

WOODHULL & CLARLIN'S WEEKLY.

PROGRESS! FREE THOUGHT! UNTRAMMELED LIVES!
BEAKING THE WAY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

Vol. V.—No. 25.—Whole No. 129.

NEW YORK, MAY 24, 1873.

PRICE TEN CENTS.

THE
LOANER'S BANK
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
(ORGANIZED UNDER STATE CHARTER.)
Continental Life Building,
22 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

CAPITAL..... \$500,000
Subject to increase to..... 1,000,000

This Bank negotiates LOANS, makes COLLEC-
TIONS, advances on SECURITIES and receives DE-
POSITS.

Accounts of Bankers, Manufacturers and Merchants
will receive special attention.

FIVE PER CENT. INTEREST paid on CUR-
RENT BALANCES and liberal facilities offered to our
CUSTOMERS.

DORR RUSSELL, President.
A. F. WILMARTH, Vice-President.

JOHN J. CISCO & SON,
Bankers,

No. 59 Wall St., 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.

HARVEY FISK. A. S. HATCH.
OFFICE OF
FISK & HATCH,
BANKERS AND DEALERS IN
GOVERNMENT SECURITIES,

No. 5 Nassau st., N. Y.,

Opposite U. S. Sub-Treasury.

We receive the accounts of Banks, Bank-
ers, Corporations and others, subject to check
at sight, and allow interest on balances.

We make special arrangements for interest
on deposits of specific sums for fixed periods.

We make collections on all points in the
United States and Canada, and issue Certifi-
cates of Deposit available in all parts of the
Union.

We buy and sell at current rates, all classes
of Government Securities, and the Bonds of
the Central Pacific Railroad Company; also,
Gold and Silver Coin and Gold Coupons.

We buy and sell, at the Stock Exchange,
miscellaneous Stocks and Bonds, on commis-
sion, for cash.

Communications and inquiries by mail or
telegram, will receive careful attention.

FISK & HATCH.

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 Che-
nango 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 \$42,000 per mile,
and it is mortgaged for less than \$12,000 per mile; the
balance of the funds required for its construction hav-
ing been raised by subscription to the capital stock.

The road approaches completion. It traverses a
populous and fertile district of the State, which in-
sures 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.

TO INVESTORS.

To those who wish to REINVEST COUPONS OR
DIVIDENDS, and those who wish to INCREASE
THEIR INCOME from means already invested in less
profitable securities, we recommend the Seven-Thirty

Gold Bonds of the Northern Pacific Railroad Com-
pany as well secured and unusually productive.

The bonds are always convertible at Ten per cent.
premium (1.10) into the Company's Lands, at Market
Prices. The rate of interest (seven and three-tenths
per cent. gold) is equal now to about 8 1-4 currency
—yielding an income more than one-third greater than

U. S. 5-20s. Gold Checks for the semi-annual in-
terest on the Registered Bonds are mailed to the post-
office address of the owner. All marketable stocks
and bonds are received in exchange for Northern
Pacifcs ON MOST FAVORABLE TERMS.

JAY COOKE & CO.

BANKING HOUSE OF
HENRY CLEWS & CO.,
32 Wall Street, N. Y.

Circular Notes and 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 Ire-
land and all their branches.

Telegraphic Transfers of money on Europe, San
Francisco and the West Indies.

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;
Interest allowed on all daily balances; Certificates of
Deposit issued bearing interest at current rate; Notes
and Drafts collected.

State, City and Railroad Loans negotiated.

CLEWS, HABICHT & CO.,
11 Old Broad St., London.

BANKING & FINANCIAL.

THE ST. JOSEPH AND DENVER CITY RAIL-
ROAD COMPANY'S

FIRST MORTGAGE BONDS

Are being absorbed by an increasing demand for them.
Secured as they are by a first mortgage on the Road,
Land Grant, Franchise and Equipments, combined
in one mortgage, they command at once a ready
market.

A Liberal Sinking Fund provided in the Mortgage
Deed must advance the price upon the closing of the
loan. Principal and interest payable in gold. Inter-
est at eight (8) per cent. per annum. Payable semi-
annually, free of tax. Principal in thirty years. De-
nominations, \$1,000, \$500 and \$100 Coupons, or Regis-
tered.

Price 97 1/2 and accrued interest, in currency, from
February 15, 1872.

Maps, Circulars, Documents and information fur-
nished.

Trustees, Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of New
York.

Can now be had through the principal Banks and
Bankers throughout the country, and from the under-
signed who unhesitatingly recommend them.

TANNER & CO., Bankers,
No. 11 Wall Street, New York.

AUGUST BELMONT & CO.,
Bankers,

91 and 21 NASSAU STREET,

Issue Letters of Credit to Travelers, available in all
parts of the world through the

**MESSRS. DE ROTHSCHILD AND THEIR
CORRESPONDENTS.**

Also, make telegraphic transfers of money on Cal-
ifornia, Europe and Havana.

TOLEDO, PEORIA

AND

WARSAW RAILWAY,

SECOND MORTGAGE CON-

VERTIBLE 7 PER

CENT. CURRENCY BONDS.

INTEREST WARRANTS PAYABLE

OCTOBER AND APRIL,

PRINCIPAL 1886.

We offer for sale \$100,000 of the above bonds in
block. By act of reorganization of the Company these
bonds are convertible into the First Preferred Shares
of the Company, which amounts to only 17,000 shares,
and into the Consolidated Bonds (recently negotiated
at Amsterdam) of six millions of dollars, which cover
the entire line of 230 miles of completed road, to-
gether with all the rolling stock and real property, to
the value of more than ten millions of dollars. The
road crosses the entire State of Illinois and connect
with the mammoth iron bridges spanning the Missis-
sippi at Keokuk and Burlington. The income of the
road for the year will net sufficient to pay interest on
all the bonded indebtedness and dividend on the pre-
ferred shares.

For terms apply to

CLARK, DODGE & CO.,

Corner Wall and William Streets.

RAILROAD IRON,

FOR SALE

BY S. W. HOPKINS & CO.,

71 BROADWAY.

WHITE STAR LINE.
For Queenstown and Liverpool,
Carrying the
UNITED STATES MAIL.
New and full-powered steamships.
Sailing from New York on Saturday, from Liver-
pool on Thursday, calling at Cork Harbor each way
Adriatic, Saturday, February 1, 3.00 p. m.
Oceanic, Saturday, February 8, at 3.00 p. m.
Baltic, Saturday, February 15, at 3.00 p. m.
Celtic, Saturday, February 22, at 1.00 p. m.
Atlantic, Saturday, March 1, at 3.00 p. m.
From the White Star Dock, Pavonia Ferry, Jersey
City.
Passenger accommodations (for all classes) unrivaled,
combining
Safety, Speed, and Comfort.
Saloons, state-rooms, smoking room, and bath rooms
in midship section, where least motion is felt. Sur-
geons and stewardesses accompany these steamers.
Rates—Saloon \$80, gold. (For sailing after 1st of
April, \$100 gold.) Steerage, \$30, currency. Those
wishing to send for friends from the Old Country can
now obtain steerage prepaid certificates, \$30, cur-
rency.
Passengers booked to or from all parts of America,
Paris, Hamburg, Norway, Sweden, India, Australia,
China, &c.
Drafts from £1 upward.
For inspection of plans and other information,
apply at the Company's offices, No. 10 Broadway,
New York. J. H. SPARKS, Agent.

**UNITED STATES, NEW-ZEALAND
& AUSTRALIAN MAIL STEAMSHIP LINE.**
—The steamships of this line are appointed to sail
from San Francisco for NEW-ZEALAND and AUS-
TRALIA, via Honolulu, upon
MAY 22, SEPT. 11,
JUNE 19, OCT. 9,
JULY 17, NOV. 6,
AUG. 14, DEC. 4, at Noon.
For freight and passage, apply to
W. H. WEBB, 53 Exchange Place, New York.

ONLY DIRECT LINE TO FRANCE.
THE GENERAL TRANSATLANTIC COM-
PANY'S MAIL STEAMSHIPS BETWEEN NEW
YORK AND HAVRE, CALLING AT BREST.
The splendid vessels on this favorite route for the
Continent will sail from Pier No. 50, North River, as
follows:
"Ville de Paris," Sarumont, Saturday, January 28.
"Washington," Roussan, Saturday, February 8.
"St. Laurent," Lemarie, Saturday, February 22.
"Pereire," Danre, Saturday, March 8.
Price of passage in gold (including wine) to Brest or
Havre:
First Cabin, \$125 | Second Cabin, \$75.
EXCURSION TICKETS AT REDUCED RATES.
These steamers do not carry steerage passengers.
American travelers going to or returning from the
Continent of Europe, by taking the steamers of this
line, avoid both transit by English railway and the dis-
comforts of crossing the Channel, besides saving time
trouble and expense.
GEO. MACKENZIE, Agent, No. 58 Broadway.

C. J. OSBORN. ADDISON CAMMACK.
OSBORN & CAMMACK,
Bankers,
No. 34 BROAD STREET,
STOCKS, STATE BONDS, GOLD AND FED-
ERAL SECURITIES, bought and sold on Com-
mission.

COUNTRY BOARD.
THE
LONG HILL HOUSE
(Near Beer's Mill depot, on the Housatonic Railroad),
Six miles from Bridgeport, Conn.
Address, C. S. MIDDLEBROOK,
Box 778, Bridgeport, Conn.

ANNA M. MEIXSEL,
DAVID S. CADWALLADER,
MAGNETIC HEALERS,
1,114 CALLOWHILL STREET,
PHILADELPHIA.

OFFICE HOURS,
9 to 11 A. M., 4 to 6 P. M.
PSYCHOMETRIC EXAMINATION OF DISEASE CORRECTLY
MADE FROM A LOCK OF HAIR.

DR. C. S. WEEKS,
Dentist,
No. 412 FOURTH AVE.,
Between Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth Streets
NEW YORK.

TEETH EXTRACTED WITHOUT PAIN,
by the use of Chemically pure Nitrous Oxide or Laugh-
ing Gas. Dr. W. has used it several years, extracting
teeth for thousands with complete success, and with
no bad effects in any instance. All operations pertain-
ing to Dentistry performed in the most careful and
thorough manner at reasonable price.
SAM'L BARTON. HENRY ALLEN.

BARTON & ALLEN,
Bankers and Brokers,
No. 40 BROAD STREET,
Stocks, Bonds and Gold bought and sold on com-
mission.

**NEW YORK
SAVINGS BANK,**
EIGHTH AVENUE,
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, \$2,451,303.05
Surplus, \$300,372.95.

TWENTY YEARS PRACTICE.

DR. PERKINS
Can be consulted as usual at his office,
No. 9 FIFTH STREET (South Side),
OPPOSITE PUBLIC SQUARE,
KANSAS CITY, MO..
or by mail, box 1,227, on the various symptoms of Pri-
vate Diseases. The afflicted will take notice that I am
the only man on the American continent that can cure
you of Syphilis, Loss of Manhood, etc., caused
by self abuse or disease. I challenge the combined
medical faculty to refute the above statement by suc-
cessful competition. The symptoms of disease pro-
duced by nightly seminal emissions or by excessive
sexual indulgence, or by self abuse are as follows:
Loss of memory, sallow countenance, pains in the
back, weakness of limbs, chronic costiveness of the
bowels, confused vision, blunted intellect, loss of con-
fidence in approaching strangers, great nervousness,
fetid breath, consumption, parched tongue, and fre-
quently insanity and death, unless combated by scien-
tific medical aid. Reader, remember Dr. Perkins is
the only man that will guarantee to cure you or refund
the fee if a cure is not permanently made. Also re-
member that I am permanently located at No. 9 Fifth
street, south, opposite the public square, Kansas City,
Mo., and I have the largest medical rooms in the city.
Call and see me; a friendly chat costs you nothing, and
all is strictly confidential. Post box 1,227.
Dr. PERKINS, Kansas City, Mo.

WM. WHITE, M. D.,
356 West 33d Street
(Bet. Fifth Avenue and Broadway).
OFFICE HOURS:
9 A. M. to 1 P. M. & 5 to 7 P. M.

DR. DAKE'S
APPOINTMENTS FOR 1873.

Elgin, Ill., 1st and 2d; Rockford, Ill., 3d, 4th, 5th and
6th; Beloit, Wis., 7th, 8th and 9th; Madison, Wis., 11th
and 12th; Watertown, Wis., 13th, 14th and 15th; Fond
Du Lac, 16th and 17th; Oshkosh, 18th, 19th and 20th;
Ripon, 21st and 22d; Whitewater, 24th and 25th;
Waukesha, 26th and 27th; Chicago, Matteson House,
28th, 29th, 30th and 31st of each month during the
year. Offices, principal hotels in each city. Chronic
complaints incident to both sexes exclusively and suc-
cessfully treated.

EXCERPTS FROM THE PRESS.
The *Western Rural* speaks of Dr. Dake as one of the
most successful physicians in the United States.
Dr. Dake.—That this scientific physician has no
equal in the West thousands will affirm.—*Journal,*
Beloit, Wis.
Live, energetic, liberal men, advertise. Such a man
is Dr. Dake, who in the last three years has built up
one of the largest practices of any physician in the
West.—*Lockport Gazette.*
Dumoulin C. Dake, M. D., is having great success in
this city. He is active, whole souled, in fact, one of
the "whitest" gentlemen we have ever known.

BROOKLYN PROGRESSIVE LIBRARY

179 South Fourth Street,

WILLIAMSBURG, N. Y.

Has for sale, or to be rented out upon the usual Cir-
culating Library plan, an excellent selection of Supe-
rior Books, of a well-known highly advanced moral
and reformatory character.

Also "WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY," the
"BANNER OF LIGHT" and other Liberal Weekly
Papers.

Office Hours.—8½ to 12 o'clock a. m., and from 2½ to
o'clock p. m., daily, Sundays excepted.

**The Most Wonderful Discovery
of any Age.**

PROF. D. MEEKER'S

INFALLIBLE CURE FOR THE OPIUM HABIT.

A reliable and painless remedy for the Opium habit.
Cures without any inconvenience to or interruption of
business. Pamphlets sent free on application.

Address,
H. DRULINER & CO.,
P. O. Drawer 1,016, La Porte, Ind.

PSYCHOMETRY.

Psychometric Readings for persons who send me
their handwriting, or who will call on me in person.
Fee, \$2. Address, 1,114 Callowhill street, Phila-
delphia, Pa., by J. MURRAY SPEAR.

MISSSES GROVER & CROSBY,
Business & Medical Clairvoyant,
316 Fourth Avenue,
NEW YORK.

(Between Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth streets.)
OFFICE HOURS FROM 10 A. M. TO 8 P. M.

Terms - - - - - \$2.00 to \$3.00.
JAMES FISK, Jr., Business Control of Miss GROVER,

HELEN GROVER. LIZZIE L. CROSBY.

SAFETY, SPEED AND COMFORT.

NORWICH LINE.
For Boston, Worcester, Fitchburg, Groton Junction,
Lowell, Lawrence, Nashua, Manchester, Concord, Pal-
mer, Brattleboro, and intersecting points.
The new and staunch steamers
CITY OF BOSTON,
CITY OF NEW YORK,
CITY OF LAWRENCE and
CITY OF NORWICH
Will leave New York daily (Sundays excepted) at 4
o'clock p. m., from Pier No. 40, North River, foot of
Canal and Watts streets.
For New London, and Norwich, their connecting
with Express trains for the above points, via Vermont
Central, Norwich and Worcester, and Boston, Hart-
ford and Erie Railroads.
For through tickets and rates for freight, apply at
the office, Pier 40, North River.
W. F. PARKER, Agent.
New York, June 7, 1873.

Dr. JOSEPH TREAT,

Of Vineland, N. J., gives

THREE LECTURES:

HENRY WARD BEECHER,
GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN,
VICTORIA C. WOODHULL,

Risk of Hall and expenses taken, and 25 cents
charged for each Lecture.
If necessary the cream of the three rendered in one
Henry Ward Beecher illustrated by twice life-size
portrait.
Address, care of Woodhull & Claflin, 48 Broad st.,
N. Y., or of J. P. Mendum, 84 Washington st., Boston,
Mass., or of J. A. Lant, Editor of the *Sun*, Toledo, O.

THE
Western Rural,
THE GREAT
AGRICULTURAL & FAMILY WEEKLY
JOURNAL OF THE WEST.

H. N. F. LEWIS, Editor and Proprietor,

WITH AN
Able and Practical Editorial Staff,
AND AN

EFFICIENT CORPS OF SPECIAL AND VOLUN-
TARY CONTRIBUTORS.

TERMS:
\$2.50 per Year; \$2 in Clubs of Four or More.
SPLENDID INDUCEMENTS TO AGENTS.

A PLUCKY PUBLISHER.

[From the *Chicago Daily Sun*, Nov. 30, 1871.]
"One of the most remarkable examples of Chicago
pluck and energy is given by Mr. H. N. F. Lewis, pro-
prietor of the *Western Rural*, one of the ablest and
most widely circulated agricultural journals in the
country. Mr. Lewis lost by the fire one of the most
complete and valuable printing and publishing estab-
lishments in the West, and also his residence and
household goods. Yet he comes to the surface again
with unabated ardor, re-establishes himself at No. 407
West Madison street, where he has gathered new ma-
terial for his business, and from which point he has
already issued the first number (since the fire) of the
Western Rural, the same size and in the same form as
previous to the fiery storm. Nobody would imagine,
on glancing at the neat, artistic head and well-filled
pages of the *Rural* that anything uncomfortably warm
or specially disastrous had ever happened to it. Suc-
cess to Lewis and his excellent *Rural*. Chicago ought
to feel proud of it."

"The Largest and Handsomest Paper for
Young People."

THE
Young Folks' Rural,
A RURAL AND LITERARY MONTHLY JOURNAL
FOR YOUNG PEOPLE OF COUNTRY AND CITY.

TERMS:
\$1.50 per Year; \$1 in Clubs of Four or More.
A PAIR OF BEAUTIFUL BERLIN CHROMOS, MOUNTED
AND VARNISHED, SENT POSTPAID AS A GIFT TO
EVERY YEARLY SUBSCRIBER.

The *Young Folks' Rural* is a novelty among publi-
cations for Young People—entirely a "new idea," and
different from any other in style and character. Six-
teen pages and sixty-four columns—the largest news-
paper in Chicago!

WHAT "THEY SAY."
[From the *Chicago Evening Post*.]
"H. N. F. Lewis, Esq., the well-known publisher of
that admirable weekly, the *Western Rural*, is publish-
ing a monthly rural and literary journal, under the title
of the *Young Folks' Rural*. It is a 'big thing.' Mr. Lewis
is just the man to make it a 'big thing.'"

[From the *Letter of a Western Mother*.]
"The *Young Folks' Rural* is just what our dear
children need. Altogether it is a noble enterprise, and
will do an untold amount of good. It is the 'parents'
assistant, and all thinking parents will join me in
thanking you."

[From a School Teacher].
"I am a teacher, and take the paper for the benefit
and amusement of my pupils. Eyes are brighter and
lessons better learned when the *Young Folks' Rural*
makes its appearance."

SPECIMEN NUMBERS SENT FREE.
Address,
H. N. F. LEWIS, Publisher,
Chicago, Ill.

Both *Western Rural* and *Young Folks' Rural* furnished
for One Year for \$3.00.

C. L. James' Column.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN ENGLAND.

Woman as a voter is an accomplished fact in Eng-
land. Every woman who occupies a dwelling in any
city or town of England, Ireland, Wales or Scotland
has a vote for aldermen and town officers in general.
Under Mr. Foster's new act, in England widows and
spinsters who pay rates have votes in the election of
school boards. In Ireland, every woman who pays any
sum as poor rate has a vote in the election of poor
guardians. It is said that the women exercise these
rights heartily, and in many cases where saloon-keep-
ers represented the wards of cities in municipal posi-
tions they were finally defeated by the votes of the
women. In London, as is well known, Mrs. Garrett
Anderson, M. D., is one of the most useful members of
the school board, and the same is true of Miss Becker,
in Manchester. The right of suffrage seems to have
been conferred on the principle that where women pay
a tax for any object they shall have the right to vote
in the disposition of the funds. America is bound to
be as far behind the age on this as she was on slavery.

DEATH STRUGGLES OF THE HOLY INSTITUTION.

A few items taken at random from one day's ex-
changes of a country paper:

WIFE BEATING.

Another case of wife-beating, almost resulting in
murder, occurred last night on Desplaines street. A
man named O'Toole pounded his wife over the head
with a pitcher which she refused to take out and fill
with beer, saying that he had already drank too much.
The blows cut her ear in two and made a horrible gash
on the head, and the brute followed them up with
pounding her with his fist. The woman was taken to
the hospital and may not recover.

Mrs. Page, shot by her husband at Vallejo last week,
is pronounced out of danger.

A party of Ku-klux, properly disguised, visited a
widow and her three daughters, near Corydon, a few
nights ago, took them from the house and gave them
a sound thrashing. They then visited a man residing
in the neighborhood and paid him a like compliment.
The ground of complaint was immoral behavior of the
parties.

Look out for Mrs. Snyder, of Cleveland; she has
killed two husbands, and is roaming around the coun-
try after a third.

If syphilis be the scourge of God for the punish-
ment of prostitution, I wonder what relation marriage
bears to puerperal fever, a far more dangerous disease,
equally painful and equally loathsome, of which many
women are now dying in Eau Claire, and proportion-
ate numbers throughout the northwest. I heard it said
of one of these women that "she never ought to have
married," as if society left her any other alternative.
Of course the authors of this terrible mortality take it
as philosophically as the doctors, and being young
men, though their victims were broken-down women,
will soon get more. Nevertheless, they get all the sym-
pathy, their victims being remanded to the orthodox
heaven with the murderers' best wishes.

Then fill up your glasses steady!
This world is a world of lies;
Here's a health to the dead already,
And hurrah for the next that dies.

COUNSEL FOR THE AGED.

When angry Katie stoops to folly,
And strives in vain new laws to make;
What charm can cheer her melancholy,
Or shield her brother from his fate?

The only way his guilt to cover,
And hide his shame from every eye,
Is to keep quiet under cover,
And let the saints of Plymouth lie.

INDEPENDENT TRACT SOCIETY.

CLINTON, Mass.

The object of this organization is the publication
and dissemination of radical sentiments from all
sources.

Yearly Subscription - - - - - \$0 25
Life Membership - - - - - 5 00

Address,
A. BRIGGS DAVIS,
CLINTON, Mass.

FLAS. Those really interested in practical social
reform should not fail to become con-
versant with the nature of this institution.
Full information may be obtained by addressing C.
L. James, Eau Claire, Wis.



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	\$3 00
Constitutional Equality, by Tennie C. Claflin	2 00
The Principles of Social Freedom	25
The Impending Revolution	25
The Ethics of Sexual Equality	25

EVERYBODY wants the Monster Scandal in Plymouth Church for himself and friends. Send for the WEEKLY of May 17th, No. 128—the most astounding *exposé* of the condition of society ever made.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The several recent decisions of courts touching the rights of women citizens of the United States have invested this question with great importance; and as it is to be one of the great political questions, let whatever may come in the near future, we feel called upon to give a brief glance at the history of the movement in its present constitutional aspect.

The Primary and the Supreme Courts of the States of Pennsylvania, Illinois and Missouri, and the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, have decided adversely to the claims of women to the rights of citizenship as voters; and the Supreme Court of the United States has also rendered a decision, which though not directly upon the question of suffrage, is so closely allied to it that it would seem to indicate at least that its decision upon that would be in the same direction.

Myra Bradwell, as a citizen of the United States, claimed the right to practice law in the State of Illinois. The State courts declared that she had no right to do so. She appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decision of the lower Courts was affirmed. But let us look at this matter; and in doing so, we are led to ask the question: Is it not one of the rights, privileges or immunities of citizens to be permitted to practice a calling? Have not citizens the right to pursue any legitimate business? Who shall say that a man shall not preach, teach or write; who shall say that a man shall not practice law? But if there are any who may say this and enforce it, what other calling may not also be restricted? It is simple madness to say that a man has not the right to practice law.

And he has this right because he is a citizen—a citizen of the United States and of the State in which he lives—and not merely because he is a man. Why, then, have not women also the same right? The constitution of the United States makes both men and women citizens. How is it possible then to deny to women citizens the same professional rights that men enjoy?

The Federal Constitution provides that no State shall make or enforce any law that shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. Is it not a privilege of a citizen to pursue some calling by which he may earn a livelihood? Clearly so! Then how is it that the State of Illinois denies one of its citizens the right to pursue a calling which she has prepared herself to pursue; and how can the Supreme Court of the United States confirm such action? We may next expect that men having the power will deny women the right to pursue any calling by which to support themselves, except the use of their bodies to men either as lawful or unlawful prostitutes. Men begin to see to what this matter is leading, and they will not give up their despotic control over the persons of women. They are determined that they shall remain in this slavery, and this is the meaning of the recent decisions of Courts on the question of suffrage and employment, and these are in direct contravention of the previous decisions involving the same points of law, only differing from them in this that the plaintiffs are women.

In view of this newly-fledged exercise of despotic power, we feel constrained to begin anew the presentation of the arguments to support the rights of citizens, irrespective of any and all arbitrary laws; and we are the more ready to do this since a most distinguished advocate of suffrage said in the recent convention in Apollo Hall, that "we are going to vote; peaceably if we can, but with war if we must," which was received with enthusiasm by the audience.

Two years ago, in the same hall, the following proclamation, before a large audience, was received with a perfect storm of applause:

"There is one alternative left, and we have resolved on that. As surely as one year passes and this right is not freely, frankly and unequivocally accorded, we shall proceed to call another convention expressly to form a new constitution and to erect a new government."

We rebel against, denounce and defy this arbitrary, usurping and tyrannical government, which has been framed and imposed upon us without our consent. We mean treason; we mean secession on a thousand times grander scale than was that of the South. We are plotting revolution; we will overslaugh the bogus republic and plant a government of righteousness in its stead."

Had the advocates of suffrage followed that course persistently since, they had been much nearer suffrage than they now are. We are glad, however, to see them, even now, waking up to the fact that no mild means will ever wrest from men their consent that women may vote.

Suffrage will be fought out and decided upon, as one of the rights of citizens. If it is not this, then women may abandon their hope of ever voting, since men will never voluntarily abandon their domination over them.

We shall now swiftly review the beginning and progress of the legal phase of the suffrage movement, which is the only phase which men fear.

January 7, 1871, Mr. Harris, of Louisiana, in the Senate, and Mr. Julian, of Indiana, in the House, introduced the following memorial:

[From the Congressional Globe, December 22, 1870.]

In the Senate;

Mr. Harris presented the memorial of Victoria C. Woodhull, praying for the passage of such laws as may be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the right vested by the Constitution in the citizens of the United States to vote without regard to sex; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

In the House:

Mr. Julian—I ask unanimous consent to present at this time and have printed in the *Globe* the memorial of Victoria C. Woodhull, claiming the right of suffrage under the XIV. and XV. Articles of Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and asking for the enactment of the necessary and appropriate legislation to guarantee that right to the women of the United States. I also ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition is as follows:

THE MEMORIAL

OF

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, respectfully sheweth:

That she was born in the State of Ohio, and is above the age of twenty-one years; that she has resided in the State of New York during the past three years; that she is still a resident thereof, and that she is a citizen of the United States, as declared by the XIV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution of the United States:

That since the adoption of the XV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution, neither the State of New York nor any other State, nor any Territory, has passed any law to abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote, as established by said article, neither on account of sex or otherwise.

That, nevertheless, the right to vote is denied to women citizens of the United States by the operation of Election Laws in the several States and Territories, which laws were enacted prior to the adoption of the said XV. Article, and which are inconsistent with the Constitution as amended, and, therefore, are void and of no effect; but which, being still enforced by the said States and Territories, render the Constitution inoperative as regards the right of women citizens to vote:

And whereas, Article VI., Section 2, declares "That this Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and all judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution and laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding:"

And whereas no distinction between citizens is made in the Constitution of the United States on account of sex; but the XIV. Article of Amendments to it provides that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws:"

And whereas, Congress has power to make laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States; and to make or alter all regulations in relation to holding elections for Senators or Representatives, and especially to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of the said XIV. Article:

And whereas, the continuance of the enforcement of said local election laws, denying and abridging the Right of Citizens to Vote on account of sex, is a grievance to your memorialist and to various other persons, citizens of the United States, being women,—

Therefore your memorialist would most respectfully petition your Honorable Bodies to make such laws as in the wisdom of Congress shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the right vested by the Constitution in the citizens of the United States to vote, without regard to sex.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

Dated NEW YORK CITY, December 19, 1870.

This memorial was supported before the Judiciary Committee by the following argument—a courtesy and right never before granted to any woman (See Illustration, page 16):

To the Hon. the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned, VICTORIA C. WOODHULL, having most respectfully memorialized Congress for the passage of such laws as in its wisdom shall seem necessary and proper to carry into effect the rights vested by the Constitution of the United States in the citizens to vote, without regard to sex, begs leave to submit to your honorable body the following, in favor of her prayer in said Memorial, which has been referred to your Committee:

The public law of the world is founded upon the conceded fact that sovereignty cannot be forfeited or renounced. The sovereign power of this country is perpetual in the politically-organized people of the United States, and can neither be relinquished nor abandoned by any portion of them. The people in this Republic who prefer sovereignty are its citizens: in a monarchy the people are the subjects of sovereignty. All citizens of a republic by rightful act or implication confer sovereign power. All people of a monarchy are subjects who exist under its supreme shield and enjoy its immunities.

The subject of a monarch takes municipal immunities from the sovereign as a gracious favor; but the woman citizen of this country has the inalienable "sovereign" right of self-government in her own proper person. Those who look upon woman's status by the dim light of the common law, which unfolded itself under the feudal and military institutions that establish right upon physical power, cannot find any analogy in the status of the woman citizen of this country, where the broad sunshine of our Constitution has enfranchised all.

As sovereignty cannot be forfeited, relinquished or abandoned, those from whom it flows—the citizens—are equal in conferring the power and should be equal in the enjoyment of its benefits and in the exercise of its rights and privileges.

One portion of citizens have no power to deprive another portion of rights and privileges such as are possessed and exercised by themselves. The male citizen has no more right to deprive the female citizen of the free public, political expression of opinion than the female citizen has to deprive the male citizen thereof.

The sovereign will of the people is expressed in our written Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land. The Constitution makes no distinction of sex. The Constitution defines a woman born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, to be a citizen. It recognizes the right of citizens to vote. It declares that 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."

Women, white and black, belong to races, although to different races. A race of people comprises all the people, male and female. The right to vote cannot be denied on account of race. All people included in the term race have the right to vote, unless otherwise prohibited.

Women of all races are white, black or some intermediate color. Color comprises all people, of all races and both sexes. The right to vote cannot be denied on account of color. All people included in the term color have the right to vote, unless otherwise prohibited;

With the right to vote sex has nothing to do. Race and color include all people of both sexes. All people of both sexes have the right to vote, unless prohibited by special limiting terms less comprehensive than race or color. No such limiting terms exist in the Constitution.

Women, white and black, have from time immemorial groaned under what is properly termed in the Constitution "previous condition of servitude."

Women are the equals of men before the law, and are equal in all their rights as citizens.

Women are debarred from voting in some parts of the United States, although they are allowed to exercise that right elsewhere.

Women were formerly permitted to vote in places where they are now debarred therefrom.

The Naturalization Laws of the United States expressly provide for the naturalization of women.

But the right to vote has only lately been distinctly declared by the Constitution to be inalienable; under three distinct conditions—in all of which woman is distinctly embraced.

The citizen who is taxed should also have a voice in the subject-matter of taxation. "No taxation without representation" is a right which was fundamentally established at the very birth of our country's independence; and by what ethics does any free government impose taxes on women, without giving them a voice upon the subject or a participation in the public declaration as to how and by whom these taxes shall be applied for common public use?

Women are free to own and to control property, separate and apart from males, and they are held responsible for their own proper persons, in every particular, as well as men, in and out of court.

Women have the same inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that men have. Why have they not this right, politically, as well as men?

Women constitute a majority of the people of this country

—they hold vast portions of the nation's wealth and pay a proportionate share of the taxes. They are intrusted with the most holy duties and the most vital responsibilities of society; they bear, rear and educate men; they train and mould their characters; they inspire the noblest impulses in men; they often hold the accumulated fortunes of a man's life for the safety of the family and as guardians of the infants, and yet they are debarred from uttering any opinion, by public vote, as to the management by public servants of these interests; they are the secret counselors, the best advisers, the most devoted aids in the most trying periods of men's lives, and yet men shrink from trusting them in the common questions of ordinary politics. Men trust women in the market, in the shop, on the highway and the railroad, and in all other public places and assemblies, but when they propose to carry a slip of paper with a name upon it to the polls, they fear them. Nevertheless, as citizens women have the right to vote; they are part and parcel of that great element in which the sovereign power of the land had birth; and it is by usurpation only that men debar them from their right to vote. The American nation, in its march onward and upward, cannot publicly choke the intellectual and political activity of half its citizens by narrow statutes. The will of the entire people is the true basis of republican government, and a free expression of that will by the public vote of all citizens, without distinctions of race, color, occupation or sex, is the only means by which that will can be ascertained. As the world has advanced in civilization and culture; as mind has risen in its dominion over matter; as the principle of justice and moral right has gained sway and merely physically organized power has yielded thereto; as the might of right has supplanted the right of might, so have the rights of women become more fully recognized, and that recognition is the result of the development of the minds of men, which through the ages she has polished, and thereby heightened the lustre of civilization.

It was reserved for our great country to recognize by constitutional enactment that political equality of all citizens which religion, affection and common sense should have long since accorded; it was reserved for America to sweep away the mist of prejudice and ignorance, and that chivalric condescension of a darker age, for, in the language of Holy Writ, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand, let us therefore cast off the work of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. Let us walk honestly as in the day."

It may be argued against the proposition that there still remains upon the statute book of some States the word "male" to an exclusion, but as the Constitution in its paramount character can only be read by the light of the established principle, *ita lex Scripta est*; and as the subject of sex is not mentioned and the Constitution is not limited either in terms or by necessary implication in the general rights of citizens to vote, this right cannot be limited on account of anything in the spirit of inferior or previous enactments upon a subject which is not mentioned in the supreme law. A different construction would destroy a vested right in a portion of the citizens, and this no legislature has a right to do without compensation, and nothing can compensate a citizen for the loss of his or her suffrage—its value is equal to the value of life. Neither can it be presumed that women are to be kept from the polls as a mere police regulation. It is to be hoped, at least, that police regulations in their case need not be very active. The effect of the amendments to the Constitution must be to annul the power over this subject in the States, whether past, present or future, which is contrary to the amendments. The amendments will even arrest the action of the Supreme Court in cases pending before it prior to the adoption of the amendment, and operate as an absolute prohibition to the exercise of any other jurisdiction than merely to dismiss the suit.

3 Dall., 382; 6 Wheaton, 405; 9 Id., 868; 3d Circ., Pa., 1832.

And if the restrictions contained in the constitution as to color, race or servitude, were designed to limit the State governments in reference to their own citizens, and were intended to operate also as restrictions on the federal power, and to prevent interference with the rights of the States and their citizens, how then can the State restrict citizens of the United States in the exercise of rights not mentioned in any restrictive clause in reference to actions on the part of those citizens having reference solely to the necessary functions of the General Government, such as the election of representatives and senators to Congress, whose election the Constitution expressly gives Congress the power to regulate?

S. C., 1847; Fox vs. Ohio, 5 Howard, 410.

Your memorialist complains of the existence of State laws, and prays Congress, by appropriate legislation, to declare them, as they are, annulled, and to give vitality to the Constitution under its power to make and alter the regulations of the States contravening the same.

It may be argued in opposition that the Courts have power, and should declare upon this subject.

The Supreme Court has the power, and it would be its duty to so declare the law; but the Court will not do so unless a determination of such point as shall arise make it necessary to the determination of a controversy, and hence a case must be presented in which there can be no rational doubt.

All this would subject the aggrieved parties to much dilatory, expensive and needless litigation, which your memorialist prays your honorable body to dispense with by appropriate legislation, as there can be no purpose in special arguments "ad inconvenienti," enlarging or contracting the import of the language of the Constitution.

Therefore, Believing firmly in the right of citizens to freely approach those in whose hands their destiny is placed, under the Providence of God, your memorialist has frankly, but humbly, appealed to you, and prays that the wisdom of Congress may be moved to action in this matter for the benefit and the increased happiness of our beloved country.

Most respectfully submitted,

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

Dated New York, January 2, 1871.

And this theory was still further elucidated as follows:

CARPENTER AND CARTER REVIEWED.

A SPEECH FIRST DELIVERED BEFORE THE NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE CONVENTION, IN LINCOLN HALL, WASHINGTON, JAN. 12, 1872, BY VICTORIA WOODHULL.

"We hold those 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 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 volumes 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 a great National question.

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 on 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 of 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 State 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 General Government 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 is 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 the 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 compelled 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. As women citizens, we 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 arriving 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 I 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 enforces such a 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 in 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 indorsing 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.

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 send 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, 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 that 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 the 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 the 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 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 claim 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 us to tremble in their usurped seats.

Since, however, we do not conclude 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 our 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? Rights are individual, not collective? If it be 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 give the same language an entirely 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 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 be at once 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 room left for equivocation, reservation or interpretation. Ours is either a monarchical or a Republican government, and there is no half-way 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 the rights or upon the credulity of the people. And I do not mean that men shall think any longer 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 distinctly 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 State 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 in legislation since the war, 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 itself to work and made everybody citizens; but, being frightened at the grandeur and extent of the result, straightway 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, pre-

sents 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, etc.; 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 crimes 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 pretence, 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 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 imputation.

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 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 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 having enfranchised all persons, 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, that 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 half million negroes, and all this was conducted with specific care that the same right should not be secured to 17,000,000 women. In other words, the men of the United States have declared by these amendments that men may vote if they choose, but that no woman shall vote under any circumstances whatever. I submit to you if this is not what they have accomplished according to their own showing.

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 is held in cases 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 regulated and guaranteed 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 become 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 excepted. 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 exception of those who are excluded by express 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 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 on account of sex.

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 could be to make all legislation negative and void. And ar-

guing 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 do not take this view of the question; since, being forbidden to deny negroes the right to vote because they belong to the African race, they may invent any other reason and exclude 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 toil the Republicans have woven about them; they supposed themselves "founded" 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 a

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 this 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 deprives 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 great 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 my 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 a dormant right existing in one class of citizens which is 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 I 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 the 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 it.

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, there never can be a lawful constitution in existence, since all constitutions and all laws must 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 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 by Justice Cartter I oppose the broad republican sentiment of Chief Justice Taney; 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 facts 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 candour and seriousness, if the President has taken care that this part of the supreme law relating to women was faithfully executed? If Congress wants to impeach him, they had better take some plain 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 of 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 are aware that this Act was framed especially for the negro, but we must again call the attention of our lords and masters that they must not object to being held to laws they have themselves made, and 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 law, I ask 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, 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 is the objection, as General Butler has termed it, is "the slimmest he had ever heard," I will take the time to sweep it out of our path.

Infants consist of male and female persons. Men leave it to be 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 each

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 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. But 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 males, 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 was 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 argument 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.

A citizen possesses all his rights of citizenship from birth, else he never possesses 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 had the privilege of voting for public officers, 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 ever was 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."

Continued on 10th page.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

One copy for one year, - - - - -	\$3 00
One copy for six months, - - - - -	1 50
Single copies, - - - - -	10

CLUB RATES.

Five copies for one year, - - - - -	\$12 00
Ten copies for one year, - - - - -	22 00
Twenty copies (or more at same rate), - - - - -	40 00
Six months, - - - - -	One-half these rates.

FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTION

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

One copy for one year, - - - - -	\$4 00
One copy for six months, - - - - -	2 00

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 must in all cases, bear the signature of VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.
Specimen copies sent free.
Newsdealers supplied by the American News Company, No. 121 Nassau street, New York.

All communications, business or editorial, must be addressed

Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly,

48 Broad Street, New York City.



NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1873.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In writing to us the following rules should be observed :

1st. Every letter should be plainly dated—town, county and State.

2d. When the letter is to contain a remittance, which, if a check or money order, should be made payable to Woodhull & Claflin, the necessary explanations should be introduced at the head of the letter; a failure to observe this rule subjects the person in charge of that department to much needless reading to find out what it is all about.

3d. After definitely stating all business matters, and especially if it be a renewal or a new subscriber, then should follow any friendly words, which we are always happy to receive from all.

4th. We request those who send either articles or personal letters intended for publication to write graphically and tersely. The necessity for this will be apparent when we say that we have already in "our drawer" enough personal communications, full of words of hope, cheer and comfort to fill a dozen papers. Many of them we shall be obliged to pass over.

5th. All letters should close with the signature of the writer in full; and it should be plainly written. Many letters that we receive are so badly signed that we are obliged to guess at what the writer's name may be.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Bills for subscriptions that have expired are now being sent in the papers weekly. We specially request that all who receive them will reply to them at once. The bills are made to show what is due up to date, and also a renewal for another year. Those who do not wish to renew will please remit what is now due and order the paper discontinued. Those who wish to renew may either send both these amounts or simply a renewal for one year, or three dollars, upon receiving which a receipt for same will be returned. Again permit us to say, Do not delay doing one or the other of these things immediately.

TO NEWSMEN AND FRIENDS.

We are glad to be able to inform our friends that the American News Co. is now prepared to fill all orders from its customers, as formerly, for the WEEKLY. The inquisition which the authorities, located in this city, attempted to establish over the freedom of the press, by their arrest of ourselves and Mr. Train upon the charge of obscenity; and, perhaps, the fear that we had libelled Mr. Beecher have, until now, prevented the Company from supplying its customers. Hundreds of newsmen have, in the meantime, received notice that the Company does not furnish the WEEKLY, and they will now be obliged to renew their orders before they will be filled. Will our friends everywhere take the trouble to inform their newsmen of this change in the relation of the Company to the WEEKLY.

The first chapter of "a heart-rendering story," will appear next week, as will also the reason why it has been so long delayed. When the people come to know what practices obtain under a republican government, the question will be fairly before the people, whether the empire is not preferable. One thing is certain; the true government is either the one-man power or the rule of all the peoples. No such bastard democracy as is here represented can much longer impose itself upon the necks of this people.

PREMIUMS TO CLUBS.

In a short time we intend to present the most magnificent schedule of premiums for new subscribers and clubs that was ever offered, as an introduction to which we now present the following:

For every subscription (from one to four) received we will send the WEEKLY one year and one of the dollar photographs—Woodhull, Claflin or Blood.

For every club of five subscribers—fifteen dollars—five copies of the WEEKLY one year, five photographs and one copy of "Constitutional Equality, a right of woman," by Tennie C. Claflin, price \$2.00.

For every club of ten subscribers—thirty dollars—ten copies of the WEEKLY, ten photographs and one copy each of "The Principles of Government," by Victoria C. Woodhull, price \$3; and "Constitutional Equality" (each book containing steel-plate engraving of the author).

For every club of twenty subscribers—sixty dollars—twenty copies of the WEEKLY one year, forty photographs and two copies each of "The Principles of Government" and "Constitutional Equality."

For every club of thirty or more subscribers, accompanied by three dollars for each subscriber, thirty copies of the WEEKLY one year, ninety photographs and one each of the books—"The Principles of Government" and "Constitutional Equality"—for every ten subscribers; and

For a club of fifty subscribers—one hundred and fifty dollars—fifty copies of the WEEKLY one year, fifty photographs, a set of the books and a Wheeler & Wilson Sewing Machine.

A SPECIFIC FUND.

"An Old Subscriber," a friend to the purposes of the WEEKLY, writes us from Hyde Park, Mass., proposing to be one of two hundred persons to contribute twenty dollars each to raise a fund with which to purchase a press, types, etc., for the WEEKLY, so that the difficulties under which we labor, in having to pass the surveillance of lawyers before going to press each week, may be obviated.

We have mentioned the proposition to several friends, and it is considered by them to be feasible and eminently proper; and we have concluded, therefore, to lay the proposition before our readers and friends, and ask them to consider it. So favorably has the matter been received by those to whom we have mentioned it, that we have already secured seven subscribers to the fund.

We do not propose that any money shall be paid until the whole amount required—four thousand dollars—is subscribed, when some proper party may be appointed to receive the money, and purchase and hold the materials in trust, for our use, until such time as we may be able to reimburse the subscribers to the fund.

If this proposition find favor with our friends, let the names be sent in immediately; and should more than two hundred offer, then the assessment of each may be reduced.

THE MONSTER SCANDAL.

The immense sale of No. 128, containing the Beecher-Tilton Scandal entire, just as it appeared in the November 2d number, for which we were really arrested; and the *Thunderbolt*, issued by Edward H. G. Clark, of Troy, N. Y., containing Tilton's "true story," exploded by Victoria C. Woodhull, shows the interest in this scandal to be still unabated. This, without exception, is the most remarkable paper ever issued from any press, and will shake the country from centre to circumference, carrying home to every soul the conviction that something must be done to remedy the terrible social conditions. Everybody in the country should obtain a copy of this paper to keep, since it will become historical and be remembered in after ages, as having stood the test of the combined powers of State and Church, in their attempt to protect the reputations of "revered citizens," by suppressing the paper that dare attack them. Orders from all parts of the world immediately filled. Single copies, 10 cents; 12 copies, \$1.00; \$7.00 per hundred, \$60.00 per thousand.

MR. BEECHER AND STIRPICULTURE.

It will be remembered that in the Beecher-Tilton Scandal article, Mr. Beecher is represented to have said: "I know that our social system is corrupt; I know that marriage as it exists to-day is the curse of society. We shall never have a better state of society until children are begotten and bred on the scientific plan. Stirpiculture is what we need." But he continued: "If I were to go into my pulpit to teach it, I should speak to empty seats. It would be the ruin of my church." Nevertheless, Mr. Beecher went into his pulpit (Sunday, May 11) and preached as follows:

"Spring was the time throughout all the temperate zone when there is a coming forth of life, when the trees and hedges renew their leaves and blossoms, and when the animals rejoice in their own rude way. The feeling of joy and the delight of sense are at this time universal, and when beautiful children—for all children are beautiful to those who own them—in common with the animals, gambol and play in a manner that to the thoughtful beholder it is extremely pleasing. In the spectacle of the gambols of the animal kingdom there was no feeling of moral responsibility to cloud the enjoyment of the spectacle; but no man could look upon

young children and forecast their probable future without a feeling of sadness. He should, therefore, look at the dark side of childhood, because he was convinced that thousands of godly men and women had their joy belittled by this feeling. First, then, children were largely dependent for their chances in life upon their organization, both physical and mental. Men and women of impaired physical constitutions are permitted to have offspring. People come together in the married state with ill-assorted faculties, and with temperaments calculated to make their lives miserable all their life long. There is no angel standing to warn them of their folly. After thousands of years, and after science has done all that it can, the instruction that is given to persons about to marry is very obscure. Probably they are but twenty years of age. How little do they know of themselves, how ill-prepared are they to be wise for their children! What would be thought of a child who was sent upon the stormy sea in a schooner, fully equipped, as far as locomotive power was concerned, but no one with him to guide the ship, and he was told to do the best he could to make a successful voyage? Yet that is the way many children were sent upon their journey of life—children who are born, in consequence of the ignorance of their parents, without the means of acquiring a knowledge of the laws of the world, society or themselves. Consider, too, how little those are likely to know who are made teachers of children. Consider this, too, in the light of Calvinism, and if you follow the irresistible logic of that system, and follow it out to its conclusion, I cannot see how a man dare to enter into the family state. The chances of failure in life, looked at in this aspect, seem to me as a hundred to one against success. Mr. Beecher read a letter that he had received from a lady, in which the dread of bringing children into the world to take this dreadful risk had prevented her assuming the crown of wifehood and the joys of maternity."

We regard this as teaching the theory and the necessity of stirpiculture pretty strongly. "Men and women of impaired physical constitutions are permitted to have offspring." "After science has done all it can (we doubt this since it has done nothing directly) the instruction that is given to persons about to marry is very obscure." "I cannot see how a man dare to enter into the marriage state."

We fain confess that Mr. Beecher is making very satisfactory progress with his audience, since according to his own statement, six months ago he could not have dared to teach this lesson in Plymouth pulpit. Verily, the world moves.

A. E. CARPENTER AND SOCIAL FREEDOM.

In the Spiritualist Convention in Jersey City on Sunday last, Mr. Carpenter is reported to have said that "Mrs. Woodhull's social opinions damned her in the opinion of every right thinking person." It would have been a little more satisfactory if he and others who spoke similarly had explained their own private views about the matter, since we have heard him express entirely different ones. He might also define whose "social opinions" he lives in his present social relations—a professor of one thing and a practitioner of quite a different thing is the smallest statured person of whom we can imagine, and comes within the meaning of Theodore Parker, through Mrs. Conant, who said: "Other canting hypocrites remain to be exposed." Is A. E. Carpenter one of them? But the consistency of these "right thinking" persons was put to the test when a little afterward they passed the following resolution:

"That the convictions of the individual are the only true basis of religion, and that this position is sustained by the Bibles of all peoples, and when the individual lives up to his convictions, he is doing all that is essential to his present or future welfare."

Yet Mrs. Woodhull's opinions damn her in the opinion of these right thinking individuals. Verily "consistency is a jewel," which canting hypocrites overlook in the mud in which they flounder or stick.

TEMPERANCE ON A BENDER.

Do you see that man with arms extended gesticulating violently with his fists, roaring and foaming at the mouth, with almost superhuman exertions; do you hear him as he hisses forth his curses and appeals violently to the passions of his hearers. That man is a lecturer on temperance. In all human probability he is just recovering from the effects of his last debauch, and much of the jargon exuding from his lips is merely the dregs of his delirium. He has just sense enough now to know that it is better to be sober than to be drunk, and just sufficient mental calibre to comprehend the fact that the cost of intemperance is much greater than the profit derived therefrom.

He, and such as he, are just now storming the Executive of the State of New York for his signature to what is called "The Local Option Bill." This title, however, is manifestly incorrect, the people have their choice now in all parts of the State to purchase drink or to let it alone. It should be termed, therefore, the "Anti-Option Bill," which name would designate its intent more correctly. It is an insolent attempt of the people who toddy at home to restrict the personal liberty of those who prefer to toddy openly at the grog-shops. It ought to be and will be resisted to the last by all liberty-loving people, and Gov. Dix would be justified in placing his veto on such a fanatical and useless

effort to abridge the personal rights of citizens of the United States.

Experience proves that the effects of all such efforts for the moral coercion of mankind are the advancement of the evils they are intended to destroy. All they do is to let loose on society a gang of knaves and scoundrels—many-named men of the Y. M. C. A. kind—to forge lies and collect blackmail from the public. Under such a system the liquor traffic is not and cannot be stopped, but is merely transferred from open and above-board traffickers into the hands of knaves and villains of the vilest character. These are much more ready and would certainly prove far more successful in debauching the youth of our community than the dealers in whose hands the trade now is. The question under the heading of The Local Option Bill is not whether liquor shall be sold in communities, but rather whether it shall be retailed by scoundrels or by fair-dealing traders?

Let no one suppose from the above remarks that we are preaching in favor of intemperance. We are not. We are condemning a base effort to deprive many of our citizens of a grave personal right—an attempt to breed strife and contention among all classes of our people; to foster and encourage the breed of Beardsleys amongst us; to stimulate solitary drinking, and to elevate toddy into a standard of gentility in our homes. We are against applying physical force in order to improve the morality of our people, because we know that it has failed before and will fail again; and lastly, we oppose it because there are better ways of proceeding against intemperance, which we have long advocated in the columns of the WEEKLY, as we intend to show.

The proper method of proceeding in order to overthrow intemperance is to attack the causes that produce it. In order to kill it effectually you must attend to its antecedents. It has a parentage. Wealthy idleness lolling on its satin couches, hatching *lisons* and forging slanders, constantly needs and uses the stimulus of liquor to develop its mischievous machinations. The ablest Police Commissioner New York ever had stated, in his last yearly report, that "in the lewd dance-houses of the city, Fifth Avenue was more than represented." Too arduous toil is its father, such as is commonly demanded of our brethren in almost all the more laborious occupations—labor such as a gas-man complained of in the late strike, when told that brain-labor was more severe than that of mere bodily toil. "Is it," replied he; "did you ever hear of a parson or a lawyer that took his flannel shirt off his back three times a day and wrung the sweat out of it, as I have often done out of mine? Whilst this savage toil exists, against which there is no Bergh to protect the human laborer, there will be intemperance. The over-stimulation of the body demands the over-stimulation of the mind in order to establish an equilibrium.

The main thing needed in order to reform the morals of the community in the matter of intemperance, is to establish justice to the laborer. When by his daily earnings he can live like a man, he will act like a man. If there is a stone wall before him over which he cannot rise, he will lie down at its foot—and toddy. When equal compensation is established for an equal time of labor, intemperance will diminish. When the unjust power of money to expand itself, independent of the laborer, ceases to be enforced by law, there will be fewer rich and fewer poor people in the Union. Wealth and poverty are the sluice-gates through which intemperance floods the land. Let us hope that soon the farmers of the West will unite with the mechanics of the East, in order to overturn the reign of rings and establish these just principles. When such union is effected, there will be fewer corrupt lawyers in our National and State Legislatures, and, consequently, simpler and better laws. When the general prosperity of the whole people is established, there will be no need to deprive a large number of the people of a grave personal right, in order to overthrow intemperance.

EQUAL AND EXACT JUSTICE, ACCORDING TO THE POLITICAL STATUS OF WOMEN.

In the Washington *Evening Star*, of the 6th inst., there is a detailed account of another "Department" affair, which is so perfect an illustration of the justice which men administer to women that we desire it to stand recorded in the WEEKLY as an impeachment of the whole set of male dominants. Things will remain just this way until women conquer political power. The facts are as follows:

"An interesting and intelligent woman of twenty was suspected of 'seducing nice young men from the acrid path of virtue.' The investigation showed that the 'evidence was too conclusive' to admit of her strenuous denial of the charges, singular and collective, and 'she was ignominiously dismissed.'

"The young man specially involved, however, 'made a clean breast of the whole affair. He was penitent and lachrymose, protested that he was the seduced and not the seducer,' and he is to be retained in the Department."

It is the usual custom of society to visit all its judgments upon the seduced, the seducer going scot free. According to this well-established rule, the young man should have been ignominiously dismissed and the young woman retained; but, "you know," it makes all imaginable difference as to "whom it is that is gored." Will the people ever wake to the fact that women are slaves?

THE PLATFORM OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS PARTY.—SEVENTH PLANK.

"That the land belongs to the people, and should be made use of by actual settlers only, in limited quantities; and that there should be no other form of disposing of the same by the government, except for public purposes."

The Land Reformers claim that this special department of reform is fundamental; that is, that upon the evils growing out of misuse of the land, all other evils relating specifically to industry, are built. We are inclined to think there is more in their claim than is apparent at first sight, even to the analytic observer. The proposition is that if the monopoly of the land were not possible under our systems, that there would be much less opportunity for other monopolies to flourish; and that if a change were effected that would tend to the redistribution of the land to the people, or its return to the government, a fatal blow would be dealt all other industrial ills.

Whether this is all that is claimed in this or not, this fact is evident, and requires only to be announced without argument to receive the consent of all logical minds: That in whatever exists naturally, as the air, the water and the soil, there can never be individual ownership, since its use belongs in common to all people; hence it also follows that whoever pretends to own the soil, and to have the right to transfer it for a consideration, is assuming a despotic use of something in which there can be no such thing as ownership. Any one who should pretend to own the air or the water, would be laughed to scorn; but it is just as preposterous to set up a claim to the soil as it would be to set up a claim to either the air or the water.

But the question naturally arises, How shall the land be occupied? Admitting that land is natural wealth and therefore that it belongs of right to all people, we may be pointed in the true direction regarding it by observing the mode by which the use of water is secured in cities, when it is impossible that it shall be had for the mere task of getting. The government constructs works in which to collect it, and provides conductors through which to distribute it wherever there is a demand for it, charging only a sufficient tax to pay the interest upon the cost of construction and to maintain the system in operation.

Thus we see that the direction of one of the elements of natural wealth, where there are a number of people who require its use, is, by common consent, indeed by common instruction, assumed by the agents of the people, who are only required to pay the actual cost. What, however, would be the condition of things were it possible, either by nature or law, that the control of water should be a subject of monopoly? It is really as consistent that it should be, as it is, that the land is; but every person sees the absurdity of the former, while, almost universally, the latter is conceded without opposition.

The air being a still more volatile element than water, there is no need that its distribution should be regulated; but the soil being relatively stationary, there is greater need that its distribution should be committed to the agent of the people, so that all of them who require its use should have it at cost, and no more. Everybody having a right to the use of the soil, its distribution should be conducted so that all who desire its use may have it. A system should be constructed therefor, based upon the facts of the impossibility of actual ownership of the soil and the equal right of all to its use, so that each individual, by making use of the regulations of the system, may secure the benefits to accrue from the use of his or her portion of the land. This system should recognize the rights of present possession and of improvements, present and prospective, and should have just regulations regarding succession, which should ignore the present system of inheritance—all right of occupation, on the death of the occupant, reverting to the government.

Such a system might be at once introduced without working any injustice to anybody. It should be made to apply immediately to all public lands, and prospectively to all occupied lands, upon the death of occupants; that is, all titles to lands now held or owned should revert to the government instead of to heirs. There can be no heirs to that which cannot be possessed by individuals.

The introduction of such a system would secure the complete abolition of the monopoly of lands, because the large bodies of it held by speculators would be immediately disposed of to numerous individuals at any price, and it would also relieve the terrible ordeal through which almost the whole farming interest of the great West is compelled to pass before the individuals secure "a home." We have reason to know that the immediate introduction of a just system of land occupation under the direction of the general Government would be the greatest blessing that could fall to the large majority of Western farmers, who are now ridden to madness by taxation and leached to death by interest, both of which would be forever abolished.

And we therefore propose to the West as the most radical and perfect cure for the ills of which they have just cause to complain, that while organizing to secure cheap transportation they also include the abolition of ownership in and the monopoly of land. This question is almost identical with that which is seeking solution in the East, where the skilled mechanic is engaged in a bitter strife with his employer, to secure more of the results of his toil, and should make the two interests clasp hands across the "Blue Ridge" and unite them in a common purpose to obtain their natural

rights, by reorganizing the government upon the principles of equality and justice, by the rule of which the platform of the Equal Rights party is constructed.

A SIGNIFICANT ADMISSION.

The Germantown (Philadelphia) *Telegraph* (Republican) in commenting upon a recent interview of Hon. G. W. Schofield, of Pennsylvania, says, that "he named the five leading Republican journals that took the contract to defeat General Grant." In commenting upon this it argued that the press of the large cities have not got the control of the country, but that that control rests with the country press. But now the significant part of the remarks: "Had the journalistic conspiracy succeeded, it might have resulted in a dangerous dictatorship. But it failed signally and that ended the peril"—which is as much as to say, that had General Grant been defeated there would have been a dictatorship. Will our friends please make a note of this as coming from a leading Grant paper, and then think of what we have been endeavoring to waken the people to is altogether without foundation?

THE GREAT ELEPHANT SHOW.

The trial of George Francis Train for insanity having ended in utter disgrace to those who instituted it, the authorities now seem on the verge of desperation, and, like a certain kind of an animal when cornered, will probably fight with desperation, and without thought or care as to what shall result.

Mr. Train was called down for trial, upon the indictment for obscenity, on Monday last, when a motion was made to quash the indictment. The motion was argued on Tuesday, and was denied by Judge Davis; but he failed to name a day, when requested to do so, upon which to try the case, and Mr. Train was remanded to prison.

If he is ever brought to trial upon this charge, the excitement it will create will exceed that created by his trial for insanity, in the ratio of nothing to everything. Mr. Train is a man of great learning, and has a perfect knowledge of literature; and he will summon every author of any considerable ability of the past and present, to the stand, and if he is condemned, so also will they all stand condemned, and, with him, receive the sentence of the law. It may, however, be a consolation to the movers in this affair to know that, if they succeed in convicting Mr. Train, that there is a league formed who will prosecute the American Bible Society for sending the Bible through the mails, and demand conviction on the same grounds.

THE SUMMING UP.

Just as we are going to press, circumstances develop themselves which make it proper that we defer the summing up of the Monster Scandal in Plymouth Church until another issue. In place of it, however, we present the article from the Chicago *Times*, which was telegraphed to Chicago on Sunday, the 4th inst., which will begin to make it evident that what we have so often said would transpire, unless Mr. Beecher should come forward as an advocate and the champion of social freedom, is shortly to come to pass. The whole truth is something so terrible that it will shock the world into a consciousness that a system capable of such fruit cannot be good enough for this advanced age and people.

WHERE IS THE AGENT OF THE Y. M. C. A.?

Recently there have been a half dozen or more papers which reflect severely upon the reputation of the "revered citizen" of the United States Courts. The Brooklyn *Sunday Review*, the Brooklyn *Sunday Press*, the Brooklyn *Eagle*, and more recently the Chicago *Times* and the *Thunderbolt*, besides a hundred others of more or less repute all over the country, have one after another cast grave reflections on this reputation; but so far as we have been able to learn, the Y. M. C. A. have made no arrests nor attempted any suppressions. What's the matter with the recently active Beardsley? Is it as we suspected that these papers will not be molested because none of their editors happen to be women? We more than half suspect that the courage of this set oozes when a man—one entitled to a citizen's rights—confronts them. Women, however, not being of that class may be proceeded against without fear. Isn't it time for the Empire?

THE THUNDERBOLT.

This paper may be obtained, so we have been informed, in any quantity by addressing J. Manning Hollis, New York, at \$5 per hundred copies.

THE BEECHER-TILTON SCANDAL.

The paper containing this scandal, just as it appeared in the WEEKLY of November 2, may be had in any quantity on application, in person or by letter, to this office. Price, \$7 per hundred copies. It also contains the *Thunderbolt* entire and explodes the same. Catharine Beecher is also done brown; altogether making it the most extraordinary paper ever issued from the press.

Continued from 7th page.

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 Cartter, "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 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, 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 exception 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 law 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 my perception is too weak to see how it can be lawfully done.

But let us look still a little further, since the further we look the clearer is our case:

1. 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 an 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 in a State to which he may remove a year 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 year's 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 wayfarer 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 the 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, under-

stood what they were doing, and meant to decree what in fact they have decreed."

If words have any definite different meaning, and if Court decisions have 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 and providing specially that women may be excluded.

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? That is too late in the day. Do men say that women won't vote? 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 they 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, without depriving anybody else of theirs either. 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 to do so. Let this, then, be henceforth our watch-word: The rights of the people—Human rights for all.

NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE CONVENTION.

This branch of suffragists met in Convention in Apollo Hall, Tuesday, May 6, to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the movement for suffrage. Prominent among the management were Susan Anthony (president), Lucretia Mott, Martha Wright, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Matilda Joselyn Gage and Louise B. Chandler. The audience, though not large, was sufficient to show that interest in the question of suffrage *per se* is not entirely lost, and that all are not yet satisfied that it is a foregone conclusion.

The president was the first speaker and gave a succinct history of the movement for the last quarter of a century, and of her emancipation from the strictest set of Quakers into the broad meads of woman's rights.

Mrs. Gage, secretary, read the report of the doings of the Association for the last year, the gist of which was that instead of being worsted, as some insisted, by their affiliation with the Republican party, they had rather got the better of that conglomeration of masculinity, inasmuch as they had made it the vehicle of getting better and more generally advertised over the country and world than ever before.

After complimenting the woman's rights movement on its prosperity, Mrs. Gage offered a series of resolutions condemning the prosecution and trial of Susan B. Anthony for having cast a ballot at the last election, deprecating the President's inaugural message, and setting forth women's wrongs in general.

Mrs. Stanton said: Let women assist themselves now as they have never assisted themselves before. Let them take care of their own interests. They have too long let their benevolent instincts work toward the church and men; let them now attend to themselves. Let the churches alone; don't carpet churches, don't have fairs to deck them with painted windows; don't give your ministers donation parties; put all your energies into earnest work for your own emancipation. Make a social revolution. Carry the war, if need be, into your own families; let the baby go without bibs, the husband's shirts without buttons, the home without care, until the men give in. When they find their comfort depends on allowing us the ballot, they will wheel into line and give it us. Women have too long petitioned and begged of men; let them now make siege and carry the war into their own homes. It is coming to that, sirs, and it is going to be a dear piece of business for you. We are going to vote—peaceably if we can, but with war if we must. Self-assertion will have twenty times the effect of argument. I have argued twenty-five years and we are yet wards of the State, not free women. Indians, children and women were wards of the State. We are under the protection of generous white men. How are we protected? How are men generous? We have the same sort of consideration shown us that was shown to Irishmen before they had political power, that was shown to the negroes before they held the ballot. I took up a paper the other day in which were reported a women's meeting and a negroes' meeting. The women's meeting was ridiculed and sneered at; the negroes' meeting was treated with respect! Why? The negro is no longer a chattel, but a political power, and woman remains as she was. She would give an illustration of the difference with which the press treated women and men. Mrs. Stanton desired particularly that the *World* should report what she was about to say. The *World* at one time was disposed to deal rather fairly by women, but latterly, for some reason or other, it has changed its tactics. It was with pain that yesterday she read an editorial in that paper concerning the elopement of a Western woman with a man who was not her husband. She had burned with indignation when she read it. She knew that woman for a noble, long-suffering, good woman. She had suffered long, had toiled hard to support a great, lazy, legal husband, and had received not love and kindness and protection in return, but unkindness, contumely and wretchedness in her daily life. Without knowing anything of the temptations that led and the wrongs that drove this woman to escape her wrongs and accept what she thought was loving protection, the *World* and all the press hound this woman's name from one end of the United States to the other. But when a noted man is charged with equally heinous crimes the press is silent—a dumb dog that opens not its mouth.

Mrs. Gage then read the following letter from Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker, which was loudly applauded:

My dear Miss Anthony—Being detained by the lingering effects of a recent severe illness from attending this very important convention, which marks twenty-five years of as honest and glorious work as ever was done by man or woman upon the face of the earth, permit me through yourself as president of the National Society, to address a few words to my fellow-workers in the cause of political equality.

And first let me beg you, my friends, one and all, to read the report of the first convention, held at Seneca Falls twenty-five years ago, as I have just been doing for the third time, that you may join me in heartfelt admiration of the distinguished women who there enunciated a "declaration of sentiments" equal to the old Declaration of Independence, and founded upon a list of grievances as serious as those which provoked and justified the Revolutionary war. Especially will you note the speech of a woman, then hardly thirty years of age, which, for philosophic comprehension of the great truths of liberty and responsibility for patriotism and eloquence, has not been surpassed in the history of our country. This alone should suffice to send the name of Elizabeth Cady Stanton side by side with the grandest of our revolutionary statesmen down to the latest posterity; and it surely will.

The moving spirit of the occasion, we are told, was Lucretia Mott, "who spoke with her usual eloquence to a large and intelligent audience on the subject of reform in general," and from time to time during the numerous sessions of the convention, swayed the assembly by her "beautiful and spiritual appeal," and was the first to affix her name to this prophetic and inspired Declaration of Sentiments—an act which she will tell you to-day, I hope, has brought to her more joy than perhaps any other act of her life.

Had I the means, the printed report of this convention should be placed in the hands of every woman in the United States capable of reading it and understanding its high import; and, my friends, if this could be done our labor would be well nigh ended, and those women who do so desire might approach the polls unmolested, leaving their sisters, "who have all the rights they want," in the comfortable security of houses made twice secure in that they are guarded by the watchful care of the mothers, as well as the courage of the fathers of the republic.

That these noble women—so intensely in earnest to secure the blessings of liberty to all their posterity, and so deeply conscious of the heavy responsibility of such a trust—should have suspended their claims during the season of our civil war, and have thrown themselves into the contest for the rights of enslaved black men, is only new proof, where none was wanting, of the unselfishness of their nature and the purity of their motives. But the war being over, and a new million of black males being added to the many million white males as rulers of the land, what do we find to-day? Susan B. Anthony, the Garrison of the Woman's Rights' movement, not dragged by a rope round her neck through the streets of Rochester precisely, but indicted for the crime of attempting to vote for her rulers—she being an honest citizen of the United States, and a tax-paying, law-abiding citizen of the State of New York! Nevertheless, permit me, dear friend, to congratulate you upon the immense progress

mselves now
Let them take
so long let their
ch and men; let
churches alone;
deck them with
s donation par-
k for your own
arry the war, if
baby go without
the home with-
find their com-
will wheel into
petitioned and
d carry the war
s, sirs, and it is
We are going
we must. Self-
of argument. I
et wards of the
d women were
ed of gener-
How are men
ideration shown
ey had political
re they held the
which were re-
meeting. The
at; the negroes'
The negro is no
woman remains
f the difference
Mrs. Stanton
report what she
was disposed to
some reason or
ain that yes-
concerning the
an who was not
ation when she
long-suffering,
led hard to sup-
ceived not love
ut unkindness,
life. Without
led and the
er wrongs and
ion, the World
from one end of
a noted man is
ess is silent—a
from Mrs. Isa-
nded:
the lingering
ing this very im-
ve years of as
man or woman
gh yourself as
a few words to
uality.
ed all, to read
Seneca Falls
ing for the third
iration of the
"declaration
Independence,
rious as those
ary war. Es-
a, then hardly
prehension of
for patriotism
history of our
the name of
e grandest of
est posterity;
was Lucretia
to a large and
n in general."
essions of the
beautiful and
r name to this
ments—an act
ought to her
is convention
in the United
g its high im-
r labor would
desire might
sisters, "who
able security
arded by the
ourage of the
est to secure
and so deeply
trust—should
t of our civil
ntest for the
where none
ure and the
er, and a new
any million
find to-day?"
an's Rights'
eck through
or the crime
n honest cit-
abiding citi-
permit me,
ase progress

in our work which this indicates. It is but a little time since you and your illustrious compeers were counted only worthy of jests and sneers and contemptuous neglect. That you are called to-day to answer for the crime of loving liberty too well, declares to us, who are watching your career, that the beginning of the end is close at hand—that slavery is soon to cease and reconstruction to begin, under the auspices of noble women (not a few), and of the noble men who have acted as a body-guard through all these years of trouble. I have heard that, with your accustomed indomitableness, you have been attempting to instruct your possible jurors of the country upon the first principles of liberty and a Republican form of government. But have you considered, in doing this, to what an incompetent jury you are possibly consigning your case, and with it the hopes of multitudes of your sisters, who, less favored than yourself in not actually having been allowed to enter the sacred precincts of the polls, have put their trust in you as in one who should not fail, sooner or later, to achieve a victory for herself and for us all? Have you considered the result of white male legislation for near a hundred years, in elaborating a jury that must mentally consist of fools and knaves, and twelve of these to declare in unison upon a case of which they have formed no previous opinion, though the papers have rung with it, and Susan Anthony has lectured every night for more than a month to crowded houses upon it? But even this difficulty you are able to meet; and we leave our destiny in your hands with unfaltering hope and faith, saying only, as many times before, God bless Susan B. Anthony!

And this brings me to our latest national steps toward political equality—an advance which is a fitting close to the twenty-five years we are called to celebrate. And this once more was the work of a woman, young and inexperienced; a tender mother, also, but with a heart bolder than a lion and a will firmer for the right than the granite rock. From a reluctant Congressional committee she wrung the first recognition that woman citizens of the United States had any other right before the National Legislature than the right to withdraw petitions that had never been considered, though they lay by thousands in the dusty pigeon-holes of the secretaries of both Houses, the representatives of more than twenty years of patient labor under appalling difficulties. If I might add to my proposed distribution among the women of the country, the distribution among the men of the minority report of the House Judiciary Committee upon the memorial of Victoria C. Woodhull, together with her own argument thereon, the fate of prejudice would be sealed forever, and "honor to whom honor is due" become the motto of our new republic, founded at last upon an absolute equality of rights, even "the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." That Judge Loughridge, of Iowa, should have been both able and willing to consecrate many days of patient study to the preparation of one of the most luminous and learned reports that has been issued from Congress, and that the Hon. Benjamin F. Butler should have cheerfully brought to his aid all the legal acuteness for which he has long been famed is one of the signs of the times which politicians would do well to heed, and which to the weary watchers for the morning is surely a harbinger of day. There is one other place where earnest and persistent work is greatly needed, as it seems to me, and that is in the States now about forming new constitutions.

That we shall vote by reason of our undeniable and indefeasible right to do so as citizens of the United States, as a part of the people who originate governments and ordain constitutions, and that within a few short years, I have no doubt; but there is no better method of agitating this subject than by insisting that in a version of the constitution the State is for the time being resolved into its original elements, and that all disfranchised classes should have a voice in such version and be represented in such convention. Some of the ablest men in our country have given in their adhesion to this opinion, and the State of New York acted upon this principle in the years 1801 and 1821 by inventing the only disfranchised class then recognized, black men, and white men without the necessary property qualifications, to vote for delegates to the Constitutional Convention and to be eligible as members.

Women should see to it that in the earlier preliminary meetings, their claims are earnestly pressed, and if they cannot secure any of their sex as delegates, they may at least so distract the counsels of the male informers as to dispose them to delay constitutional reform for a time, whereby patriotic women may save their several states, the disgrace of declaring in one article, as many of our constitutions do, "that all political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded upon their authority, and that they have at all times an undeniable and wide feasible right to alter their form of government, as they may think expedient," and in a latter article limiting the right to elect all State officers to "white male citizens" and this when, as in my own State, the number of women citizens over twenty-one years of age, is several thousand greater than that of men.

In conclusion let me urge upon you dear friends, one and all, that each man and woman of you shall work for impartial suffrage as though the welfare of our beloved country depended upon the devotion of each single life, and the day is ours. I am now and always yours for liberty,

ISABELLA BEECHER HOOKER.

HARTFORD, Conn., May 1, 1873.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Susan B. Anthony took the chair.

Mrs. Halleck, Mrs. Lozier, Mrs. Wright and Mrs. Gage were appointed a committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year. Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake, who tripped forward to the edge of the platform in a gracefully terpsichorean fashion, was the next speaker. Mrs. Blake's remarks elicited considerable applause from the audience, and she was followed by Mrs. Stanton, who, before making her address, begged to say that she did not quite agree with Mrs. Blake in opposing the proposal to limit the ballot for women by a

property qualification. She thought we should expect men to do no better for us than for themselves. As they formerly limited the ballot for men by property qualification, we should, perhaps, be content if they pursued the same course toward us. Considering the high-toned morality of the men of the present day she was not surprised that they were afraid of the lower grades of women. Remembering how she felt under the knowledge that the lowest, most degraded, rascally and indecent of men had their hand in making laws for her and her children, she felt willing to save men from the horror of being under subjection to the lowest grades of women. [Applause.]

Mrs. Stanton made a long and elaborate speech, and was followed by Lucretia Mott, Mrs. Chandler and others.

EVENING SESSION.

A rather larger assembly than during the day. Mrs. Gage made the first speech, inveighing strongly against Grant's policy of ignoring women after making use of them for his promotion; of Miss Carroll's plans for the war campaign and of women suffragists to electioneer for him in the late political campaign. Miss Anthony then took the stand and gave an account of her persecution and prosecution for casting a vote. The place at which she registered for dropping that precious bit of paper was after the fashion of an Eighth-avenue polling booth, and a barber-shop into the bargain. She had some sharp arguments with the enlightened American citizens who officiated at the registry, and being led to suppose that her registry would be ignored, she proposed to have a hold on the inspectors, and straightway went to a lawyer for counsel. She found not a *rara avis* of his kind, but a lawyer of the old, old sort. He said: "Why, Miss Anthony, you show that you know nothing at all of law. You should pay down a round, retaining fee and then you are all right." Five women registered in the Eighth Ward of the city of Rochester, and by their example fifty others were incited to register in other wards, though only fourteen out of the whole voted. When election day came, fearful of insult, they went early and found no difficulty in putting their ballots through the broken pane. The inspector said, "Miss Anthony, you are challenged, are you ready to swear?" "Yes," said I, and I forgot my Quakerism and kissed the Bible. "Do you swear you are a citizen?" etc.; and I swore (the papers made me swear I was a male citizen); then they made me swear that I had neither bribed nor taken a bribe for this election; of course I swore that. There were \$1,500 floating around that day, but no man was challenged, no man sworn. The Quaker lady, Mrs. De Garmo, who followed, was also challenged. She refused to swear, saying: "I will not swear, but I will tell the truth if that will answer." The whole party voted and not an insulting word was spoken. It was said that arrests would be made, but days passed and none were made. I began to get afraid that they would not arrest me. But finally Commissioner Storrs, whose office is in the Arcade, sent word for me to call at his office. I sent word to him that I had no social acquaintance with him and didn't wish to call on him. If he wanted to see me on official business he must come and see me. Then a young man in beaver hat and kid gloves (paid for by taxes gathered from women), came to see me. He sat down. He said it was pleasant weather. He hemmed and hawed and finally said Mr. Storrs wanted to see me at the Arcade. "What for?" I asked. "To arrest you," said he. "Is that the way you arrest men?" "No." Then I demanded that I should be arrested properly. My sister desiring to go with me, he proposed that he should go ahead and I follow with her. This I refused, and he had to go with me. In the car he took his pocketbook to pay fare. I asked him if he did that in his official capacity. He said yes; he was obliged to pay the fare of any criminal he arrested. Well, that was the first cent's worth I ever had from Uncle Sam. A more wilted officer of the law cannot be imagined than he. And Mr. Commissioner Storrs was not less out of his element. Miss Anthony read the section of the Constitution upon which she is arraigned for illegal voting, and argued that she had not even violated it.

THE FINAL ARGUMENT FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The following letter was written in reply to one addressed to Justice Kingman by the Pennsylvania Woman Suffrage Association, asking for information in relation to the working of woman suffrage in Wyoming;

LARAMIE CITY, Wyoming Terr.,
December 26, 1872.

To the Pennsylvania Woman Suffrage Association:

It is now three years since the act was passed giving women the right of suffrage and the right to hold office in this territory, in all respects the same as other electors. Under this law they have been elected and appointed to various offices, and have acted as jurors and justices of the peace. They have very generally voted at all our elections, and have taken some part in making the nominations; and, although there are some among us who do not approve of it as a principle, I think there is no one who will deny that it has had a marked influence in elevating our elections and in making them quiet and orderly, and in enabling the courts to punish classes of crime where conviction could not be obtained without their aid.

For instance: when the territory was first organized almost every one carried a loaded revolver on his person, and, as a matter of course, altercations generally resulted in using them. I do not remember a single instance where a jury of men has convicted either party for shooting at each other, even in a crowded room, if no one was killed; or for killing any one, if the victim had been armed. But with two or three women on the jury they have never failed to follow the instructions of the court.

Again: the courts have been nearly powerless, with only men for jurors, in enforcing the laws against drunkenness, gambling, houses of ill fame, and debauchery in any of its forms. Neither grand nor petit juries could be relied on; but a few women on either panel changed the face of things

at once, and from that day this kind of vice has trembled before the law and hidden itself from sight, where formerly it stalked abroad with shameless front and brazen confidence in protection from punishment.

There are, comparatively, so few women here, and these are so generally kept at home by domestic duties, that the courts have been unable to obtain as many of them for jurors as was desirable. But those who have served have uniformly acquitted themselves with great credit. Not a single verdict, civil or criminal, has been set aside where women have composed a part of the jury. This has not been the case by any means when they have not been present. They have given better attention than men have to the progress of trials, have remembered the evidence better, have paid more heed to the charges of the court, have been less influenced by business relations and outside considerations, and have exhibited a keener conscientiousness in the honest discharge of responsibility. And I have heard of no instance where they have incurred any odium, or ill will, or want of respect, from having served as jurors. On the contrary, I am quite sure that in every instance they have been more highly appreciated and more generally respected in consequence of it.

There is no other influence that has grown up out of the presence of women in the court room, both as jurors and bailiffs, that has been more apparent and welcome. It is the quiet order and decorum, the decent and respectful behavior, the gentlemanly bearing that has always been observed in their presence. The spectators come here better dressed, chew less tobacco, spit less, sit more quietly in their seats, walk more quietly on the floor, talk and whisper less; and in all respects the court room assumes a more dignified and business-like air, and better progress is made in disposing of the matter in hand. Certainly the whole effect on our courts and on our community, resulting from the participation of women in the administration of the laws, has been most beneficial and satisfactory; and it seems to me particularly proper that those who suffer most from the commission of crime and the evils of vice should take part in its suppression and punishment.

There is another matter in which we have been greatly benefited by this law, and that is the change it has wrought on election days and its influence on the polls.

Formerly our elections were scenes of drunken revel and noise, of fighting and riot. But when the women came to vote they were always treated with the attention and respect every where shown to women in the United States. If there was a crowd around the polls, they always gave way when a woman approached, and were silent and orderly while she deposited her vote and went away. If men became intoxicated, they did not remain there where the women would see them. No noisy discussion would arise around the polls, because invariably, when a woman came up, all such conversation would cease. The fact has been that very few people have gathered at the polls, and noise and fighting and riot and drunkenness have been entirely unknown there. If men drank too much, as they sometimes did, they remained at the drinking shops, each particular party by itself, and consequently avoided the quarrels and collisions that so often occur; while the people went to the polls and voted as quietly as they went to the church. This in itself has been a gain, in our community, of no small moment.

At first there was quite a number of women who refused to vote, but at every election that number has grown less, until now very few, if any, fail to exercise that privilege. Many refuse to vote as their husbands do, but I have not heard of any domestic discord or trouble growing out of such a course.

In conclusion, I wish to say, as broadly and as unqualifiedly as I can express it, that while I have seen many advantages and much public good grow out of this change in our laws, I have seen none of the evils or disadvantages so generally apprehended and so warmly denounced by the opponents of the measure.

Very respectfully,
Associate Justice United States Supreme Court, Wyoming Territory.

J. W. KINGMAN.

SPIRITUALISTIC.

TO THE NATIONAL MASS CONVENTION OF SPIRITUALISTS, CALLED TO ASSEMBLE AT CINCINNATI, OHIO, MAY 23, 1873.

To the Brothers and Sisters, Greeting:

In an extensive country like the United States, any national mass convention is usually largely made up of the friends in the adjacent States to where the convention assembles, and commonly the call is also signed to a very large extent by the same persons; consequently it cannot represent the Spiritualists of America. This fact alone should entitle the people to an unlimited discussion of the issues, in the Spiritual press, prior to the meeting of the convention.

Most of the correspondence in relation to the proposed convention has been through the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, and numerous articles in favor of it have been admitted to its columns, but never has a single article, I believe, been admitted which was opposed to the dividing and sectarianizing of the glorious Spiritual movement.

That noble lecturer and writer Mrs. Addie L. Ballou, has been denied admission to its columns, for the purpose of expressing her views against the call of this convention, and has been obliged to send her article to WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY for publication.

Although I have been a reporter and correspondent for the *Journal* for over a year, and intend to report for its inner-life department as long as the spirit world or Bro. Jones desires me, yet I have been unable to gain admission to its columns for the purpose of exposing the folly of dividing and sectarianizing the Spiritual movement; at least, I forwarded an article to Bro. S. S. Jones, early in April, advocating

the unity of Spiritualism, and have not heard from it, neither has it been published up to this date, May 8, 1873.

I also recently forwarded the article to WOODHULL & CLAPLIN'S WEEKLY, after I found that it was not published in the *Journal*, and, thank God, there is at least one independent paper in this country.

My personal relations with Brother Jones are of the most kindly nature, but my sense of duty impels me to ignore all personalities, and discuss facts and principles, and apply the lash of criticism to the course of the *Journal* in this matter, as in my opinion it richly deserves it. In such a bold, outspoken paper, I cannot account for this spirit of illiberality in reference to the discussion of this question.

The stirring events of the past make it of vital importance to consider where we are drifting. The fact that the United States Government, at the demand of the agents of the Young Men's Christian Association, arrested and imprisoned the President of the American Association of Spiritualists, and suppressed her paper, is indeed significant, when we consider that they are the chief corner-stone in the revolutionary movement, instituted to subvert our national Constitution and make it an agent of the priesthood.

George Francis Train has had his paper suppressed by the government, and has also been arrested and imprisoned in a common prison, with felons and murderers, for nearly five months without trial, and a diabolical plot to send him to the insane asylum almost succeeded. All this persecution has been instigated by the agent of the Y. M. C. A., simply because he dared to publish three columns of extracts from their divinely inspired Bible, and then plead guilty to its obscenity, is another very significant fact. If the mercenary agents of those who are working for this God-in-the-Constitution movement dare thus interfere with the individual freedom of spiritualists and liberalists at present, where, in the name of Heaven, would they stop if they had the whole power of the Constitution and government to back them? If the so-called independent spiritual and liberal press of the land are too weak-kneed to speak out in defense of persecuted and imprisoned human beings before the Constitution is subverted, where will we find a press with backbone enough to fight the battles of liberty, after the religious bigots have the whole power of the government in their own hands? These are pertinent questions for consideration by the people as well as by the mass convention. I would suggest the propriety of passing resolutions demanding of the spiritual press the utmost freedom for discussion on all questions of public interest or welfare. It is not enough for an editor to say that he controls his own columns, because the people pay for it, and have a right to liberal discussion. The people make and support editors as well as priests; and it is *their right to demand a free press*. That "the voice of the people is the voice of God," is most emphatically the spirit of the age!

The unity of the Spiritual cause on its present individual basis must be preserved at all hazards, and if you dare organize an association which ignores the character of this heaven-born movement and return to the exploded practices of sectarianism, the spirit world will hold you responsible, as well as the mass of the Spiritualists throughout the land.

It would be well to take into serious consideration the propriety and practicability of adopting some plan of compromise which would be satisfactory to yourselves and to the American Association, with the view of preserving the unity of the cause. I would respectfully suggest for your consideration the following plan, viz.:

1. Let the expression of belief or creed be confined to a simple statement of a knowledge or belief in the future life.
2. Demand the greatest individual freedom of speech in the press and on the rostrum.

All Spiritualists will be a unit on the first proposition pertaining to a creed and in reference to freedom on the rostrum and in the press. It does not commit the conservatives to doctrines they do not believe, and at the same time the radical element will have an opportunity to advocate their special reform on a free rostrum and in a free press.

I would respectfully suggest that it is not expedient at this present time to organize a new National Association, for the reason that a free discussion has been denied in the press; consequently a call for a mass convention of Spiritualists, where the large majority of the signers belong in the adjacent States, is in no sense a representative mass convention of the Spiritualists of America. There are other weighty reasons indicated in the general statement of the argument advanced which should prevent any new organization at this time.

I would further respectfully suggest that you consider the propriety of this proposed plan of compromise, or any other similar one, and if it meets your approbation appoint a delegation or commission to attend the next annual meeting of the American Association for the purpose of urging its adoption by that Association. If a compromise cannot be effected so as to preserve the unity of the Spiritual cause, then the discussion of the subject by the people will be exhausted before your convention should be recalled next year, if deemed desirable.

If you organize a new association and ignore the time-honored character of the movement, the masses of the people will not support you.

Brothers and sisters, I implore you to act slowly and surely; do not be in haste, ponder well the fact that you are working to divide this movement, without ever having made a single effort to compromise the causes of disaffec-

tion. I plant myself firmly on the unity of the Spiritual cause, and affirm that I will do all in my power to bring about a compromise with the existing American Association. I will not stand alone in this matter, as the spirit world and the generous souls of the people desire no division in the ranks. Will you not stand for a united cause and let the sects alone, as a relic of priestcraft? The spirit of the age demands that creeds, sects, pathies and isms be overturned, while we remain united upon a common platform upholding the rights of humanity.

Oh, may the fraternal spirit of love, harmony and peace pervade all your deliberations, and may you rise above the bigotries, prejudices, and contentions of earth, and join hands, hearts and souls, with the spirit world, for the advancement of a united cause is the prayer of your brother,

JOHN SMITH BROWN.

812 North Tenth street, Philadelphia, Pa., May 8, 1873.

REFLECTIONS

ON REPORT OF THE CELEBRATION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM IN BOSTON.

BY W. F. JAMIESON.

[Concluded.]

Emma Hardinge-Britten was the next speaker. Emma is gifted with an eloquent flow of words. She is about three-fourths Christian, one-fourth Spiritualist. Said she:

"At last came the gentle Nazarene, he to whom the previous speaker referred so justly when he represented him as the grandest and most perfect exemplar of Spiritual power and possibility that the earth had ever seen."

"Gentle," was he?

"And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen, and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables."—John ii, 15.

The "gentle Nazarene" did that. He was "on his muscle," to use a modern Christian phrase. On his way to the temple, he distinguished himself by cursing a fig-tree, because it had no figs when it was not fig time! Matthew represents him as saying:

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword."

Christians have taken him at his word upon that point. To show that this cannot be explained by calling it figurative I need only quote Luke, who tells us that he said to his disciples:

"He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one."

The gentle John reports that, "Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear."

True, the Nazarene aforesaid commanded Peter to put up his sword, and informed him that "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

The latter clause is not quite true.

But the command to sheath the sword was evidently making a virtue of necessity, for the book asserts that "a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people," came against him and his small band. The "gentle Nazarene" said something about twelve legions of angels and more coming to his rescue; but the reinforcements did not come up. A prayer might have brought them, but it is supposed if they had come up it would have spoiled a prophecy.

It is unnecessary for me to refer to his denunciations of the Pharisees and the harsh epithets he hurled at them. Nor need I allude to his doctrine of hatred against kindred, as I have already adduced sufficient proof to show that if he was gentle, kind, loving and liberal-minded, then Nero was not a tyrant and King George III. was America's best friend. Says Mrs. Britten:

"No matter how many extraneous errors had been foisted upon the system founded upon their revelations (Rochester knockings), no matter how many theories of ideality and sexuality had been fastened to its car, no matter what man had done to it, God had in it answered the cry of the appealing soul." [Applause.]

Who has "foisted" errors upon Spiritualism? Mrs. Woodhull, of course, is aimed at. What is it to "foist"?

"To insert by forgery or without warrant; to introduce surreptitiously or fraudulently; to thrust in; to interpolate."

Is there a council to grant a warrant to advocate certain measures as Spiritualism, and pronounce against others as heretical? Is this what we are coming to? Are all Emma Hardinge-Britten's "theories" Spiritualism, and all ideas and methods which are broader than her theories not Spiritualism? There are issues which she may deem "side issues." They lie "outside" of what she considers ought to be the domain of Spiritualism. They are beyond it and all around it. They are the branches of the Tree of Spiritualism. She wants the branches stripped off!

She would do with Spiritualism as Jesus Christ did with the fig-tree—*curse it!* She would have it bereft of all "side issues," its wealth of leaves and far-reaching arms which help to procure it sustenance, sunshine, air, rain. She would strip it of its beautiful foliage. She would cut off its roots that reach down in the dank soil of social life and leave us the dead trunk to be called "Spiritualism proper!" Another unsightly form added to the forest of religious stumps.

Miss Jennie Leys did good work amid so much conservatism. She declared that Spiritualism must be "all-embracing." Her question was significant: "What is Spiritualism to accomplish for this country during the next quarter of a century?" That is it. What is it going to do? She answers it. Like the sun, its rays must enter into and therefore invigorate every department of life. Pearls of wisdom, glistening with the dew of inspiration, came from the lips of this three-years' old child in Spiritualism, while the veterans of

our cause were wasting their precious time in striving to show how nearly alike is primitive Christianity and modern Spiritualism!

Mrs. Palmer compressed much truth in the remarks—Spiritualism "must prove its teachings by its works," and, "built upon science, it must live forever." She may, by-and-by, however, conclude that the "Scriptures" are far from "Holy."

John Wetherbee was cheery as ever. Thus closes my reflections.

A MEDIUMS' AND SPEAKERS' CONVENTION.

A quarterly convention of mediums, speakers and others for Western New York will be held in Canaseraga Hall, Dansville, on Saturday and Sunday, June 7th and 8th, 1873, commencing on Saturday at 11 o'clock A. M., or as soon as the express train arrives from the north. Good speakers will be present, and a general attendance is solicited. The friends in Dansville will, so far as they are able to do so, entertain all from abroad.

Come, friends, with hearts all aglow with love of truth and humanity, and make this re-union one in which our aspirations shall be responded to with the best influences from the higher angelic spheres.

J. W. SEAVER, }
G. W. TAYLOR, } Committee.
A. E. TILDEN, }

PLAINWELL, May 7, 1873.

Dear Woodhull—Please insert in your worthy columns the following notice:

The Michigan State Association of Spiritualists will hold their next semi-annual Convention in the village of Charlotte, Eaton County, on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, June 13, 14 and 15, 1873. Let all Spiritualists and friends of liberty consider themselves cordially invited to attend. Preparations will be made by the friends of Charlotte to entertain all strangers from abroad; and should the numbers prove too great, arrangements will be made with the hotels for board and lodging at reduced prices.

Able speakers will be in attendance to address the meeting.

By order of E. C. MANCHESTER, President.

Mrs. L. E. DRAKE, Secretary.

Friendly papers please copy.

[From the Chicago Times, Monday, May 5.]

IS HE A LECHER?

An Answer to the Plymouth Church Conundrum—The Bill of Particulars in the Beecher-Tilton Scandal—Henry Ward in the Role of a Rascal—The Women who Accomplished His Fall—His Amours and How They Were Exposed—Theodore's "True Story" of the Erratic Pastor's Wrong-Doing—Free Love on Brooklyn Heights.

[Special Telegram.]

NEW YORK, May 4.—While the church bells were ringing this morning in New York and Brooklyn, the newsboys were yelling in the City of Churches: "Sunday Review—full account of the great Beecher Scandal!" I bought a copy of the paper, and found that some light at last was breaking in upon this Plymouth Church putridity. The *Review* contained

THE "THUNDERBOLT"

boiled down which Mr. E. H. G. Clark has fired at Brooklyn from the walls of Troy. This remarkable document has been extensively canvassed and anxiously looked for. It begins with the following remarkable headings:

The Republic Threatened. The Beecher-Tilton Scandal and the Beecher-Bowen-Comstock Conspiracy. The Seal Broken at Last. Woodhull's Lies and Theodore Tilton's "True Story." The Account Horrible at Best. No Obscenity, but God's Truth. The Sexual Ethics of Plymouth Church. A New Revelation. The Brooklyn Saints Torture St. Paul into a Free Lover. The Thunderbolt Shatters a Bad Crowd and Plows up the Whole Ground.

Then the "true story" is given, which is in effect this: Tilton asserts that in the fall of 1870, Mrs. Tilton being just back from a watering-place, Mr. Beecher visited her, and in a moment of fervid pastoral duty, he sought her to accord to him all those peculiar favors which her sex admits of. Mrs. Tilton declined the honor with the mature sadness of common sense. Then she told her husband. He asked her to make a memorandum. This is it:

"Yesterday afternoon, my friend and pastor, Henry Ward Beecher, solicited me to become his wife in all the relations which that term implies."

Tilton was then editor of *The New York Independent*, and of *The Brooklyn Union*, making all of \$15,000 a year. Six weeks after the occurrence, Tilton tells Bowen of the honor Mr. Beecher intended to confer upon his (Tilton's) wife. Theodore also says that for a year previous, Bowen had been accusing Beecher of adulteries and rapes.

Bowen urged Tilton to go for Beecher, and finally Tilton wrote this note, which Bowen delivered:

HENRY W. BEECHER:

Sir—For reasons which you will understand, and which I need not therefore recite, I advise and demand that you quit Plymouth pulpit forever, and leave Brooklyn as a residence.

THEODORE TILTON.

Then Mr. Frank Moulton comes on the scene. He is also a prominent member of the church. Tilton told him about the note to Beecher.

"Did Bowen sign with you," said Moulton. "No," "Then you are a ruined man."

When Bowen handed Beecher the letter, he said:

"Mr. Beecher, a letter from Tilton. Tilton is your im- placable enemy, but I will be your friend."

Shortly after, Bowen discharged Tilton. Some eight months after, Beecher, fearing the gathering storm, called on Mrs. Tilton. She was sick in bed, but her pastor sought her side and demanded a retraction, which she wrote, saying that Mr. Beecher in his intercourse with her had conducted himself as a gentleman and a Christian. This is the sweet concessiveness of Mrs. Tilton which Woodhull speaks of. When Tilton heard of this he besought Moulton to visit Beecher and demand the paper containing the retraction. The meeting was a stormy one, but Moulton was implacable. Beecher asked him what he would do with it if he had it. "I will keep this memorandum and the first one to- gether," said Mr. Moulton, "and thus prevent you and Tilton from harming each other."

"But can I confide in you?" implored Beecher. "Will you protect the paper?"

"I will," quoth Moulton.

"How?" queried Beecher.

"With this, if necessary," said Moulton, and he brandished a revolver.

Then Beecher gave up the document, and Moulton has kept it since. All this dramatic scene is in Tilton's "true story." Now we have Woodhull on the scene, Tilton finally making her acquaintance. One day she showed him a copy of the *World* containing a letter of his in which she had written this passage: "I know a clergyman of emi- nence in Brooklyn who lives in concubinage with the wife of another clergyman of equal eminence."

"Do you know whom I mean?" said Vicky.

"No."

"I mean you and Beecher."

Then Tilton sought to get on the right side of Woodhull, and began that celebrated intimacy with her which resulted in his writing her life, and an account of the nightly trances she and old Demosthenes enjoyed together, but he found Vicky could not be bought in that way. Her first shot came in the early part of 1872, when on the occasion of Woodhull being snubbed by the Woman's Rights women, she sent them her tit-for-tat proofs, declaring that if they disgraced her for teaching Free Love, she would disgrace them for practicing it. At last Woodhull and Claflin's bombshell was touched off, much to the astonishment and disgust, so Theodore says, of himself. Such is the gist of Tilton's true story, as it appears in Clark's *Thunderbolt*.

TILTON INTERVIEWED.

I interviewed Tilton this afternoon, and was dumbfounded as we walked the heights, observed by all we met. He said he was never more in the dark any time during the past year than now. Letter after letter has appeared in the papers, of which he was given as the author, and of which he said he knew nothing. He does not deny the contents of his letter to Bowen, dated January 1, 1871, but says that it is not a correct copy. He denies any personal knowledge of E. H. G. Clark, of the *Troy Whig*, and has no positive knowledge of ever having met the gentleman; believes that a man named Clark did once bring him a letter of introduction from James Redpath, but has entirely forgotten the circumstance. He criticised the article in the *Review*, pointed out several minor inaccuracies, but did not deny the general truthfulness of the account. Several passages alluding to Mr. Beecher's proposals to his wife he did most emphatically deny, and yet he read those self- same passages to me from his own manuscript last Thanksgiving day. It was evident Mr. Tilton was on his guard, and purposely evading and denying this, too, at an interview to which I was invited by him, he well knowing my character as a journalist, and evidently expecting me to make use of anything he might communicate. He played the role of a bravado to perfection, and said that he didn't care a snap about what the papers said, or what Mesdames Woodhull and Claflin or Col. Blood did. There did not exist, he said, a single scrap of paper emanating from his pen which he was not willing to have given to the world at any time, whether addressed to man or woman. Allusion being made by me to the manuscript statement of his case, which he had read to me last winter, and which was intended at the time for private circulation, and possibly publication, he said that there were at that time certain contingencies existing which affected not himself but others, but that now happily these were all removed. Notwithstanding this statement, my recollection is perfect that what Tilton read to me as his story tallies exactly with what the *Thunderbolt* says in reference to Mr. Beecher soliciting Mrs. Tilton to extend to him the favors of wifehood; and fur- thermore, that the letter from Tilton to Bowen, but recently published, was there in *extenso*, the one case being that in which the honor of his wife was attacked, the other springing from a business and salary relation with H. C. Bowen. Mr. Tilton then alluded to the fact well known to those who are *au fait* in this matter, that Mr. Bowen's first wife, now dead eleven years, was also a victim to Mr. Beecher's lust, which very reasonably accounts for the vindictive spirit shown by Mr. Bowen when he urged Tilton to write that demand for Beecher's resigna- tion which he so obligingly carried, and which he was smart enough not to sign. In view of the fact in this connection that notwithstanding the hot shot the *Eagle* is pouring into the *Union*, of which Bowen is proprietor, calling him the slanderer of his pastor daily; and in view, furthermore, that last Wednesday Mr. Beecher's friends offered \$125,000 for

the purchase of a controlling interest in the *Union*, the situ- ation is certainly suggestive.

Not the least disgraceful feature, therefore, of this thor- oughly disgraceful affair, is the barefaced attempt of Beecher's friends to hide the shame of the dead wife with the glamour of gold. It may be well to mention here a fact not generally known: During the incarceration of Woodhull and Claflin in the Ludlow-street Jail, where they were vis- ited daily by Geo. F. Train, a gentleman from Western Pennsylvania, named W—k, ex-minister and ex-lawyer, and now a successful coal operator, also called upon them and heard their story. Thence he went to Tilton and in- terviewed him. Tilton read him the statement now published in the *Thunderbolt* previously read to me, and supplemented that reading by the recital of a gross rape by Mr. Beecher upon the person of a celebrated literary lady of this city by the name of Proctor, dressing the story up in glowing and dramatic colors. This is the case alluded to in the letter from Tilton to Bowen, lately published, in which the grossness of the rape was concealed by the characteristic stars. W—k, himself, is my author- ity for this; and further that Tilton told him that upon learning of this rape from Mr. Bowen, Tilton called upon Miss Proctor and asked her if she had told Bowen of the outrage, and that she said she had, and immediately swooned at his feet. On recovering her consciousness he promptly asked her whether she had communicated the intelligence to Bowen verbally or in writing, and she answered verbally. Mr. Tilton admitted to me to-day that he had such an inter- view with W—k, had told W—k of his interview with Miss Proctor, but evaded direct questions about the lady, and maintained that the story was exaggerated. All this time we were walking along the streets, Tilton carrying the *Re- view* in his hand, title out. He sought the most frequented thoroughfares, just as the churches were dismissing their congregations, and seemed in no way to be annoyed by his conspicuousness. He chatted pleasantly, and several times laughed heartily at what the paper said about him, inti- mating that the *Thunderbolt's* "true story" was put together by some clever hand from the pilfering memories of those to whom he had read his statement. He said the original statement called his "true story" was in the custody of Mr. Frank Moulton, which remark was confirmed by Mr. Moulton himself. Mr. Clark also says in his paper that he, when called upon, will show satisfactorily where he got the statement he published. When parting from Mr. Tilton he asked me in a careless, off-hand manner how the town talked about the scandal. I told him this: "Every man I had met that morning, among them several prominent mem- bers of Plymouth Church, believed it now, while they never did before, and gave as their opinion that Mr. Beecher must come down from his pulpit."

It is difficult to get at the feeling of the church, but I may remark in conclusion that a nephew of H. C. Bowen, a prominent member of 'Change, has offered to wager \$5,000 that in this social tilt his uncle is bound to win.

INDUSTRIAL JUSTICE.

1. Go to, now, ye rich men; weep and howl, for your miseries that shall come upon you.

4. Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is kept back by fraud, crieth, and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord.

Gel. Ep. James v. 1-4.

THE AMERICAN LABOR REFORM LEAGUE.

The third annual convention of the American Labor Reform League met Sunday, May 4th, at the Masonic Hall, on Thirteenth street, near Third avenue. At the morning ses- sion, the meeting was called to order by E. H. Heywood, Secretary, who introduced L. K. Joslin, Vice President, from Rhode Island. At the afternoon session, a paper was read by Louis Masquiner, of Brooklyn, on "Labor Reform," and the subsequent discussion was taken part in by Dr. C. S. Weeks, John H. Kiser, Dr. Shevlin, M. D. Bucklin and Dr. Sheppard. They held that beyond the necessities of life the accumulation of property is a wrong, and a man who gathers wealth robs his fellow-men. Mr. Bucklin said that when a man is worth \$20,000,000 it is better for the community for him to be in State Prison than out of it.

At the evening session letters were read from J. F. Bray of Pontiac, Mich.; Emma M. Beckwith of Hudson, N. Y.; Wil- liam Ben. Wright of Boston, Mass.; Benj. R. Tucker of Bos- ton, Mass.; Elizabeth Kimball of Oxford, N. H., and Lemuel Parmely of Hammond, La.

The meeting was then addressed by William Hansom, who said that there was no standard of measurement for labor as there was for cloth and liquids. He was then followed by Col. Henry Beeny, who spoke upon the right of the laborer who tills the land to own it.

SECOND DAY.

The day sessions were principally occupied by the Ameri- can Anti-Usury Society.

In the evening Stephen Pearl Andrews gave a long exposi- tion of his peculiar views on everything under the sun. He started by a ready solution of the whole banking troubles, passed through the proper distribution of all industries through government warehouses, gave his ideas of God and Christianity, and spoke of the present government at Wash- ington as a dead carcass. Out of this muck-heap a new mode of ruling would shortly arise, but it will without revolution. After answering any and all questions the audience thought fit to put Mr. Andrews closed.

The following permanent officers of the league were elect- ed: President—Wm. R. Greene of Massachusetts. Vice- Presidents—J. R. Ingalls, New York; S. F. Bray, Michigan;

Stephen Pearl Andrews, New York; Wm. K. Cowing, Maine; Mrs. S. L. M. Patterson, Pennsylvania; John Orvis, Massa- chusetts; Lemuel Parmely, Louisiana; M. D. Bucklin, New York; A. B. Brown, New Hampshire; John Greble, Kan- sas; Mrs. L. M. Tilton, Massachusetts; Mrs. J. H. Brooks, Iowa; Mrs. L. M. R. Poole, Ohio; Mrs. Mary E. Tillotson, New Jersey. Secretaries—Mrs. Olive H. F. Ingalls, New York; Mrs. E. H. Heywood, Massachusetts. Treasurer—L. K. Joslin Rhode Island. Executive Committee—J. R. In- galls, Wm. B. Greene, L. K. Joslin, E. H. Heywood, Wm. Houson, Edward Palmer.

Mr. E. H. Heywood, in the closing remarks, charged every bond-holder as an unchristian robber, since all the sum ori- ginally loaned the government had been paid back to the bondholder, and hence any further exaction was theft. The land reformers had been working at their particular point, and yet, under republican rule, there were one hundred acres of land stolen where one was taken by any other party. He denied that there could be any ownership in land, which was the gift of God to the whole people. There is a happy time coming, within a very brief period, when Wm. B. Astor instead of selling a corner lot for \$100,000 will be locked up in the Tombs if he take \$1 for it. A long, rambling letter from the veteran reformer Eliphalet Kimball, of New Hamp- shire, was read on the abolition of both capital and labor, natural government without laws, and other equally com- prehensible themes.

E. H. Heywood offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That since ownership in values which are not the product of human effort takes the earnings of labor without equivalent return, property in land, mines, forests or other natural resources is robbery; and the only value which govern- ment can equitably recognize is the cost of improve- ments.

Resolved, That since present laws of property are relics of the savage instincts of past periods, favor speculative accu- mulation at the expense of honest production, and tend to make the leisure class rich and the industrial class poor, no adequate solution of the labor problem is possible without a redistribution of existing wealth.

Resolved, That in recommending abolition of the Usury Law without also urging the removal of State and Federal restrictions upon the manufacture and issue of currency, Governor Dix does not, in any honest sense, favor free trade in money, but sides with the National Bank monopoly to heap new burdens upon productive enterprise.

Resolved, That the Credit Mobilier frauds and "salary steal" of Congress, the high-toned perverseness of Republi- can legislation at Albany and Boston, the "Religious Amendment" movement, the Methodist Book Concern, and the "obscenity" idiocy of the Young Men's Christian Asso- ciation and Plymouth Church, are sufficient evidence that extant governments and religions are a compound of stu- pidity and scoundrelism which intelligent people should not longer support or tolerate.

Resolved, That the attempt to suppress WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY and the imprisonment of Geo. Francis Train are efforts to limit freedom of speech and the press by ecclesiastical and political authorities, determined to stifle investigation of industrial and social evils, which should be resisted by all true friends of progress.

Resolved, That renewing our demand for the immediate enfranchisement of woman—her political and social equality with man—we urge school committees to cease discriminating against her in the salaries of teachers, and entreat all people to aid in putting an end to the ineffably mean and dishonest practice of paying girls and women less than boys and men for the same work.

L. K. Joslin offered this:

Resolved, That the people need land for homes in our large cities quite as much as for parks and pleasure-grounds, and the city should appropriate the lands of the city, now held at extortionate and speculative prices, to the families for homes, and pay for the same by general taxation.

Several letters were also read which we should be glad to present, especially one from William Ben. Wright and Benj. R. Tucker, of Boston, but space forbids.

SESSION ON ANTI-USURY.

Mr Edwin Palmer, the chairman, submitted the following propositions:

1. That money should in no case be regarded as a com- modity. It is a token and measure of values, to facilitate the exchange of commodities; a counter or certificate of service; a convenient agent in the distribution of the pro- ducts of labor.

2. That there is really no conflict between labor and capi- tal, the aggregate product of labor; but there is an irrespec- tible conflict between labor and usury, modernly called in- terest; a delusive and morally blinding device, by which a privileged class are enabled to avoid labor and obtain the continual service and unremitting toil of the laboring class without rendering any adequate service in return.

3. That labor or the product thereof is the only equivalent for labor or its product. Therefore every cent taken for usury or interest is so much unjustly taken from the hard earnings of the laboring people.

4. That in view of the countless millions thus taken con- tinually, it is evident that poverty and degradation must inevitably be the lot of the laboring class so long as usury or the interest-paying system is continued; which in its vari- ous forms takes all the net product of labor from laboring people to double continually the capital of capitalists.

5. That the effort to render inquiry respectable by legal- izing the requirement of a certain per cent, and calling it "interest," will prove unavailing; whether called usury or interest, either term will ere long be understood to be sy- nonymous with robbery.

6. That moral corruption may reasonably be expected to increase and abound in every department, while the interest- paying system is allowed to subvert moral principle, and thus undermine the moral foundation of society.

7. That this unjust, oppressive and demoralizing system which has come down to us from the past, and which we have had no hand or voice in making, now permeates and controls human affairs, so that we are all more or less in- volved in it, and can be freed from it only by abolishing the entire system, which we are morally bound to do, as the only way possible to establish justice, secure the rights of labor, or have honest dealing between man and man.

THE LAW OF MOSES.

The question of usury, said Mr. Heywood of Massachusetts, lies at the basis of the whole labor movement. There has

always been an anti-usury movement. The conscience of human nature is against it. The Bibles of all nations denounce it, and the Christian Bible is particularly against it. Moses, the lawgiver of Israel, repudiated all debts once in seven years, and labeled it the Lord's release. Ezekiel advocated the repudiation of all debts, the principal whereof had been paid in the form of interest.

The question arises whether this is mere sentimentality or founded on a scientific basis. The question is how does this money belong to this man. The whole battle will have to be fought on the labor basis.

No disputant has appeared who can confute or explain away the assertion that labor is the source of wealth. If labor is the source of wealth, the pretended owner of the corner lot, on which he has expended no labor, does not own it. "But," says he, "I have put \$60,000 into it." He can only be answered as he would be if he had bought a negro. By what right does he call the land his property? Banking is the only kind of business which gets both its security and profit in advance. The money question is simple. It has been befogged in the attempt to justify profits. The business men take the whole risk. The bank takes all the profit. The whole cost of running the largest bank in New England for the last ten years has been less than one-half of one per cent. If the cost of money is less than one-half of one per cent., the price will in the long run come to the same. If the business men furnish the security, the business men might as well run their own banks. All that is necessary is to have our usury laws repealed. Who are these bankers that they should be exempt from competition? Who are these property holders? The trades unions are asking this. The question is simply a question of costs.

ANTONIO TO SHYLOCK.

Mr. Ingalls of New York addressed the meeting. He said the money fallacy was punctured in the question of Antonio to Shylock: "Is thy money then ewes and rams?" Shylock answered: "I know not; but it breeds as well." Revolution is inevitable, necessary—our only escape. Under the governments of Europe there is no way out but through blood. Here we have the ballot, by which we should take hold of government and restrict the power of capital.

Dr. Weeks, of New York, said: I have times of discouragement when I think what has been called human cussedness is pretty thick—almost unendurable—but after all it is the pioneer worker in clearing the way for reform. It works effectively while the moral convictions lack the courage to do so. Puritan piety and morals ran away from persecution, but Puritan selfishness when taxed gave fight and broke its power. So through all human history. The devil is the great working reformer—this devil. The new and more vital selfishness of our age, when the oppression of capital gets a little work, will grapple with it for defense, and necessity will force us then to revolutionize prevailing systems of governments, and destroy all class privileges and monopolies and the laws which support them. We will then make pumice of all our law libraries, saving only a copy of such volume for an antediluvian museum. Then, with only general laws of universal natural principle of equity, one volume which may be carried in one's pocket will be sufficient for a law library. There can be no real liberty till laws are brought to this. We are now in the barbarous stage of the industrial epoch, just as the early historic period, was in the barbarous stage of the military epoch. As things now are, the squandering of the rich, producing gout among themselves, is the only pecuniary salvation of the poor. Matters will grow worse till they explode into revolution as did the slavery system. This is the way all great reforms have come, and when the prospect is the darkest the revolution is nearest at hand.

Messrs. Joslin and Buckland addressed the meeting, and the Convention adjourned.

THE WORD—A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF REFORM.

Favors the abolition of speculative income, of woman's slavery and war government; regards all claims to property, not founded on a labor title, as morally void, and asserts the free use of land to be the inalienable privilege of every human being—one having the right to own or sell only his service impressed on it, not by restrictive methods, but through freedom and reciprocity. The Word seeks the extinction of interest, rent, dividends and profit, except as they represent work done; the abolition of railway, telegraphic, banking, trades-union and other corporations charging more than actual cost for values furnished, and the repudiation of all so-called debts, the principle whereof has been paid in the form of interest.

E. H. HEYWOOD, Editor.

Contributors, correspondents and those from whose works extracts may be printed are responsible only for their own opinions; the editor must not be understood to approve or reject any views, not editorial, unless he says so.

Terms: 75 cents annually in advance; 5 copies, \$3.50; 10 copies, \$6; 20 copies, \$11; 50 copies, \$20; 100 copies, \$37.50. Single copies 7 cents. Address,

THE WORD, Princeton, Mass.

THE I. W. A.

MEETINGS OF THE AMERICAN FEDERAL COUNCIL.

The subjoined Address was received at a meeting of the Council, held the 27th ult., via Sec. 26 (American), Philadelphia, Pa. It was directed to be printed in the WEEKLY, and read at the meeting of the proposed Eight-Hour Law League. In consequence of the absence of one of the delegates at the meeting of the League, it was not read there, and for the same reason was not printed in the last issue of the WEEKLY. It is much to be regretted, since many Internationalists, too much disposed to surrender to Trades' Unions (as such), need to learn the lesson it conveys:

TO THE TRADES OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

"Freedom doth forge her mails of adverse fates."

FELLOW-MEN: The London Trades' Delegates have ad-

ressed a manifesto to the Trades of Great Britain and Ireland, setting forth certain propositions for your consideration. Have you seen it? Have you considered it? If not, do so without delay; it contains matter for serious reflection, and is of vital importance to you. It is based on first principles, and strikes at the root of all your grievances—social and political. The London Trades have taken a wise step, as it is virtually one in the right direction. They are convinced of the absurdity of the old system of Trades' Unions having no connection with politics; and they have witnessed, from sad experience, the utter failure of them all to secure that to the laborer for which they are intended, namely, "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work."

There are few amongst you, I presume, who have not, at some period of life, been in the field, struggling in an unequal contest against the inroads of grasping capital; and but fewer, I am certain, who can boast of having come off victorious. At all events, your victories are but temporary, and the humbled capitalist retaliates with a two-fold severity whenever the favorable time arrives.

How many have been brought to beggary and ruin through the pernicious effects of strikes? And then what animosities have been created between man and man—between you and those who have broken faith with you by succumbing to the will of the despot capitalist; some from groveling and slavish motives; others, and the greater number, from the stern law of necessity!

I do not mean here, craven like, to cry down strikes and those who have been engaged in them, for I hold that they are sometimes necessary, although mostly all of them are provoked by the insatiable appetite of capital. But I will cry war to that system which necessitates strikes, and which too often makes the laborer the victim. War to that system which compels the honest laborer to "beg a brother of the earth to give him leave to toil." War to that system which allows the deepest misery to exist beside a spoiling abundance. War to that system which makes the laborer a mere machine in the hands of a useless, but mischievous, profit-monger. War to that system which keeps our streets swarming with unwilling idlers, while there are millions of acres of waste land, much of it teeming with richness, and capable of giving employment to ten times the "surplus population" as the unemployed are heartlessly called, and of yielding them abundance of the necessities and comforts of life. War—war to death, with that most unjust, most atrocious and tyrannical system that ever disgraced a nation:

"For I will teach, if possible, the stones,
To rise against earth's tyrants."

The men of London propose a grand National Union of Trades, one solid bond of brotherhood of the working classes of these realms, not for the purpose of struggling with selfish capital—of laboring to check the stream while the fountain flows—but with the wise intent of going direct to the fountain head, by destroying that system which creates capitalists at the expense of the laborer being fleeced of almost three-fourths of the product of his skill and industry.

Trades' Unions have hitherto been just so many props to that system which made them a necessity, by diverting the attention of the people from the real source from whence flow all their wrongs—by keeping them wrestling with the effect, while the cause is left in full vigor and allowed to gather strength every day.

Is it not a monstrous system where the laborer has to depend for his daily bread on the whim and caprice of a money-lord who, very probably, never earned a penny by his own industry during his whole life? Yet such it is. Such is the system under which we live; and such it will remain (until it breaks up of its own rottenness) while we are governed by a class, and especially if that class be a non-producing one.

This system you have allowed to go on from year to year; every year, as a natural sequence, sinking deeper in the mire of misery and dependence; while, in like proportion, wealth is gathering a giant's strength, and growing the more able to keep you at its mercy.

Working men of all grades, respond to this call of the London Trades, if you would rise to your proper position in society; it is your only chance—your only hope. Through such a union can you ever hope to free yourselves from the galling yoke of capital and class rule. At present you are prostrate at its feet—you are bound to capital with an iron chain—the chain of dire necessity; while unity and will are all that is required to snap that chain asunder. How long, then, will you allow such a state of things to exist? How long will you remain the mere machine or beast of burden to a useless and despotic few—who just retain you in their services so long as you have sweat and blood to coin into gold; and then having spent your prime—your time and strength—having eked out, in misery and humiliation, your valuable lives, creating wealth for them, you are thrown aside as useless lumber? You become

"The broken tools that tyrants cast away."

I know how keenly you will feel the humiliation and insult to which you are subjected; and I have fond hopes that you will yet wash out that stain which has disgraced the working classes for so many generations. Arouse you, then, and be men, there is a glorious task before you—that of freeing your country from the worst, because disguised, despotism that ever a people was cursed with.

Would you merit a place in the pages of future history? Would you be remembered with feelings of pride and gratitude by future generations? Would you save old England from the fate of Rome? Then respond to this call of the London Trades; it is the best, perhaps the only plan, whereby the people may be united. Throw your intellect, your energy and enthusiasm into this grand union, and instead of an agitation it will become a movement—a movement of the entire working classes of Great Britain and Ireland for their industrial, political and social emancipation.

RIENZI.

At a meeting of the Council held May 4, the following address was reported by Citizen Hugh McGregor, from the

Committee appointed for the purpose, and unanimously adopted:

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL—AMERICAN FEDERATION. TO THE FEDERAL COUNCIL SPANISH FEDERATION OF THE I. W. A.:

Citizens—Your circular No. 8 has been received and unanimously adopted by the autonomic Internationalists of America.

We, like yourselves, are anxious to effect a solidarity of action based upon the principles of social and democratic freedom, so that the day may be hastened when the wages-slaves shall be enabled to burst the fetters that hold them in social, political, mental and economic bondage.

You ask the American federation for an expression of opinion concerning your circular. We answer: The principles of the I. W. A. are everywhere as identical in spirit as they are universal in application, based upon justice and exact science. Independent of all theological and metaphysical speculations they are unvarying and irrefutable, and must sooner or later be adopted by all people as the only true basis of free government; but as the obstacles in the path of progress differ in the various countries, so the several federations must be the best judges of the necessary steps to be taken to insure the triumph of the principles in their respective countries. For these and other reasons we uphold the principles of autonomy. Jealous of the autonomy of the American federation and the sections composing it, we respect and will uphold the autonomy of all other federations and sections.

The American federation understand perfectly the necessity for a radical reconstruction of society, and are moving toward that issue as fast as circumstances and the political situation will allow. In these United States may be seen the effects of the profit-making system pushed almost to its logical conclusion. A few monopolists reign supreme. Their vast wealth enables them to trample upon every safeguard to the liberties of the people. Appeals to the Courts and Legislatures are uncertain experiments, for the reason that the judges upon the bench, alike with the representatives of the people, are bought and owned by consolidated capital. The Social Bastards of America are even more reactionary than the corresponding class in Europe (*le bourgeoisie*). Sprung from the ranks of the people but yesterday, in their aspirations for monopolistic power they have seized upon the children in order to crush the parents. Destitute of even commercial morality, honor, patriotism and humanity are nothing when compared with the dollar. The wages-slaves, blinded by the glory of the political revolution of 1776, hug their chains and loudly boast that they are free, while the landlords and money-lords hold them more completely in their grasp than in any other country of the world.

The causes that have led to this fearful condition of things are the legitimate effects of the traditions of monarchy and the anti-democratic features incorporated into the constitutions of our several States.

As remedies for existing evils, the American federation advocate the following fundamental measures:

The nationalization of land, labor and the instruments of labor, both productive and distributive.

The nationalization of money, certificates of labor (bearing no interest), to be issued by the collectivity as evidence of indebtedness for labor actually performed.

The nationalization of education, to be obligatory, gratuitous, secular, scientific and technical.

The Referendum which will invest the individual with the initiatory and veto power, thus effectually destroying all despotism and authoritative dictation.

We also advocate the following measures:

Complete political and social equality for all, without regard to sex, race, nationality, color or condition.

The normal working-day, viz.: eight hours.

The abolition of infant slavery.

The encouragement of co-operative societies, for production and distribution, not for declaring dividends.

We totally ignore the subjects of religion and taxation.

In short, we advocate: The people the government and the government the employer of the people; or the substitution of the emulative aspirations of the collectivity, for competitive and monopolistic individual enterprise. By these means we intend to transform our Republic into a pure social Democracy, abolishing forever the cursed profit-making system, the destroyer of the life, liberty and happiness of the people.

Companions in Slavery: We believe that the darkest hour of night—the hour that precedes the dawn—is rapidly passing away; relying upon the activity, the devotion, the solidarity, and the intense love of freedom animating the hearts of the proletariat, we are assured that the dawn of true civilization is at hand.

Workers of Spain: Receive the fraternal salutation of the workers of America.

129 Spring Street, New York, U. S., May 4, 1873.

HUGH MCGREGOR, } Committee,
WILLIAM WEST, }
WM. WEST, Rec. Sec.
B. HUBERT, Gen. Cor. Sec.,
16 Catharine St., New York.

At the same meeting the subjoined resolution, proposed by Citizen Carsie, was also unanimously adopted:

WHEREAS, The leases of several of the ferries of this city have expired, and so reverted back to the city; and

WHEREAS, The citizens of Brooklyn and Jersey City have protested against their past management by monopolies as an oppression and robbery of the people. Therefore be it

Resolved, That we request the city authorities to retain the ferries in the possession of the whole people, to be managed, at cost, for the benefit of the people, and not hand over our water highways to a ring of public plunderers.

PAGAN BIBLE is now ready for delivery. Send in your orders at once. First edition nearly exhausted. Price, 25 cents; or \$15.00 per hundred copies.

COMSTOCK ON THE LOOK-OUT FOR THE PAGAN BIBLE. PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

SOCIALISTIC.

CALL

FOR A CONVENTION TO ORGANIZE A WESTERN RESERVE FREE-LOVE LEAGUE.

We invite all who believe in woman's freedom, equality and individuality; who believe that her affectional and maternal nature should be entirely free from arbitrary control, and who desire to see her emancipated from the slavery of legal marriage, to meet in Convention at Ravenna, Ohio, on Sunday, June 1, to organize a Western Reserve Free-love League.

Lucia H. Cowles,	J. H. Philleo,
D. Allen,	Sarah L. S. Philleo,
O. L. Sutliff,	Betsy E. Farrington,
Frances P. Sutliff,	Dr. D. H. Chace,
Sarah M. Day,	H. W. Cook,
Francis Barry,	Lewis Fuller,
Angeline King,	Elisha Young,
Ann B. Spink,	E. C. White,

Lausing Kellogg.
A CARD.

We invite all who cannot meet with us at Ravenna, June 1, to confer with us by letter (not only residents of the Reserve, but all others), making such suggestions as may seem called for. We especially ask for suggestions in regard to the name of our organization; for while the convention is called to form a "Free-love League," if any other name shall seem to more fully indicate our purposes it will doubtless be adopted.

We freely confess we are not in sympathy with the spirit which seems to inspire some of those who have ranged themselves under the Free-love banner. We have no feeling but disgust for any efforts to patch up, or in any way improve or modify an infernal system. We are ABOLITIONISTS. We demand the utter abolition of marriage. We war against it in the same spirit which animated Garrison and his co-peers in their opposition to a lesser diabolism. We propose to fight it to the death, and for the reason that it is the direst curse that afflicts humanity. We have no use for the term "marriage" but to apply it to the world-wide, time-honored system of prostitution, rapacity and murder; we have no use for the term "husband" but to describe a "respectable" ravisher and baby-stealer; we have no use for the term "wife" but to describe a slave and prostitute.

It is no part of our mission to secure facilities for coward and hypocrites to make their married state more comfortable, or to aid "husband and wife" in securing a better supply of "magnetism." If, therefore, the name, "Woman's Emancipation Society," or "Anti-marriage Society," shall seem more clearly to indicate this spirit and these views, we had better adopt it.

Address, FREE-LOVE COMMITTEE.
RAVENNA, Ohio.

LETTER TO J. P. LLOYD.

My old Friend—Your letter in the WEEKLY of March 8 lies before me. We have so long been friends and co-workers in this glorious cause, so dear to us both, that I know you will bear with me while I criticise some points in your letter somewhat plainly.

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

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

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

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

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

doubt. Perhaps there is a sexual incompatibility between them, and they have the good sense to recognize the fact and act accordingly. But there remains his public professions. Whoever teaches that he may go outside of marriage while his public position is what it is, is guilty of teaching a loose code of morals.

But Beecher did what even a Free Lover has no right to do. He invaded a family. Now I do not believe in the institution of the family, nor do I believe in the Catholic Church. But I would protect the one the same as the other from interference. Theodore Tilton has no claim whatever, no more than I have, upon Mrs. Tilton the moment after she has declared herself a free woman. But till then, so long as the understanding of their exclusiveness remains, so long neither has a right to step outside.

I would always treat woman tenderly, at least so long as she is womanly. I would not put burdens upon her shoulders hard to bear. She has it hard at best. Her way is hedged about with difficulties. But a woman must be tried by the test of principle the same as man, and she oftener stands the test. Sooner than criticise Mrs. Tilton, could my feeling have its way, I would envelop her in a cloud of sympathy and love and strength, shutting her out utterly from the rude gaze of the base, senseless world. I have an instinct that she is a noble, sweet, glorious woman.

You take advantage of Mrs. Woodhull's admission that she had no right to the secrets of Beecher's life to make a point against her. But she had no need to make any apology. She was unnecessarily sensitive. She has done by Beecher what was eminently proper. She has made an exposure which justice and human weal required. Until Beecher avows himself a Free Lover before the world, he has no right to any of the advantages or blessings of freedom, and deserves to be exposed whenever he attempts to avail himself of them.

I do not go for grafting Free Love upon the old rotten tree of marriage. I want it torn up by the roots and utterly burned up, and its ashes cast to the four winds of heaven. I do not want slaveholders or slaves to be happy or comfortable in their slavery or slaveholding. I want them to suffer all that violated law and justice and right require. I would have husbands and wives shut up in the hell of corruption and misery they have chosen for themselves and recommended to others, till in their agony they cry, "Enough!"

FRANCIS BARRY.

RAVENNA, Ohio, March 16, 1873.

A PART OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

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

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

LOWELL, April, 1873.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE PAGAN BIBLE:

OR, THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE OFFICIALS TO BE INDICTED FOR MURDER.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE MURDERERS' CLUB.

FROM THE TOMBS TO THE ASYLUM.

George Francis Train in Hell!—Blood or bread! Vive la Commune! "The Chamber of Horrors, or, the Tortures of the Damned in the Tombs." A thrilling book of startling epigrams on the downfall of Christianity. By a Pagan Preacher; written in his fourteenth Bastille by the coming Dictator. A bombshell among the churches; exposing the great Grant-Tweed Republican Ring fraud and the subsidized Press, giving names and amounts; secret history Credit Mobiliery; Beecher, Tilton, Colfax, Dodge; obscene Y. M. C. Ass. Conspiracy.

Workingmen! Pay no Taxes!

Start the battle! Grind your axes!

The only thing to save the nation

Is immediate repudiation.

Down with the Party! Smash up the Ring!

Wake up, people! Death to Kings!

ONE MILLION COPIES WILL BE PRINTED!

Agents Wanted from all over the United States.

CAN MAKE TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS A DAY.

Book sent by Mail—Retail Price, Twenty-five Cents; or, Fifteen Dollars a hundred,
C. O. D.

Remit your Stamps for the Greatest Book since the World Began, to
WOODHULL, CLAFLIN & CO.,
48 Broad street, New York.

Victoria C. Woodhull addressing the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on the Right of Woman to Vote, Washington, January 2, 1871.

