It would be ignoble in them not to do so. But in our case—why, it is quite a different matter. They don't deem it quite expedient. They don't know exactly what use we shall make of the ballot if they permit us to get it. We are only women, you know—between whom and men, it is said, there is an impassable political gulf fixed. But let me simply say to those expedient Congressmen, who think more of their positions and prospects than they do of justice, that they cannot afford to maintain that position.

But let us enter into a close analysis of the situation, and the law which applies. We, as women citizens, are either entitled to vote under the law, or we are not. Let us take it up, and see for ourselves just how the matter stands. We do not need to ask anything. I think we are capable of reading and getting at the real sense of it for ourselves. And if we read, and find that we are entitled to the ballot, under the very laws men have made, we are surely justified in demanding the benefit of such laws.

One of the following positions must be correct. Either the States have the right to deny the right to vote to all citizens, or they have no right to deny it to any citizen. Now, we claim that they have no right to deny any citizen the right to vote. But if we admit that they have no right to deny any citizen the right to vote, we thus claim that that is not a Republican form of government which makes such denial. And if the government which makes such denial is not a Republican government, is that form of government which will admit of such denial a Republican form? I say most emphatically no! But what say the Republican Party?

During last Summer, Mr. Tilton addressed an exhaustive argument to Senator Sumner upon this question, ending by asking him to become the champion of this movement in Congress, as he was the champion of the Slavery movement. Though several months have elapsed, Mr. Sumner has made no reply. Whether he thinks it unworthy his attention, or whether, like many Republicans, he thinks it inexpedient to broach this question upon the eve of a Presidential election,—since they are not capable of seeing how it will affect that election,—or whether he is indifferent to it, we are not able to determine. But I must confess to not a little astonishment that a Senator who played so honorable a part in the destruction of African Slavery, and advocating human rights, and whose speeches only need to be amended by substituting the word "sex" for "negro," to furnish us all the argument we require, should, for any reason whatever, hesitate to become a champion against this greater slavery. I may be in error in supposing he will not. I trust I may be.

But as yet he has made no reply, though another honorable Senator has. And I think we are justified in assuming, and I do assume, that the address of Mr. Tilton to Mr. Sumner was not considered as simply a personal address, but as addressed, through Mr. Sumner, to the Republican Party, and that since Mr. Sumner could not consistently take adverse grounds, and since the party could not permit itself to be committed to Woman Suffrage by an indorsement of it, that Mr. Carpenter was selected as the person to break the force of Mr. Tilton's onset, and to bridge the question over another Presidential election, when, as I have been informed by several prominent men, they will be willing that we get our rights. And to such things, my friends, has our Republic descended. Justice, when placed in the scales with party expediency, is found wanting, and goes by the board. What business have these men to deny us our rights because a Presidential election is impending? Had they a particle of the sense of honor and true patriotism; had they a single feeling of love for their country, as above their love for self and position, they would the more gladly welcome us just at this time. Hence I say, and I declare it boldly, that these men whom other men sent to Congress to legislate for themselves and against us, are traitors to their country, and unfit to occupy seats in so honorable a place as the Capitol of this country, representative of freedom to the world, if they for a single moment deny us justice. We ask no favor. We want no alms. We beg for no charity. We demand what is ours of right. And woe betide them if they shut their ears to our demands, since—

"Ever the right comes uppermost,
And ever is justice done."

But, as I have said, the question is now narrowed down to a very small point—a single point—but around it are grouped several important questions which, it appears to me, must have been either totally ignored, or, at best, but casually observed by those who established it, as the position from which to resist the attack of Woman Suffrage, under the Constitution as it is. It has seemed to me ever since I thought upon this subject that we had a queer sort of a Republican form of government whose Constitution had to be amended in order to meet each new contingency. It appeared to me that "We the people" included all the people. But our wise governors seated in the Capitol inform us quite to the contrary. They tell us that "We the people" are only those persons whom from time to time their graciousness permits the privilege of interest in government.

That is to say, though our Constitution is based upon individual equality, exact justice and perpetual freedom, yet those whom men choose to legislate have the right to decide who are to be the recipients of these blessings which the Constitution was ordained to guard, protect and defend. Some of you may be able to comprehend such a position, and see its benign results; but, for my part, I freely confess I am too obtuse. I can understand the simple propositions of the theory of our government; but, for the life of me, I lose sight of the theory altogether if I attempt to grasp the application which is made of it in practice—since the paradox is too obscure for me to discover its truth. And this Republican Paradox, enunciated by Senator Carpenter, became to me still more enveloped in clouds and fogs after it passed the searching

ordeal of Justice Cartter's logic. The Paradox, as stated by Mr. Carpenter (as far as can be discovered from his language), is this: We have a Republican form of government because we are compelled by the Constitution to have it, and it consists of the right of States to deny the right to vote to any citizen, except male negroes, which, after passing through the judicial furnace of Justice Cartter's brain, becomes still further attenuated—since, he says, that to admit the theory that the right to self-government is an inherent right is to destroy our civilization—hence the right don't exist.

Now, before going further, I submit to you whether Justice Cartter's logic, added to Senator Carpenter's wisdom, should not compel us, out of respect to ourselves, if not from deference to them, to adjourn and go home, convinced that we form no part of "We the people," nor of the persons whom this Amendment made citizens; or, if we are citizens, that we must wait with due patience for our gracious masters to extend us the ballot, since they instruct us that we have no rights that men are bound to respect, unless we can shoulder our muskets and fight for them. What say you? Let me tell you, my friends, for my part, instead of going home to wait for the tardy justice hinted at, I will shoulder the musket and fight for freedom, and no longer submit to this degrading vassalage. I say, "Give me freedom or give me death!" and it is time for women to declare their emancipation in terms that shall make the country ring from end to end, rouse each sleepy soul, and cause those who hold sway over them to tremble in their usurped seats.

Since we have not concluded to go home, let us examine the questions that are grouped about the new Republican doctrine of States Rights, as remodeled and announced by the modern Lycurgus, and made law by the later Daniel. And first let us examine as to what a Republican form of government is. Mr. Carpenter says: "It is a strong point in favor of your position, that under the old Constitution it is made the duty of the United States to guarantee a Republican form of government to every State." But he sweeps that point away by the assertion that, since when women did not desire to vote, the States were held to have a Republican form of government; that, though women do now desire the right to vote, and are denied, the States, nevertheless, are Republican. Is that strictly logical? I say, emphatically, No! It is neither logic nor common sense, as I will shortly show.

A hundred years ago women made no demand for the exercise of the elective franchise. They simply did not want it. They were not denied it, however; and they freely exercised such other citizen's rights as that of pre-empting lands, obtaining passports, and clearing vessels. Nobody thought of denying them these rights. But it is quite different now since women do demand the elective franchise, thousands strong, and are denied. The argument hurled at us, that the majority of women do not want the ballot, instead of being against our position, is directly and forcibly in its favor—since a government might be held to be Republican which had non-voting citizens from choice, which could not be so held having non-voting citizens from compulsion.

Would Mr. Carpenter assume that to be a Republican form of government which deprived every man of the ballot? We hardly think he would go to that extreme. How, then, can he assume the same of one that denies the ballot to every woman? And do you not see, to admit if all women wanted the ballot that they should have it, is to admit, if any one desires it, it is clearly her right to have it, since rights are individual, not collective? If it is the right of all women, then it follows necessarily that it is the right of each one constituting the all. Is not that a clear statement?

But Mr. Carpenter facetiously says: "The Constitution, deriving its powers from the will of the people, must be construed as it was understood by the people." Admit all that, and it cuts its own throat; since, if the people a hundred years ago construed indefinite language to mean one thing, the people of to-day may very properly give the same language a very different construction. Or are we always to accept the theories of past ages? The Constitution exists to-day under the authority and by the will of the people who exist to-day; and it is for them to determine for themselves what a Republican form of government is to-day, not what it may have been held to be a hundred years ago.

But how are we to know whether the States ever had a Republican form of government? Mr. Carpenter says: "The Courts would undoubtedly have held that the States under the old Constitution were Republican;" but, unfortunately, that question was never raised, and of course it was never decided. It seems to me, however, that Mr. Madison did not so understand the matter, since he said: "Some States might regulate the elections on the principle of equality, and others might regulate them otherwise. Should the people of any State by any means be deprived of suffrage, it was deemed proper that it should be remedied by the General Government."

Now, what did Mr. Madison mean by the principle of equality in elections? Mr. Carpenter will hardly contend that he meant admitting one half the citizens to suffrage and excluding the other half, since that would be *inequality*. If Mr. Madison were now here, and should make that assertion, he would at once be set down by our opponents as a shrieker for Woman Suffrage.

If a Republican form of government mean the equality to which Mr. Madison referred, then neither the United States nor any of the States ever had it; and they have not got it now. Mr. Carpenter saw the force of this, and said, "Well, it is a strong point."

A Republican form of government means a government guaranteeing equality of rights among its citizens exercising the right of self-government, in opposition to a monarchical form, in which citizens submit to be ruled by a monarch, as women submit to be ruled in this country by men. There is no mistaking the meaning of these terms. There is no chance left for equivocation, reservation, or interpretation. Ours is either a monarchical or a Republican government, and there is no halfway house at which to stop. Leaving a monarchy, we must go to the other extreme to find a Republic. To do otherwise is to set up a false

pretense—is to practice a cheat either upon rights or upon credulity. And I do not mean that men shall any longer think it is upon my credulity that they are practicing. I am for exposing this monstrous fraud, and for compelling the enforcement of that provision of the Constitution which demands a Republican form of government in every State of the Union.

But now let us see about the muddle into which Senator Carpenter, in his zeal to establish his new-fledged doctrines, would precipitate the Fourteenth Amendment. The language of its first section is: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law that shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, nor deny to any person the equal protection of the laws."

Of this language Mr. Carpenter says: "*Had the Fourteenth Amendment stopped with the first section, I think the right of all citizens, black and white, male and female, to vote and hold office, would have been secured.*" He thinks only!

But is such the actual fact? Had there been no second section, would the right to vote have been secured alike to men and women? That is the question, and it is the only one. The language is positive. It does not leave any room for doubt, or place for construction to step in and quibble over words. The States shall not (that is the language) make or enforce any law that shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States. Now, everybody who knows anything about the definition given to the term citizen knows it describes a person entitled to participate in government, and that was distinctively and expressly settled as the law of the United States in one of the most important cases that ever came before the Supreme Court of the United States—the Dred Scott case. In delivering the opinion of the Court, Mr. Justice Daniels said: "Who, it may be asked, is a citizen? What do the character and status of citizens import? Upon a principle of etymology alone the term citizen, as derived from *civitas*, conveys the idea of connection or identification with the State or government, and a participation in its functions. But beyond this there is not, it is believed, to be found in the theories of writers on government, or in any actual experiment heretofore tried, an exposition of the term citizen which has not been understood as conferring the actual possession and enjoyment of the perfect right of acquisition and enjoyment, of an entire equality of privileges, civil and political."

Now, what are political privileges? Are voting, being elected and appointed to office, political privileges? If they are not, then there are no political privileges. Take them away from politics and there would be nothing remaining. Then the right to vote is a political privilege which every citizen has the perfect right to possess or acquire and enjoy; and since every woman born or naturalized in the United States is a citizen, every such woman, by the supreme tribunal of the nation, has the right to vote; and that decision of that tribunal stands the supreme law, unreversed by any later decision.

It inevitably and unavoidably follows, then, that the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment *does* give to "black and white, male and female," the right to vote; and no proposition can be more clearly and forcibly established.

Now, then, let us see about that second section, upon which Senator Carpenter makes so magnificent a retreat, saying, "Although all citizens have been made voters by the first section, the second section clearly recognizes the right of the States to exclude a *portion* of the same from voting." If a portion only, why not the whole—but if only a portion, what portion? "Oh! but—but—but it doesn't tell us who may be excluded. That, you know, we left for the States to decide." And who, pray, are the States? Do they consist of men only, and is it for them, having usurped the power to do so, to say that all women are the portion who may be excluded? Is that the magnificent result obtained by all the wisdom expended since the war in legislation, to which Congress has been almost exclusively devoted? It seems to me that such an abortion is better described by that little game, "first you see it, and then you don't," than anything else that ever emanated from Congressional brains. For the sake of ushering negroes into the mysteries of citizenship, Congress set themselves to work and made everybody citizens; but, being frightened at the grandeur and extent of the result, straightway they turned about and gave the States the right to exclude a *portion* of the newly-made voters from voting, and magnanimously left it to the States to say that that portion should be women. Such patriots; such lovers of their country; such devoted adherents to the right of the States, to do whatever they please with citizens of the United States so that they let men alone, is truly astonishing. And Mr. Carpenter, the Raphael of the nineteenth century, presents them to us in such life-like colors and in such grandeur, that we fain must bow down and worship at their shrine.

But let us analyze these beautiful pictures of the Gods of Wisdom and Justice, to see if indeed they are the only true Gods. We have been so often deceived that we must be pardoned for having become just a little bit skeptical. This Amendment declares that when the right to vote shall be denied by a State to a portion of the male citizens of the United States, the basis of such States' representation shall be reduced, &c.; and this, Mr. Carpenter says, is clearly an acknowledgment of the right of the States to deny the right to vote to women. General Butler a year ago said of a certain argument, that it was "the slimmest he ever heard." That may be the slimmest he had ever heard, but Mr. Carpenter had not then advanced this one, of which we are speaking. I think General Butler will be obliged to revise his assertion in favor of Mr. Carpenter's last effort. When the States shall deny the right to vote to a single man, then they shall have the right because of such denial to deny the same right to all women. Wonderful wisdom; wonderful indeed!

But again: this provision is in the form of a penalty; it provides if any State shall do a certain thing to certain citizens of the United States, that it shall suffer a certain penalty. Now that is all that can be made of the language. And it may be well to remember that that only is

law, which is written; *ita lex scripta est* is the rule everywhere. It is the only safeguard to law, since if we are at liberty to infer anything we please, then we might as well have no law at all.

But Senator Carpenter tells us, that because the sovereign people have declared, if the States shall assume to commit a certain crime against citizens, they shall suffer a certain penalty, that that gives them the right to commit all other crime against all other citizens with perfect impunity. Undoubtedly Senator Carpenter and Justice Cartter will give to the world a new system of logic; but I hope I shall not be called upon to formulate its rules.

Let us try by the same rule a similar kind of a case outside of voting, and see how it would work. The people say that if a person commit the crime of murder he should be hanged; therefore, any person has the right to commit all other crimes and suffer no penalty at all.

But there is still another face to this remarkable thing, which we are called upon to admire. If men are denied the right to vote, then the representation must be reduced. But all women may be excluded from voting and still be retained in the basis of representation. This pretense, however, is too shallow to dwell upon. Any school-girl of twelve years who could not detect it ought to be accounted a dullard. But these logicians must stick to this line of argument, since it is their last line of defense. Give this up and women suffrage is inevitable. I don't expect them to give it up until driven from it by brute force.

But we will bid adieu to this part of the subject by calling attention to the fact everywhere recognized in law, that anything granted by positive law cannot be taken away by implication.

Justice Story, in speaking of Constitutional law, said: "Contemporaneous construction is properly resorted to, to illustrate and confirm the text; it can never abrogate the text; it can never fritter away its obvious sense; it can never narrow down its true limitations. There seems little room for interpretation, except in cases leading to an obvious absurdity, or to a direct overthrow of the intention expressed in the preamble."

Now the text to the Fourteenth Amendment is clear and positive making, as Senator Carpenter, even, is compelled to admit, all persons voters. Then, if the common rule is applied, how can the inference drawn by Senator Carpenter, from the indefinite and negative language of the second section, be held to "abrogate that text;" and "fritter away its obvious meaning;" and "narrow down its true limitations," and finally to directly overthrow not only the intent but the positively expressed meaning of the text. In other words, how can what is granted to women in express terms by the first section be taken away from them by the inference it is found convenient to draw from the second section?

"But," says Senator Carpenter, "the Fifteenth Amendment is equally damaging to the right of female suffrage, since if by the Fourteenth Amendment the elective franchise had been secured to every citizen, the Fifteenth Amendment would have been unnecessary." Now mark the consistency of the three points of his argument which we have reached: First, he informs us that the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment secured the right to vote to all citizens, black and white, male and female; second, that all persons having been enfranchised, the second section of the same Amendment confers the power upon the States to disfranchise any citizens, for any reason whatever; and that since the States continued to disfranchise male negroes, the Fifteenth Amendment was necessary to take that power away from the States. Now, if it was the intention of Congress from the first to arrive at this end, why did they proceed by such a roundabout way? Why did they not at once specifically state that all this legislation was for the purpose of securing the votes of male negroes, since that, according to Senator Carpenter, is the final result. The States may deny the right to vote to any citizens except to male negroes. Suffrage in all other cases stands just as it did before the Amendments, the fact of all persons having been made citizens counting for nothing.

All men save negroes voted then. All men, including negroes, vote now. So that the result of all the work and talk about human rights has ended in securing the exercise of the elective franchise to say, a million negroes; and all this was conducted with specific care that the same right should not be secured to 15,000,000 women. In other words, the men of the United States have declared by these Amendments that all men may vote if they choose, but that no woman shall vote under any circumstances whatever. I submit to you if, according to their own showing, this is not what has been accomplished.

But we object to this conclusion, and propose to show that men have proceeded upon an opposite theory quite too long to permit them to shift its application, now that women demand what belongs to them. The Courts have held that all limitations of rights must be made in express terms; we must demand that the same rule shall operate in our case, especially since it has been held to apply in cases arising under this Amendment.

Justice McKay laid down the following proposition: "The rights of the people of a State, white and black, are not granted them by the Constitution thereof; the object and effect of that instrument is not to give but to, restrain duly regulate and guarantee rights; and all persons recognized by the Constitution as citizens of the State have equal legal and political rights, except as otherwise expressly declared."

Again: "It is the settled and uniform sense of the word citizen, when used in reference to the citizens of the separate States of the United States, and to have rights as such citizens, that it describes a person entitled to every right, legal and political, enjoyed by any person in that State, unless there be some express exceptions made by positive law covering the particular persons whose rights are in question."

Let me ask, is there any language in these Amendments by which women are excluded from suffrage "by positive law covering the particular persons" whose rights are involved. On the contrary, there is no direct reference made to women whatever, and no particular persons excluded. Therefore, by still another argument we are compelled to conclude that since women in common with all other persons are made citizens, and consequently voters, all women are voters, with the ex-

ception of those who have been excluded by express constitutional provisions.

Again: Senator Carpenter tells us that before the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment any citizen could be excluded for any reason whatever, but since that adoption any citizen may be excluded for any reason other than race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Now I claim, if language have any definite meaning, and if there are any rules of logic by which such meaning is to be arrived at, and if the construction of general law as announced by the Courts has any weight, that the Fifteenth Amendment forbids the denial or abridgment of the right to vote to any citizen whatever. The language is plain and explicit:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Now, the question is not what that language was framed to cover, nor what it has been construed to mean; but what does it say, and what would it be considered as meaning if it were to be interpreted by people having no interest in the matter as citizens of the United States, and no knowledge of the circumstances under which it became the law of the land?

It asserts, first, that the right to vote is a citizen's right; and, secondly, that that right shall not be denied or abridged by any government on account of race, color, or previous condition. Now, what do these terms cover? We know that the African race were denied the right to vote, and that by this Amendment the male portion were raised to the exercise of that right. But we also know if the Celtic race had also been denied the same right that they would have been affected in the same way. Hence it must be held to mean that not only are the States prohibited from denying the right to vote to the African race, but also to all other races—that is, that no person of any race shall be denied the right to vote because he belongs to that specific race.

If none can be denied the right to vote on account of race, can any be denied that right on account of anything that goes to make up race? That is, since the African race cannot be denied the right to vote, can any part of that race be denied? We say, emphatically, NO! The larger always includes the parts of which it is composed, and if the whole is granted a privilege, or the exercise of a right, no part of the whole can be excluded, unless the exclusion of that specific part is expressly provided for, as I have shown it must be by the decisions, quoted, which have never been reversed. If we say the citizens of the United States may vote, it could not be held that the citizens of any of the States could be prevented, unless such States were excluded in definite terms. If the United States could not deny the right to vote to citizens of the United States, they surely could not to the citizens of the State of New York, unless there was a specific provision granting the right to exclude New York. And what applies to citizens in general must apply to all classes of citizens, no part of whom can legally be excluded, except such exclusion is made in express terms, so as to specially declare who are excluded.

But let us look at this provision from another standpoint, that we may judge of it upon some other issue than of voting. Suppose that negroes, instead of having been denied the right to vote, had been denied the right to register vessels or to pre-empt land, which, equally with his right to vote, are citizens' rights; and that the Fifteenth Amendment had read: "The right of citizens of the United States to register vessels and to pre-empt lands shall not be denied by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, etc.," would that have been construed to leave the privilege of denying those rights to citizens on account of sex? Why are not those rights denied on account of sex? That they are not, under the interpretation of the language of the Amendment, is clear and unmistakable; since what would apply in one class of cases must also apply in all classes of cases. Nobody would think of denying a negro woman the right to register a ship, or to pre-empt land, or to obtain a passport. She is a citizen, and entitled to these citizen's rights; but the moment another citizen's right is involved—that one by which men hold their usurped power—then they are denied the exercise of that right, and are quietly informed that that right may be denied to citizens being women.

The right to vote shall not be denied on account of race. Now, if it may be denied to anybody covered and included by that term, then everybody included by the term race may be excluded for various other reasons, which would render the provision utterly nugatory. To assume such a position would be to make all legislation negative and void. And arguing upon the plea of intent, of which opponents make such constant though thoughtless use, it was the intent of the framers of the Fifteenth Amendment to prevent negroes from being denied the right to vote for any reason whatever.

Now, what does the term race include in comparison with sex? A race is composed of two sexes. Thus sex is a component part of race. But who ever heard that a sex was composed of two or more races? Therefore, if the right to vote cannot be denied on account of race, it cannot be denied on account of sex, which is a constituent part of race, unless it is specially provided, in express terms, that exclusion may be made on account of sex, and stating which sex may be excluded.

Our State constitutions provide that male citizens are electors. Why may we not just as reasonably assume that some male citizens may be excluded for other reasons than simply because they are males? Men say that the women are excluded for other reasons than because they belong to a race. We say that men may also be excluded by the same rule for other reason than because they are males. Is not that statement clear? The several races include all people, and the right to vote cannot be denied on account of race. But a part of the race are denied because they are women. Now, by the other proposition, all men are included in the phrase, "all male citizens," and they cannot be denied the right to vote, but a part of all male citizens, even the negro part, may be excluded for any other reason it may be convenient to invent. That would not be excluding them because they are males, but because

they had a certain colored hair, or because they were not a certain number of feet in height, or for any other reason of which use might be made to compel arbitrary distinctions. This would be the same rule which men now apply to the term race. Women are not excluded because they belong to the African, or any other race, but because they are women, who are a part of race; as different colored haired men are a part of the sum total of men; and as different sized men are a part of the sum total of men. But while exclusions are made on account of sex, they are not made upon the other accounts simply because men don't choose to make them; which resolves the whole question into its real position: that men exclude women from voting because they have got the power to do so, and that is the sum and substance and all there is of it since it completes the argument, and the conclusion is impossible of escape.

Do you not see it is as I asserted in the beginning, that this doctrine of Mr. Carpenter's, to which he has committed the Republican party, and which they have made no effort to reverse, is the most complete possible statement of the old and exploded doctrines of States Rights, in a new form, to meet a specific contingency? It seems to me that it was an unfortunate oversight in the Southern States that they did not take this view of the question; since, when they were forbidden to deny negroes the right to vote because they belonged to the African race, they might have invented any other reason and have excluded them in spite of Congress. If this doctrine prevail, I do not see why the States may not go on and find reasons to exclude every negro in them from the ballot. Senator Carpenter says they have the right. I am quite certain some of the people of some of the States would like to have it done. Then I say do it and have the sincerity of these self-constituted advocates of freedom and equality put to the test, as to whether their affections run to the negro rather than to women.

We are all aware of the desperate strait in which the Democratic party find themselves. They are seeking in every direction for an escape from the toils the Republicans have woven about them; they supposed themselves "foundered" on the rock of a Centralized Government, from which there was no chance of escape except to accept the situation and make a "New Departure." Even the astute and learned, and legal and excessively constitutional New York *World* lately acknowledged that it was not only the intent, but the effect of the Amendments to vest the control of citizenship in the General Government, and to put it entirely beyond the control of the States. Now, I do not state this of my own knowledge, but I have been privately informed, that Senator Carpenter is ambitious to be the next President, and since he saw that in the Republican party there was no chance for him, he put forth this new doctrine reviving the theory of States Rights as a bid for the Democratic nomination. As I said, I cannot state that this is so, but this I can say: He ought to have it, since he has had the temerity to assert in a new form a doctrine which the most earnest old line Democrats had abandoned not only as impracticable but obsolete.

The further we pursue this argument the clearer it becomes that women are excluded from a right common to all citizens by the despot's right of might, which in all ages has been the argument of tyrants. Each succeeding proposition which we examine results in demonstrating this by a new method. Each analysis proves the logic of the right of men to be the flimsiest assumption, the merest pretense.

But, for all that, we will go through the list. Senator Carpenter says the States have the right to exclude women. This would have been a little more satisfactory had he explained what the States are. Suppose we admit his proposition. There must be some definite method of procedure by which to accomplish it. How must they do it? First, it must be determined what the States are to which this power is intrusted. Next, have the States excluded any citizens from suffrage? Lastly, was that exclusion made in proper form?

States are not certain territorial areas, having definite limits abstracted from their inhabitants. But they are the people and their effects living in such defined limits. It is impossible to conceive of a State without people. A State is a people under the jurisdiction of a certain organized government. I think no person can object to that rendition. Now, the State of New York consists of all the people who are included within specified limits, and over whom its Constitution and Laws hold jurisdiction. Now, have those people ever denied to the women of New York the right to vote? There has never been any such procedure, or any attempt at such procedure. The Courts say that all persons who are citizens are entitled to every right, civil and political, enjoyed by any person in the State, unless excluded by express terms covering the persons excluded. I have examined the Constitution and Laws of New York, and I find no express terms excluding women from equal political rights. There is no such provision existent. By what authority, then, are women denied the right to vote? I answer, by the authority of the right of might.

In the State of Nebraska this question came before the people, but the men absolutely prevented a part of the people from expressing their opinion. And yet they say that the people of Nebraska rejected Woman Suffrage. Was there ever such insults heaped upon a class of citizens as this? Will Senator Carpenter assume that the people of Nebraska have denied women the right to vote? If he cannot, neither can he escape the inevitable conclusion that they are wrongfully and illegally deprived of a right exercised by other citizens of Nebraska, and consequently he must admit that it is the duty of the General Government to interpose its power to prevent the continuation of the wrong.

More recently, in Wyoming, an attempt was even made to take from women the right to vote, exercised by them for two years, and, as Governor Campbell testifies, in a manner worthy of the best citizens. Now, what is the lesson to be learned from this attempt at despotic power in Wyoming? That to allow the right of the States to deny suffrage to any of its citizens is a dangerous precedent, and that it will be a fatal error for women to rely upon their tenure for their rights, since every Governor may not be like Governor Campbell, and some Legislatures may not have even six men out of twenty who will admit that women

have any rights that men are bound to respect. Governor Campbell wisely remarks, "If this Legislature deprive women of the right to vote, the next may deprive men."

There is but one position for women to assume, and that they should advocate first, last, and all the time. They must take the Amendments, as they have the legal and established right to take them, to mean just what they say, utterly regardless of whatever might or might not have been the intent of their framers. They have completely reversed the order of government. Formerly citizens were originally citizens of the State. Now they are first citizens of the United States, and by virtue of being so are citizens of the States wherein they reside.

The first duty of every citizen is allegiance to the United States sovereignty; secondly, when it does not interfere with his first allegiance, allegiance to the sovereignty of the State. And if the State interfere with any of her privileges as a citizen of the greater sovereignty, then she must appeal for relief to that greater sovereignty. State sovereignty then is merged in the sovereignty of the United States. And the people of this larger sovereignty have decreed that neither that sovereignty nor that of any State shall interfere in any way whatever with the rights of citizens of the United States. This is as we read the Constitution, and all the authority there is supports this reading. Those who read it differently invite all the dangers of a return to despotism. It must be all the people governing themselves; or it may be one of them governing all the rest; since to begin discrimination is to open the way to discriminate against all, and to permit a government to deny one class of citizens a right that is exercised by another class, is to admit its right to deny all kinds of rights to all classes of citizens; and there is no escaping that conclusion, unless it be by the remarkable logic of Justice Cartter, which we will presently admire.

There are several other points in Senator Carpenter's "New Departure," which, with these examined, are equally felicitous. But I have not time to notice them here. I wait however to hear him advocate them from his seat in the Senate, and to see his brethren of the Republican party say, Amen!

But we hear opposition from another quarter and must take some time to look after it. Since this constitutional question has been raised this matter has found its way into the Courts, notwithstanding the oft-repeated wail from Boston that the raising of this question by those "ungodly people" has done irreparable harm to the cause. It has ruined the prospects for women, since it has sunk the question from a mere matter of glittering generalities into the depths of Constitutional law. Now, I am willing to accept suffrage, even if we have to drag it through such low and filthy slums as this to get it. I want it, and want it right away. I am even willing to get it by a "Short Cut," across lots, and through a gate left open by those who loved the negroes so well that they forgot there were any women. Even by a "trick" am I willing to get back our rights. When we deal with thieves who have stolen our birthrights, it is not only our right, but our solemn duty to take advantage of all their oversights to make safely off with their booty. I am for stealing every possible march upon them, and for confronting them in the places to which they have fled for safety and security. They have built up a something which we have shown to be a mere pretense, but which they now desire the Courts to confirm, and to thus fortify their position against us forever.

This *entree* into the Courts caused a considerable flutter among politicians and political journals. Farmer Horace in the *Tribune* recently said that we might as well keep away from the Courts, since if we went there with our troublesome petitions we would be requested to go home and mind our own business. But we did go to the Courts, and the Courts having forgotten the injunctions of the Philosopher, listened.

Justice Howes of Wyoming even rendered a decision in which he declared that all women citizens in the United States acquired the right to vote by the Fourteenth Amendment. And Justice Underwood of Virginia announced, semi-officially, the same doctrine. This frightened the press, and straightway they roused to the fact that there really was such a question before the people. Even the *Nation* in its critical clumsiness felt called upon to enter its protest; and so it went the round, until Justice Cartter, of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, solved the whole question to the complete satisfaction of both parties. He is so remarkably clear in his elucidation of the subject that I am satisfied; and our opponents assert that they are also satisfied. This decision is almost as remarkable in its possibilities as the Amendments themselves appear to be, which it pretends to interpret.

Since that portion of this decision which satisfies me is the latter part, I will begin with that. He says, in giving expression to my own judgment of this clause (the first clause of the Fourteenth Amendment), it does advance them (women) to free citizenship, and clothes them with the right to become voters. Now, I hold that is the law. Women are full-fledged citizens, with the right to become voters in the same manner that men become voters, by qualifying under the existing regulations. But we found the Constitution of the States standing in the way of our becoming voters. Hence, I asked Congress to compel the removal of the obstructions by passing an act forbidding the States to make distinctions of sex a bar to voting. Such action will also meet the legal objection raised by Justice Cartter, since he says: "It is a constitutional provision that does not execute itself. It is the creation of a constitutional condition that requires the supervision of legislative power to give it effect. The capacity to become a voter created by this Amendment lies dormant until made effective by legislative action." Now, while I deny the possibility of such a thing as dormant rights existing in one class of citizens which are active in another class, being equal in other respects, and which require legislation to make them legal, still legislation is the readiest way to compel the removal of the distinctions, and hence we seek it.

But Justice Cartter strikes a blow at the very existence of our theory of government, when he argues that the right to vote is not a natural right, existing regardless of constitutions and laws. He says: "The

legal vindication of the natural right of citizens to vote would involve the destruction of civil government, hence the right does not exist." Civil government does exist, even with all the accumulation of male depravity. Justice Cartter in substance tells us if women participate they would destroy it, hence women do not have the right to participate. Complimentary, truly; isn't it?

Men are bad enough; but women—oh, no, that will never do—they would ruin us. Since some men make bad use of the ballot, therefore women have no right to it. Since some people abuse their stomachs, through their appetites, therefore the right to eat and drink does not exist. Since some people steal, therefore the right to possess anything does not exist. Since some people commit suicide, therefore the right to life does not exist. A wise man! A wondrous wise man! I stand abashed before the awful majesty of such wisdom!

But this is not all the discoveries in constitutional law made by this latter-day Columbus. It has been his fortune to find out that women have been rescued from one unpleasant condition by this Amendment. "It has done so much as to distinguish them from aliens," says this Solomon. "To be an alien," says Webster, "is not to belong to the same country or government;" "belonging to one who is not a citizen;" "estranged;" "foreign;" "not allied;" "adverse to;" "one not entitled to the privileges of a citizen." Now we are informed that we are rescued from these conditions; that we now "belong to the same country and government;" that we are "citizens;" that we are not "estranged," or "foreign;" that we are "allied," and not "adverse to;" and that we are "entitled to the privileges of a citizen." All this may be consistency, and very precious jewels at that, but I am free to confess that my obtuseness will not permit me to appreciate the application of it, made by Justice Cartter.

But, back of all this statement of Justice Cartter, he proposes a principle which is fatal to all his elaboration. By his own argument he proves that our government never had, and has not now got, a legal existence, since civil government can have no legitimate existence anywhere unless it have a lawful beginning somewhere. How can a legal legislative body be organized if there is no one qualified to vote until that right is conferred by legislation? How were the first legislators elected, and who elected them? and if they were elected by the people, who had no right to vote, how shall we go about to establish the validity of our laws? I assume that, if the right to vote or the right to self-government do not exist in the people, independent of constitutions and laws, that there can never be a lawful constitution in existence, since all constitutions and all laws must then emanate from an arbitrary assumption of power on the part of somebody.

It is scarcely necessary to pursue this absurd fallacy, since the matter has been so thoroughly passed upon by a higher authority than Justice Cartter, who must have been oblivious of Chief Justice Taney's decision in the Dred Scott Case. Justice Cartter assumes that the government confers the right to vote. Hear him rebuked by Taney, who said: "The words 'people of the United States' and 'citizens' are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body, who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the sovereign people, and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty."

Can anything be clearer than this exposition, or more pointed as to our claim? Every woman is a member of the sovereignty, who hold the power, and conduct the government through their representatives. Against the pandering to despotism of this late decision I oppose the broad republican sentiment of the former one; nor do I fear the judgment of the American people when they shall come to see this matter properly—Senator Carpenter and all whom he represents, and Justice Cartter and his confederates, to the contrary notwithstanding.

But I must call your attention to another fact that this decision brings into the argument, because when it is stripped of subterfuges and inconsistency, it has a few substantial points left. He says that women are made full citizens by a constitutional provision which does not execute itself. He scarcely need have told us that, though I thank him for having done so. If anybody ever saw a constitutional provision executing itself, he has witnessed something that if he can reproduce and take it to Barnum's Menagerie, I am sure he can realize a fortune from it. We go to a deal of trouble and expense, and pay seventy thousand men four years' salary, who do scarcely anything else than work for the election of a President, to execute the constitutional provisions; from all of which we should have been exempt had the Constitution been self-executing. And, moreover, one of these constitutional provisions is specially framed in this view, since it is made one of the positive duties of the President "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed," the provisions of the Constitution itself being the supreme law. Now I ask, in all candor and seriousness, if the President has taken care that this part of the supreme law relating to women was faithfully executed? If Congress want to impeach him they had better take some clear case of neglect of duty, and here, according to Justice Cartter, is a very plain one.

But let us take another view of this question of dormant right raised by Justice Cartter. He says legislation must supervene before it can become a right to be exercised. Is that the view Congress took of the Amendment in its application to negroes? If the negroes acquired any benefits by this Amendment, women also acquired the same benefits. If it made negroes citizens and voters, so also did it make women citizens and voters. Is there any escape from that logic? How did negroes become voters? Did the State make them so? No. This Amendment is all the legislation there has been upon the subject. And if it only made them citizens having the dormant right to become voters, how is it that they are voters? As Judge Underwood has naively remarked: If by a constitutional enactment a word of five letters was stricken out of the State Constitutions and Laws, why cannot a word of four letters be also stricken out. Justice Cartter seems to have ignored

history in this matter. Or does he hold that the "Force Act" was the legislation that raised negro suffrage from its dormant stage? If so, should not Congress also, and for the same reason, make the same sort of legislation, or rather, enforce the same Act, for the benefit of women.

That Act has never been understood, and I here desire to call the attention of Senator Carpenter to it, since it stabs his whole plea to the heart, and sweeps away the dust with which he endeavored to blind the eyes of thoughtless people. Section 2 of this Act reads as follows:

And be it further enacted, that if, by or under the authority of the Constitution or Laws of any State, or the Laws of any Territory, any Act is or shall be required to be done as a pre-requisite or qualification for voting, and by such Constitution or Laws, persons or officers are or shall be charged with the performance of duties in furnishing to citizens an opportunity to perform such pre-requisite, or to become qualified to vote, it shall be the duty of every such person or officer to give to all citizens of the United States the same and equal opportunity to perform such pre-requisite and to become qualified to vote.

We know this Act was framed for the negro, but we must again demand the attention of our lords and masters. They must not object to being held to laws they have themselves made, and we beg them to remember that having made it the duty of officers of election to give all citizens the same and equal opportunity to become qualified and to vote, that if they intended to make any exception, they should have done so in the Act in specific terms covering the particular citizens intended to be excluded from its benefits. In the name of justice and common sense as well as in that of law, I ask you, my friends, if that is not a reasonable demand. And if they failed to make the requisite exception to exclude women, shall we not claim under the Act? And I will now state that Judge Woodward, of Pennsylvania, while I was at Washington last winter, brought this Act to me and said, "There is no question about women being able to vote under it." Many other eminent men have said the same thing to me. But such plain language as is used scarcely needs authoritative exposition to make its meaning clear.

And this brings us face to face with the last argument, to which everybody alike resorts when driven from all other possible positions. Invariably they come at last back to the baby objection, which is considered as a sort of a general antidote to Woman Suffrage. "Well," they say, "if all you say is just as you assume it to be, why, babies have got the same right to vote that women have." That is exactly what we claim, only we claim a little more—that men have got no right to vote that the women and babies do not possess. All we ask is that men, women and babies shall exercise the right equally and under the same regulations, as James Madison said they ought, otherwise it was the duty of the government to remedy it.

It is a strange fact that people can never see that this baby objection applies equally and as forcibly to man suffrage as it does to woman suffrage. If it is an objection in the last-mentioned, it is equally so in the first instance. Though this objection is, as General Butler has termed it, "the slimmiest he ever heard," I will take the time to sweep it out of our path.

Infants consist of male and female persons. But men would have it inferred that there are no male infants, since they ask, "Are women born in the United States?" and reply, "so are babies." Male and female babies are both born in the United States, and consequently both are citizens, and both possess the right to vote; but the regulations prevent its being exercised until they have resided twenty-one years in the United States. On arriving at that age they have the requisite qualification of age, and both arrive at that qualification by the same process—by living twenty-one years. But just at that point the discrimination between the male and the female, as against the latter, begins. The male is permitted to begin the exercise of the right to vote, while the female is quietly informed that no age to which she can attain will ever qualify her to vote. This is an unequal exercise of power against which I rebel. It is neither a regulation nor the establishment of the citizen's right to vote, but a flat and unqualified denial of it.

Again, criminals, paupers and lunatics are citizens, but, by the common law, by which all legal construction of law is governed, are held to be incompetent to exercise the suffrage. Still there is no inequality here. All criminals, all paupers, all lunatics, be they men or women, are alike excluded. To make men's logic sound they should say that these classes of citizens, being women, should, while those being men should not, be excluded from suffrage. This would make their reasoning consistent. Now, will men say that adult women are to be placed in the same category with these classes of citizens and excluded from the suffrage for the same reasons that they and infants are excluded? But if they are not excluded for the same reason that these classes of citizens are, pray tell us what the reason is for which they are excluded. I have never heard one given.

On arriving at the age of twenty-one, men become entitled to the exercise of the suffrage. Why women should not also become entitled by the same reason, men may be sufficiently wise to determine. I hope they may. I am sure none will be more ready to give them credit than I. But if they cannot give a good, lawful and constitutional reason why women twenty-one years of age cannot vote, then I shall hold their assumptions as valueless.

Now, what did Mr. Madison mean by "the principle of equality?" Evidently he meant equality among citizens in regard to the right of suffrage. Suppose Mr. Madison were now living and should make that declaration, would he not be justly set down as an advocate of the right of women citizens to vote under the provisions of the Constitution; and further, that he would deem it proper that the general government should remedy any inequality in such States as should regulate elections upon the principles of inequality? The Constitution itself now declares that women are citizens, and that the right to vote is a citizen's right. The States deny the right to vote to women citizens. Is not that an inequality, according to Mr. Madison, to be remedied by the general government?

But we suppose Senator Carpenter would at this stage of the argu-

ment again remind us of that "fatal" second section of the Fourteenth Amendment. None of our opponents now attempt to say that women are not citizens. That is admitted by them all. Now if to be a citizen is to have the right of suffrage, or, if the elective franchise is included among the privileges of citizens, then women have the right to vote. I will prove both propositions, and thus doubly establish our claim by two other methods.

A citizen possesses all his rights of citizenship from birth, else he can never possess them legally as I have shown; but some of these rights, like the right to bear arms, he does not exercise till the military age; others, like the right to vote, and to possess inherited property, till the legal age; and others, still, like the holding of the higher offices of state, till a yet wiser age; and till different ages for different offices. No one will pretend to say that there is a single citizen possessing the qualifications, who has not got the right to become President, though he or she cannot do so until thirty-five years of age.

I make the broad assertion that a citizen (whether man or woman) by virtue of simple citizenship (and with nothing else as his or her credentials) possesses constitutionally the right of suffrage. What is a citizen?

Noah Webster says that "a citizen is a person, native or naturalized, who has the privilege of voting for public officers, and who is qualified to fill offices in the gift of the people."

Worcester says that "a citizen is an inhabitant of a republic who enjoys the rights of a citizen, or freeman, and who has a right to vote for public officers, as a citizen of the United States."

Bouvier's Law Dictionary, which gives the legal meaning of the word, says that "a citizen is one who, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, has a right to vote for Representatives to Congress and other public officers, and who is qualified to fill offices in the gift of the people."

Thorbecke saying that "the right of citizenship is the right of voting in the government of the local, provincial, or national community of which one is a member."

Turning to the courts, I quote the Supreme Court of Kentucky, which declares that "no one can be in the correct sense of the term a citizen of a State who is not entitled, upon the terms prescribed by the institutions of the State, to all the rights and privileges conferred by these institutions upon the highest classes of society."

And, finally, the Supreme Court of the United States, in, perhaps, the most important case that was ever decided—the Dred Scott case—Justice Daniels said, as I have already quoted, that to be a citizen is to have the actual possession and enjoyment, or the perfect right of acquisition and enjoyment, of an entire equality of privileges, civil and political.

Mark the force of the words of Justice Daniels: "*The actual possession and enjoyment, or the perfect right of acquisition and enjoyment, of an entire equality of privileges, civil and political.*"

How lame and how impotent beside such authority as this is the decision of Justice Carter, that though the amendments had conferred upon women the right to vote, it was a dormant right not to be enjoyed until men should graciously see fit to make it active.

But let us see more of this business.

In the opinion of Justice McKay, among other propositions, he lays down the following: and here we must again repeat

3d. It is the settled and uniform sense of the word "citizen," when used in reference to the citizens of the separate States of the United States, and to their rights as such citizens, that it describes a person entitled to every right, *legal and political*, enjoyed by any person in that State, unless there be some express exceptions made by positive law covering the particular persons whose rights are in question.

Now, you all know that the phrase "all male citizens" in our State constitutions is what men make use of to prevent women from voting. I ask, in all seriousness, is that an *express exclusion made by positive law* covering the *particular persons* whose rights are in question? It does not even refer to women, and therefore there is no law that covers the particular women whom the men seek to exclude from the exercise of a citizen's right. But even if this were not so—if there were express laws in the States, of what force would they be as against the Constitution of the United States, which declares itself to be the *supreme law* of the land, the constitution and laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding? Now, if the Constitution of the United States give women the right to vote, how can the States take it away or deny its exercise? Some of these wise governors of ours may tell us, but I confess I cannot see how it can be lawfully done.

But, let us look still a little further, since the further we look the clearer our case becomes. The Supreme Court of Massachusetts says:

"The privileges and immunities" secured to the people of each State, in every other State, can be applied only to the case of a removal from one State into another. By such removal they become citizens of the adopted State without naturalization, and have a right to sue and be sued as citizens; and yet this privilege is qualified and not absolute, for they cannot enjoy the right of suffrage or eligibility to office without such *term of residence* as shall be prescribed by the constitution and laws of the State into which they shall remove.

This case fully recognizes the right of suffrage as one of the "privileges of the citizen," subject to the right of the State to regulate as to the *term of residence*—the same principle was laid down in *Corfield vs. Correll*. Justice Washington, in delivering the opinion, used the following language:

"The privileges and immunities conceded by the Constitution of the United States to citizens in the several States," are to be confined to those which are in their nature fundamental, and belong of right to the citizens of all free governments. Such are the rights of protection of life and liberty, and to acquire and enjoy property, and to pay no higher impositions than other citizens, and to pass through or reside in the State at pleasure, and to enjoy the elective franchise as regulated and established by the laws or constitution of the State in which it is to be exercised.

The elective franchise, then, is one of the privileges referred to in the

Fourteenth Amendment which shall not be abridged. It only remains to be asked, what it is to regulate and establish the elective franchise to complete our case, since the Court says "as regulated and established by the States."

I have never heard any objection made to the regulations established for the protection of the ballot. Nobody objects that a person is forced to reside a year in a State to which he may remove before he can vote. This changing however does not impair the right. But we make this objection. We object that when a man and a woman remove from one State to another, that the woman is not permitted to vote after a years residence. We want these things to fall equally upon all classes of citizens: and they must be made to do so, we no longer say they ought.

To regulate, Webster says, is "to put in order," not to put out of existence. To establish is "to make stable and firm," not to nullify and destroy. Now, that is all we ask. We demand that our elective franchise shall be so "put in order" that we may have the enjoyment of a perfect equality of political privilege with men, and that it shall be made "stable and firm." We want nothing but what the law gives us, and that, too, in terms so plain that "the wayfaring man, though a fool, can understand."

But men say there was "no intent" to enfranchise women. There ought not to have been any need of intent, and I do not know how they can say there was any, but since they do, I presume both men and women will be compelled to leave that matter as the Supreme Court of the United States has decided it. Justice Bradley, in delivering the opinion of the Court in the case of *The Live Stock Association vs. The Crescent City*, said:

"It is possible that those who framed the article were not themselves aware of the far-reaching character of its terms, yet if the amendment *does* in fact bear a broader meaning and *does* extend its protecting shield over those who were never thought of when it was conceived and put in form, and *does* reach social evils which were never before prohibited by constitutional enactment, it is to be presumed that the American people, in giving it their *imprimatur* understood what they were doing and meant to decree what in fact they have decreed."

Again I say, if words have any definite meaning, or Court decisions any weight, I submit that I have established, first: that by the mere fact of being citizens women are possessed of the elective franchise; and second, that the elective franchise is one of the privileges of the Fourteenth Amendment which the States shall not abridge; that the States cannot regulate the suffrage out of existence, as they attempt to do, and have done, in the case of women; and finally, that whether it was, or was not, the intent of the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment to give women the elective franchise, *they have done so*, past all hope of retreat, except by getting woman's consent to another Amendment to the Constitution repealing the Fourteenth.

But let us look at this matter in the light of a common business transaction, and see it in a still more ridiculous position. There are joint-stock companies in which women are stockholders. What would even men say if the male stockholders of such companies should get secretly together and pass a resolution reciting that "all male stockholders may vote? Do you think the female stockholders would submit to such a usurpation of powers? But women submit to a still more despotic and tyrannical usurpation. Our government is a joint stock company, in which every citizen has an interest, and yet men, without even so much as consulting women, have denied them all right to participate in the administration of that interest. Is that despotism, or can a better term be found by which to designate it?

Thus have I carefully gone through the arguments, *pro* and *con*, and as I think, both legally and logically, fully established the fact that women have, not only just as clear a natural right to participate in government as men have, but also that they have a constitutional and legal right conferred by the Supreme Court, and therefore that they are illegally, unconstitutionally, and tyrannically excluded. But the majority of men oppose us, and as men only have power, they may under the present form of government, continue to exclude us. Suppose there are fourteen millions of adult citizens who would vote—seven millions of men and seven millions women. At least two millions of the men are in favor of Woman Suffrage. Add them to the seven millions women, and our majority would be nine millions to five millions. Shall that majority remain bound hand and foot by such a minority? But men say that women won't vote? That is too late in the day. Wyoming has nailed that lie fast.

Now shall we quietly submit to have five millions men domineer over and insult seven millions women and two millions men. If men think so I am sure they will be mistaken. There is one thing left to be done. If, under our present Constitution, we cannot obtain our rights, we will project one under which we shall be able to get them, and that too without depriving anybody else of theirs. These nine millions citizens are entitled to a Constitution to represent them, and they have got the power to inaugurate it. I do not propose they shall wait "sixty years" for justice. I want it here and now; and I intend, at least, to propose a way to get it; and not only to get this justice, but also a way by which justice shall be secured to all classes; and especially to those millions who toil all their lives only to see the results of their labor poured through channels constructed by our wise legislators into the coffers of the already rich—a justice which shall set this tide in the opposite direction, until equality shall be restored, and until no man or woman shall be able to exist from the sweat and toil of another. We have spoken of revolution before, and what I shall now propose means revolution—means a complete transformation of the present condition of things—means the voice of the people heard as the government of this country, in the place of Congress and Legislatures, who have usurped our rights, and who presume to deal them out to us by the teaspoonful, and even this only when they see fit, or think it expedient.—[Here followed the presentation of the New Constitution to be published in full next week.]

**APPROACHING NEW ERA,
The Coming Man to be a Woman**
Confidently Predicted!

The closing lecture of the Present Term of the Spiritual and Progressive Association of the Eastern District of Brooklyn, N. Y., will be delivered by
ELDER FREDERICK W. EVANS,
Of the Shaker Fraternity, Mount Lebanon,

on
THE GREAT NEEDED REFORMS OF THE DAY!

Read the printed public notices in the *Golden Age* and other popular New York weekly papers.
* * Theodore Tilton, also Victoria C. Woodhull, are expected to be present.

"The Coming Man to be a Woman," prophetically declared! "Great Events impending over Society," "Their Hidden Causes," "The Seven Worlds One Within Another," "Wheels Within Wheels," with other relative topics, will be interestingly explained and graphically delineated.

At the Large Hall of the MASONIC TEMPLE, corner of Seventh and Grand Streets, Williamsburgh, N. Y., on Wednesday evening, January 31.

N. B.—All advocates of equal rights should attend. Deputations from the Woman's Rights movement and from Temperance and other Reformatory Societies invited.

* * Tickets of admission, 25 cents. Doors open at 7, lecture to commence at 8 o'clock precisely.

H. B. CLAFLIN & CO.,
DRY GOODS, CARPETS,

HOSIERY AND WHITE GOODS, LACES AND EMBROIDERIES,

YANKEE NOTIONS,

FLANNELS AND BOOTS AND SHOES,

CHURCH, WORTH AND WEST BROADWAY,
NEW YORK.

FRANCIS D. CLARK,
DESKS

AND OFFICE FURNITURE,
No. 113 BROADWAY,

Late of 81 Cedar street, NEW YORK.

ANNA KIMBALL, M. D.,

257 WEST FIFTEENTH STREET,
Near Eighth avenue.

Office Hours from 1 to 8 P. M.

Electrical and Magnetic Treatment given when desired.

"THE BEST IS THE CHEAPEST."

**STANDARD
AMERICAN BILLIARD TABLES**

Being constructed with regard to scientific accuracy, are used in all tests of skill by the best players in the country, and in all first-class clubs and hotels. Illustrated catalogue of everything relating to billiards sent by mail.

PHELAN & COLLENDER

728 BROADWAY, New York City.

TIFFANY & CO.,
UNION SQUARE.

SECOND FLOOR NOW OPEN.

Bronze, Majolica

ROYAL WORCESTER AND OTHER FINE

PORCELAIN.

London Cut and Engraved Glass.

FREDERICK KURTZ'S
DINING ROOMS

23 New Street and 60 Broadway

AND

76 Maiden Lane and 1 Liberty St.

Mr. Kurtz invites to his cool and comfortably furnished dining apartments the down-town public, assuring them that they will always find there the choicest viands, served in the most elegant style, the most carefully selected brands of wines and liquors, as well as the most prompt attention by accomplished waiters.

87-79

**HOME
INSURANCE COMPANY,**

No. 135 Broadway.

Branch Office... No. 586 Sixth Avenue.

Capital . . . \$2,500,000

Assets, over 4,000,000

This Company having provided for all its Chicago Losses, without borrowing a dollar or disturbing a single Bond and Mortgage, invites the attention of the public to the following Certificate of Hon. George W. Miller, Superintendent of the Insurance Department of the State of New York, that the Capital has been restored to the full amount of Two and One-half Millions of Dollars.

CHAS. J. MARTIN, Pres.

J. H. WASHBURN, Sec.

INSURANCE DEPARTMENT,
ALBANY, N. Y., Dec. 27, 1871.

Having on the 10th day of November, 1871, made a requisition, directing the officers of the Home Insurance Company, of New York, to require the Stockholders of said Company to pay up the sum of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars deficiency then existing in the Capital of said Company, and upon due examination made, it appearing that the said amount of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars has been duly subscribed and fully paid in, in cash, I hereby certify that the capital of said Company has been fully restored to its original amount of Two Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal on the day and year above written.

GEORGE W. MILLER,
(L. S.) Superintendent.

8 PER CT. GOLD

First Mortgage Sinking Fund Bond,

(COUPON AND REGISTERED.)

INTEREST PAYABLE QUARTERLY,

FREE OF

Government Tax,

ISSUE LIMITED TO \$16,300 PR. MILE,

OF THE

**LOGANSPOUT,
CRAWFORDSVILLE**

AND

**Southwestern Railway,
OF INDIANA.**

Price 92 1-2 and Accrued Interest.

This road, 92 miles in length, 70 of which are in actual operation, runs southwesterly from Logansport to Rockville, passing centrally through five of the wealthiest and most productive counties of Indiana, hitherto without railway facilities, and penetrating for twelve miles at its Southern terminus the celebrated Block Coal Fields of Parke county. It affords the shortest existing outlet to Chicago, Toledo, Detroit, Fort Wayne, Logansport and all other intermediate points for the Block Coal (now in such large demand), Lumber, Cattle, Grain and other surplus products of this rich agricultural and mineral section of the State.

For the present we offer a limited number of these First Mortgage Bonds at 92½ and accrued interest, in currency, or will exchange them for U. S. Bonds or other marketable securities at the rates of the day.

At the above price these Bonds yield to the investor 60 per cent. more income than the Bonds of the United States, and we unhesitatingly recommend them to all classes of investors as offering the most ample security and liberal returns.

Further and full particulars, with pamphlets and maps, furnished by us on application.

JONES & SCHUYLER,

No. 12 Pine Street,

FINANCIAL AGENTS OF THE COMPANY.

**A GRAND
Fire Relief Concert,
ACADEMY OF MUSIC, N. Y.,**

FEBRUARY 22, 1872,

In Aid of the Sufferers by Fire in the Northwest.

\$100,000

TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO TICKET-HOLDERS.

\$25,000 for \$2,
\$10,000 for \$2, \$5,000 for \$2,
\$3,000 for \$2, and

10,115 OTHER PRESENTS,
Making

\$100,000 IN GREENBACKS.

BANKING HOUSE OF WELLS, FARGO & CO.,
84 BROADWAY,
NEW YORK, December 9, 1871.

TO THE PUBLIC: The "Northwestern Fire Relief Committee" have opened with our Banking House a SPECIAL DEPOSIT ACCOUNT, known as "THE TICKET-HOLDERS' FUND," with directions that the whole amount deposited shall be by us paid out to such holders of the Grand Fire Relief Concert-Tickets as become entitled thereto.

This Fund will be paid by us, at our Banking House, No. 84 Broadway, New York, upon the order of the said Committee, in accordance with the above instructions. Respectfully,
WELLS, FARGO & CO.

TICKETS. \$2 EACH.

Address all communications and orders for tickets to
NELSON CROSS, Chairman.

General Office, 267 Broadway, N. Y.

7 PER CENT. AND ALL TAXES.

The Connecticut Valley Railroad First Mortgage Bonds,

FREE OF ALL TAXES in Connecticut; free of income tax everywhere. Interest payable January and July in New York. Road running; stock paid up larger than mortgage; road already employed to its utmost capacity.

For sale at moderate discount, by

ALLEN, STEPHENS & CO.,

Bankers, No. 12 Pine street, New York.

**A FIRST-CLASS
NEW YORK SECURITY**

AT A LOW PRICE.

The Undersigned offer for sale the First Mortgage Seven Per Cent. Gold Bonds of the Syracuse and Chenango Valley Railroad, at 95 and accrued interest.

This road runs from the City of Syracuse to Smith's Valley, where it unites with the New York Midland Railroad, thus connecting that city by a direct line of road with the metropolis.

Its length is 42 miles, its cost about \$40,000 per mile, and it is mortgaged for less than \$12,000 per mile; the balance of the funds required for its construction having been raised by subscription to the capital stock.

The road approaches completion. It traverses a populous and fertile district of the State, which insures it a paying business, and it is under the control of gentlemen of high character and ability. Its bonds possess all the requisites of an inviting investment. They are amply secured by a mortgage for less than one-third the value of the property. They pay seven per cent. gold interest, and are offered five per cent. below par. The undersigned confidently recommend them to all class of investors.

GEORGE OPDYKE & CO.,

No. 25 NASSAU STREET.

**CARBOLIC
SALVE**

RECOMMENDED BY PHYSICIANS.
BEST SALVE IN USE.

Sold by all Druggists at 25 cents.

JOHN F. HENRY,
Sole Proprietor, No. 8 College Place,
NEW YORK.

Operators upon Sewing Machines,

Why will you suffer from back-ache and side-ache, when by using

DR. SAPP'S WALKING MOTION TREADLE,

The whole trouble may be overcome? Price \$5,
LADD & CO., 791 Broadway.

BANKING HOUSE

OF

KOUNTZE BROTHERS,

NEW YORK,

14 WALL STREET.

Four per cent. interest allowed on all deposits.

Collections made everywhere.

Orders for Gold, Government and other securities executed.

**Omaha & Northwestern
RAILROAD**

FIRST MORTGAGE

LAND GRANT BONDS.

7 3-10 PER CENT. GOLD INTEREST.

Issued at the Rate of \$16,000 a Mile on Completed Road.

The Company has Valuable Lands in Eastern Nebraska, granted by the State.

The Union Trust Company of New York, trustee for the bondholders, receives the proceeds of all land sales, and whenever accumulated to the amount of \$10,000, will apply the same to the redemption of bonds.

The road, completed to Burt County, has in large part been built by cash subscriptions and County donations.

Two-thirds of the bonds issued have been sold.

PRICE 90 AND ACCRUED INTEREST.

For descriptive pamphlets and maps apply to the agents,

KOUNTZE BROTHERS,

Bankers, No. 12 Wall Street, New York.

DUNCAN, SHERMAN & CO.

BANKERS,

No. 11 Nassau Street,

Issue CIRCULAR NOTES and LETTERS OF CREDIT for TRAVELERS in EUROPE, and available in all the PRINCIPAL CITIES, also for use in the UNITED STATES, WEST INDIES. Also, TELEGRAPHIC TRANSFERS to LONDON, PARIS and CALIFORNIA.

G. EBBINGHOUSE. G. A. WIDMAYER. J. BAUMAN.



The Highest Cash Prices

PAID FOR

OLD NEWSPAPERS OF EVERY DESCRIPTION;
OLD PAMPHLETS of every kind;
OLD BLANK-BOOKS AND LEDGERS that are written full;
and all kinds of WASTE PAPER from Bankers, Insurance Companies, Brokers, Patent-Medicine Dealers, Printing-Offices, Bookbinders, Public and Private Libraries, Hotels, Steamboats, Railroad Companies, and Express Offices, &c.

JOHN C. STOCKWELL,
25 Ann street, N. Y.

68-120.

SAFES.

MARVIN & CO.'S

ARE THE BEST.

265 BROADWAY.

OFFICE OF THE METALLURGICAL CO. OF N. Y.,
38 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, Jan. 16, 1872.

The undersigned, the President and a majority of the Trustees of The Metallurgical Company of New York, do hereby certify that the Capital Stock of The Metallurgical Company of New York is Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$250,000), divided into Twenty-five Thousand (25,000) Shares of Ten Dollars (\$10) each; that the full par value of each and every share has been paid in, and that the entire amount of the existing debts of the said Company do not exceed the sum of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars.

CHARLES W. BROOKE, President.
THOMAS F. WELLS,
THEODORE FABER, Trustees.
THOMAS C. LOMBARD,

Being a majority of the Trustees duly elected by and for the said corporation.

City and County of New York, ss.

Martin E. Twyford being duly sworn according to law deposes and says, that he is the Secretary of The Metallurgical Company of New York, a corporation duly formed under an act passed the 17th day of February, 1848, to authorize the formation of corporations for manufacturing, mining, mechanical, chemical and other purposes, and that the foregoing reports as to the amount of capital and of the proportion thereof actually paid in and of the amount of the existing debts of said corporation is a just and true report of the affairs of said Company with relation thereto, and that the said report is signed by a majority of the Trustees duly elected by and for the said corporation.

MARTIN E. TWYFORD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of January, 1872.

WM. W. MANN,
Notary Public City and County New York.