

WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY.

PROGRESS! FREE THOUGHT! UNTRAMMELED LIVES!

BEAKING THE WAY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

VOL. 3.—No. 3.—WHOLE No. 55.

NEW YORK, JUNE 3, 1871.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

SPEECH

OF

MRS. A. M. MIDDLEBROOK

BEFORE THE

National Woman's Suffrage Convention,

AT

Apollo Hall, May 12, 1871.

I propose to look at the Woman's Suffrage question in a legal point of view, and to examine those arguments that are based upon constitutional authority. It is well for us to be told again and again, what rights are possessed by women under the laws made by men.

It seems to me that a crisis is approaching, that the time has nearly arrived for some decisive measures in this matter, and that with earnest purpose, and a full understanding of all its claims, we should go to the root of the subject, and each one of us do our work with a faithful zeal worthy of our cause. I present no new views, I offer no theories that have not been before discussed, but to such as I have I ask your undivided attention. When a body of men, chosen as representatives of the needs of a great people, meet together calmly to deliberate, discuss, and legislate for this people, thus bringing into a common interest the happiness, and protection; the rights and privileges; the duties, and responsibilities of all classes who make up the inhabitants of a country; I am certainly right in assuming that their conclusions ought to be accepted as of the utmost importance and authority. Then, when these conclusions, or the laws thus passed by the assembled wisdom of these statesmen, are sent out to the legislatures of the several states, there again to be discussed, criticised and finally accepted (if a three-fourths majority so decide) it must be generally accepted that by this time the result ought to bring a state of greater prosperity, justice, equality and peace, to all parties concerned therein.

For, it must be evident to all, that these deliberations would not have been called for, but as the effect of some grievance, some great wrong that had remained unseen by preceding legislatures, a wrong that had become too great for endurance, and therefore called for redress. And there may have been also, in the making of some of these laws, a prophecy of the future—a certain grand and glorious spirit of liberty inherent within—bursting forth in divine utterance, so that our rulers became at such times "wiser than they knew;" for many of our laws thus made are far-reaching, and their deepest meaning only becomes manifest after years of suffering and tyranny.

Thus I believe it was with our famous Declaration of Independence, where it declares "these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," etc.—"that to secure these rights, governments were instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," etc. This was not so much the utterance of the masses in those days, as of those who were enlightened, so as to feel the inspirations of freedom, and to breathe the inspiring breath of future generations, for even now, these "rights" are not "secured" to all, probably because our government does not derive its just powers from the consent of the governed; for, with these grand utterances a century old, half of the most cultured and refined people of our country are in a state of most deplorable political subjection; and from this rostrum to-day, we, in the name of the women of this land, insist upon those "unalienable rights" with which our "Creator endowed us," and which our revolutionary fathers held to be "self-evident." The meaning of this truth has increased in power and intensity, until its wail of pain from an unjustly oppressed class has reached the brains of our nation. This, I believe to have been also the case with the Fourteenth Amendment to our National Constitution, as passed at the first session of the Thirty-ninth Congress, June 16, 1866. It is upon this and the following amendment that I shall base the greater portion of my argument to-day.

It is well known to all politicians at least, that when this amendment (the Fourteenth) had passed both houses of Congress, and had afterward been subjected to the deliberations of each separate State Legislature, and ratified by more than three-fourths of those States; and when the official announcement had been made public by William H. Seward, Secretary of State, July 28, 1868, it then (to use Mr.

ULTIMATUM

OF THE

NATIONAL WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION,

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL CITIZENS

UNDER OUR PRESENT GOVERNMENT; OR, A

New Rebellion and a New Government

WHICH SHALL SECURE THEM.

Seward's own language) became "valid to all intents and purposes, as a part of the Constitution of the United States." So that now this amendment is as much a law of the land as the original Constitution; and the enforcement of this law is as binding upon our legislators and the officers of our government as any other.

Article 6th of the Constitution says: "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 the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." When the Fourteenth Amendment became the law of the land, it found itself foretold, and the States prepared for it by Section 4 of the 4th Article, namely: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government;" and, thus heralded, the Fourteenth Amendment is ushered into existence as the legitimate offspring of the necessities of a great people. Who can tell, but that prophesied of, proclaimed, foretold, it is destined to become the political saviour of our nation. Yet the young child has been kept in solitude for three long years, and even some of our State officers do not know its import, or hardly its existence.

We are indebted, in a great measure, to Victoria C. Woodhull, for the graceful, yet persistent manner in which it was rescued from oblivion and introduced to public notice in Washington, on the 21st day of December, 1870. All thanks and honor are due to her clear-sightedness in arousing anew the agitation of the subject of woman's suffrage. A great and efficient work had been done by other noble women previously, but when she was most needed she came.

I will proceed now to analyze this one supreme law of our land. 1st. It tells us who are citizens. When slavery existed at the South, and the negroes had no vote, and no voice in making the laws that should govern them, they might well conclude that it was because they were not citizens, especially after knowing of the existence of such a law as we find in Article IV., Sec. 2. "The citizen of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States." If that law gave them no vote, then there could be no other reason than because they were not citizens. But the Fourteenth Amendment rectifies this mistake, and leaves no further room for doubt. "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." Could the English language be plainer than it is here? It would hardly be necessary to explain to a child that "all persons" does not mean men alone, or white men, or white and black men, but that a person (according to Webster) is an individual human being, consisting of body and soul, and is applied alike to man, woman and child." Very well. No further question here. Women are citizens. Congress says so. Our State legislators said so when they ratified this amendment.

Further than this Webster's unabridged says: "In the

United States a citizen is a person, native or naturalized, who has the privilege of exercising the elective franchise, or the qualifications which may enable him to vote for rulers and to purchase and hold real estate."

Putting this and that together, or taking them separately, we cannot avoid the same conclusions, namely, that women are citizens; that as citizens they have the right to vote and to a free use of all privileges and immunities that are granted to the most honorable and the most dishonorable among men.

Webster uses the terms "right" and "privilege" as synonymous, or nearly so. "Right is just claim, immunity privilege. All men," he says, "have a right to the secure enjoyment of life, personal safety, liberty and property."

Further than this Mr. Butler says, in reference to the citizenship of women: "None but citizens of the United States could register a ship at our ports, none others could pre-empt lands or receive passports; but from time immemorial in this country women have registered ships, pre-empted lands and secured passports without question."

This opinion, coming from a gentleman so well versed in constitutional law, is not by any means to be despised. But, on the contrary, it is worth a great deal as authority, because it is based upon legal points and is the result of careful thought, which cannot always be said of opposing arguments. And Mr. Butler further said: "The right of a citizen to vote for his rulers was a right outside of all Constitution and laws; it was an inherent right," as he understood the principles of the government. Whatever may be said about this inherent right of citizens to vote for their rulers, or whatever argument may be brought against it, we certainly have the matter clearly explained in the Fourteenth Amendment. That is, understanding, as I do, that national governments are instituted by men (and I use the term in its largest sense), out of the great wisdom and power that belong to them naturally, or that is inherent within them, for the purpose of giving protection, safety, happiness, life, liberty, etc., to all persons that dwell under the dominion thereof; therefore this amendment, aiming at the best and broadest republicanism, says: "No State shall make or enforce any law that shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Whatever power the States might have possessed previous to the passage of this act, could be possessed no longer after its passage. If one of the greatest privileges of citizenship was the ballot, and this privilege (under the excuse of "State rights") had been denied to the negro, simply because he was black, though he possessed all other qualifications, and to women simply because of sex, though she possessed all other qualifications, yet henceforth this right of the State was prohibited, and the full license of sheer prejudice was no longer allowed. After the ratification of this act and its proclamation to the people as one of the supreme laws of our land, "No State shall make," if it has not already made, or if any State within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have passed any law previous to this amendment calculated to abridge the privileges or immunities of any of its citizens, it shall not

"enforce" such law. Oh! I hear some political foggy exclaiming, "What have you done with our State rights"—our right to say who shall vote? I answer, given them over to the United States, their lawful master—made the State laws subservient to the supreme laws of the land, as they certainly are, and no one can deny it. Hear what the Tenth Amendment says: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." As the Constitution has prohibited the States from abridging the privileges of its citizens, therefore the State where I reside has no right to deny me the right to consent to those who are to govern me. And the same rule will apply to all the women of our country. Besides this, what are the States whose rights we talk so much about? Do we mean simply a tract of land containing so many square miles? Or do we mean the whole body of people in a certain locality united under one government? Certainly, in this sense we mean the latter, and no one, however prejudiced, would think of denying me the right of belonging to the State of Connecticut simply because I am a woman.

If, then, women are part of a State—natural-born citizens thereof—subject to its jurisdiction, under the United States, how can there be such a thing as "State rights" when all women (though counted in the representation) are denied the privilege of a voice in choosing those representatives, or in the making of State laws? I assert that our State representatives have held office and drawn money from the public treasury unlawfully, because they have never occupied their positions by a vote of a majority of all the people; and, in the same sense, the qualifications of electors pretended to be made by the States, are not made by the States at all, but by an aristocracy composed of part of the people, who take it upon themselves to make laws for and rule over the other part. Therefore, the qualifications made for electors by this aristocracy, not being in accordance with the representation of the whole State, but only a part, are no qualifications at all. Of course, I base my premises upon the republican professions of our government. How can a government be republican unless all are represented and have a voice in the affairs of State? Let us reverse things and talk about "State rights" and "State sovereignty" and "State laws" with the white male left out in the cold. How our masculine rulers would laugh; but the only difference between then and now is that the laugh is in the other corner of the mouth. The States are in the same predicament that they would be in such a case with a large portion of its loyal citizens proscribed, limited, muzzled, by the other portion, without any just, constitutional or natural claim to precedence—a living illustration of the old adage that "might makes right." It seems to me that whatever may have been right or just in this matter previous to the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment (and there can be no doubt that the right has always been the same as now), that since that law was enacted clearly setting forth that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens; and prohibiting the States from abridging our privileges as citizens; that no State officer has any right to deny us the full and free expression of opinion by the ballot, and the judges in every State ought to sustain us in this, because it is in obedience to the express wording of the above article of the Constitution. And as the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives in Congress, as well as both houses of our State Legislatures, have sworn to uphold and support the Constitution of the United States, I do not see how any of these great men can fail in sustaining our measures without great remissness in duty, which should incur the just reproach of every loyal person. Or, taking another view of this question of the State power to qualify, if we could have full representation—that is, admitting women as voters—qualification cannot mean prohibition or disfranchisement. Women as a class are prohibited or denied a right that is as sacred, and would prove as beneficial to them as to men. And this prohibition in the face of our grand national principles becomes wholesale swindle, which is quite as degrading to our rulers as it is humiliating to us. Another clause in the Fourteenth Amendment requires a little passing observation. Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. Now is it not plain that where one class is prohibited a voice in making the laws, and is compelled to be governed entirely by another class, and the laws thus made for them being, in regard to property and in the marriage relation, so shamefully unequal, is it not plain, I ask, that the ruled class are deprived in a great measure of their liberty of person and property, and denied that equality of protection that is guaranteed them. A glance at the property laws of some of our States would bring confounding testimony in proof of the disloyalty of our State laws to our National Constitution. And, in the name of justice, what is our Constitution worth if it avows these sublime principles and no action is taken upon them any more than if they did not exist, and our officers are not compelled to enforce them. Are women to be insulted by a sham law, that pretends to extend equal protection to every person and equal privileges, and yet allows every rum-drinking, tobacco-chewing frequenter of gambling houses and brothels to control and govern by their infamous laws such women as are represented upon this rostrum to-day? For shame! For shame! It is not our husbands, or our fathers, or brothers or other good men alone who represent us at the ballot-box (if it were possible for one person to represent another) which I deny, but we become politically the common slaves of this common herd. Protected by men too vile for us to associate with a moment? No! Represented by men too ignorant to choose their own candidates without the assistance of some tricky politician? No! And yet our dear lords—many of them remain in this enlightened age perfectly satisfied to allow things to remain as they are. Were it not so, this would not be. Justice and right are on one side, but the power is in the hands of men. The Constitution is with us, as I have shown, and as I propose further to show. Hear what the Fifteenth Amendment says: "The right of citizens 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." This follows the previous article of amendments so directly that it is clear that the right to vote is understood as one of the privileges meant in the wording of that law. These two articles evidently belong together—the one clearly defines the rights and privileges of citizens, and states who are the citizens that possess these privileges, while the last lays special emphasis upon this one right of voting, and declares that it shall not be denied or abridged by either the States or the United States.

It recognizes the right as something that already existed; and our National as well as our State Constitutions acknowledge that all political power is inherent in the people.

The Fourteenth Amendment is a sort of declaratory act; it defines the word citizens, and declares their power to make use of what is already theirs. "All persons native or naturalized are citizens," and then, in the Fifteenth Amendment, "their right to vote shall not be denied or abridged." But, we are limited to race, color, or previous conditions of servitude, says our opponent. Well, are not women included here? In fact, if it does not say men, or women, why does it mean men more than women? What proof is there that it means one more than the other? It says citizens, and there is proof positive that this word applies equally to both.

There are women of race and color, as much as there are men of race and color, and if the word sex is not used, why should we manufacture an excuse for using it, simply for the purpose of misrepresenting the plain rendering of this article.

And as for the "previous condition of servitude," no one in their senses can pretend that negroes do not belong to this class. And if this article meant negroes, as is claimed, it must have meant negro women as well as men. For the service rendered by the black woman was oftentimes a thousand times more degrading, and called louder for redress than that rendered by the black man. But in applying this to our own race of women, I can do nothing better than to give you Mr. A. G. Riddle's argument upon the subject, in his speech made at Washington. He says:

"The condition of the married woman is that of servitude. The law gives her to the man, not the man to her, or the two mutually to each other. They become one, and that one is the husband, such as he is. Her name is blotted out from the living, or at best is appended to that of the husband. She belongs to her master; all that she has belongs to him. All that she earns is his, because she is his. If she does anything that binds him, it is simply as his servant. If she makes a contract that is binding even upon herself, it is because he consents to it. She does not own anything; she does not own the children that are born to her. The husband exclusively controls them while living, and by his will he may, and often does, bequeath to somebody else the custody and care of them after his death." "And," he says further, "the law which we men make enforces all this today. If the wife of a man should suffer from an accident on a railroad, and suit should be brought to recover against the company for injury to her person, the suit brought by the husband would be upon the ground that his wife was his servant, and he had lost her service." "The wife," he says, "is always the servant of the husband, she never graduates away from him; she never becomes of age, or arrives at years of discretion." If there is any further doubt upon this subject, reference to the statute books of the various States will settle the matter at once. It is not the question whether he beats his wife (though I think that is done oftener than he beats his hired servant), but what is the legal relation between them? And it is answered above, and upon our statute books, that the law demands her entire subjection to him, and that he often demands of her the duties of wife, and mother to his children, and the drudge of his household, and that, too, with only the compensation that he chooses to offer, which is too frequently very meagre indeed. It would not be borne in any other relation in life, the law would never uphold it in other relations. Talk about cruelty to animals! And yet, as Mr. Riddle says, "the laws which men make enforces" this cruelty to women. Our opponents tell us that the word "sex" is absolutely necessary in the Fifteenth Amendment to make it applicable to women, and without that word it cannot be made to apply. Has not the word "race" a larger meaning—a broader and mightier significance? Can you think of a race of men alone, and is any one so narrow and so unjust as to admit all other races to the exclusion of the daughters of this republic? If a special word must be used to define the particular sex meant, by what means of turning and twisting could all our governmental matters be given over to the masculine gender during the century past, when the word "male" does not occur once in the Constitution until we find it in the Fourteenth Amendment. It is true the words "he," "his" and "him" occur often, but may be taken in a general sense, as they are in law and within our statute books. In many of our laws the matter referred to embraces all persons as absolutely as if the specific word "she" had been used. Where the word "male" is incorporated into the the Fourteenth Amendment there is such a palpable display of the prejudice and timidity of those who drew up this important document, that by the side of the noble words that were previously written as a herald of promise, it sinks into miserable insignificance. There is evidently a prejudice against the woman question, and a fear that this construction may be put upon this article, which might divert public attention from negro suffrage. We well know how jealous our Republican friends were of our cause at that time, and that many of them now are among our most able advocates. Ah! while "waiting" for victory, as they told us we must—"obedient" as it is a woman's duty (?) to be, we live to see the conversion of those great statesmen that were thought nearly perfect before. And now even they admit that the two first paragraphs in the Fourteenth Amendment are broad enough and emphatic enough to embrace even our cause.

Our legislators, in laying down principles which they intended to apply to some particular case, should not regret that these principles take broader and deeper root than they intended. How often it is that under the control of some unseen and mighty power, words are brought forth from lips glowing with living fire, that are pregnant with high hopes and golden promises of future greatness, while those who are the instruments thereof remain unconscious of their deepest meaning. And how different are our dreams while sleeping from the reality when awake. For centuries the world has dreamed that woman's fate was to be an inferior being—the toy and plaything of man—to sit at his feet and mumble, parrot-like, the words that fall from his lips—the tool and machine for his lust and avarice. Waking, it finds her his equal—an immortal soul endowed with mighty responsibilities and lofty aspirations! Sleeping in the intoxicated stupidity of custom, it has limited her sphere to the narrowest and meanest latitudes. Waking, her range is the wide universe, and within her grasp are all human possibilities! Shall we not accept as the lesson of the hour the reality rather than the dreams?

Again: we know how in law, there is oftentimes great stress laid upon parallel cases; and we know how words are made to apply in cases that they were not intended for, so that the intention is sometimes lost sight of entirely. Were I to say that the condition of the women of our country was parallel, or nearly so, to the condition of the negro, before he was admitted to the full rights of citizenship, it would I am aware, bring down upon me a laugh of derision from our opponents. I have tried it too often not to know this. But I maintain it, notwithstanding the derision, for I know it can only come from those who are too much prejudiced to see it;

or, from those who are too far removed, and, therefore, too ignorant of the suffering caused by this condition, to comprehend it. It is difficult for a person to feel the pain caused by the boot that pinches some one else's foot. Or, for a man with anti-republican principles and finely-spun theories of "Dear woman's trusting dependence and sweet reliance on the protecting arm of man," to feel for one moment the pain suffered by a highly-cultured, intelligent woman, who fully realizes the deep humiliation of our present state of political subjection. It is because of this pain and humiliation that we welcome the noble and authoritative words of Chas. Sumner and others; which, though intended to help the cause of negro suffrage, are just as well fitted for our work, as to carry out the original intention. Hear the great words of Mr. Sumner. "Beyond all question the true rule under the National Constitution, especially since its additional amendments, is that anything for human rights is constitutional." No learning in books, no skill acquired in courts, no sharpness of forensic dialectics, no cunning in splitting hairs, can impair the vigor of the constitutional principle which I announce. Whatever you enact for human rights is constitutional. There can be no State rights against human rights; and this is the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution, or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." Then he quotes from Franklin's works the following: "That liberty or freedom consists in having an actual share in the appointment of those who frame the laws, and who are to be the guardians of every man. That they who have no voice, nor vote in the electing of representatives, do not enjoy liberty, but are absolutely enslaved to those who have votes, and to their representatives; for to be enslaved is to have governors whom other men have set over us, and be subject to laws made by the representatives of others, without having had representatives of our own to give consent in our behalf." Another argument proving women's condition of servitude.

Is not this confounding testimony in our favor? And yet there is plenty more of it—in fact it has been piled mountains high within a few years. Here is more, which Mr. Sumner takes from Elliot's Debates: "The right of suffrage is certainly one of the fundamental articles of republican government, and ought not to be left to be regulated by the Legislature. A gradual abridgement of this right has been the mode in which aristocracies have been built on the ruins of popular forms." It will doubtless be urged against these quotations that they refer to another subject. In reply I say, what of that? They are the fruits of our governmental tree—a tree whose branches are so far-reaching that it is expected to overshadow the whole nation, and its fruits, I believe, are for the healing of the nation. At any rate they suit our complaints exactly just now, and we propose to see if, by partaking of them, they will not prove a panacea for our unhappy political ailments. They are found good for native white men and for native black men, for naturalized Irish, Dutch, French; in short, all men who, tired of their own country, may chance to land on our shores. We cannot be treated longer as too many parents treat their children, who, while partaking of luxuries themselves, tell the little ones that such luxuries are not good for them. We are not children, but part and parcel of this great republic. We work for our government; we pay taxes on our property for its support; we raise mechanics, farmers, lawyers, doctors, ministers—yes, statesmen, soldiers and presidents. In fact our government only exists by our sufferance, and we do not intend it to exist without our suffrage.

It seems to me that the great and important time has come for action, when we should concentrate all our efforts upon this one matter. We should let all religious prejudices, all social distinctions, all questions of expediency and policy be laid aside, and stand truly united in this work. No one can deny that our interest are in common with those of men; that our necessities are the same; that our loyalty cannot be questioned more than theirs; that every argument that favors their right to vote favors ours. Then can it, with any degree of consistency, be said, that the same means by which they seek a redress for their grievances will not also bring the same result to us.

The great principles of republicanism that were sent down the long years from our immortal Declaration of Independence, for a century, live as an eternal monument of glory, when fulfilled; but as a blasting shame before all nations, while half of its children sit and wail for their enfranchisement. The noble love of freedom that burned within the blood of our ancestors who framed that document has gathered tribute with every advance, until, an impetuous torrent, it threatens to overthrow and inundate your present miserable system of sham republicanism. The spirit of our Constitution is all right, its letter is all right; enforce both—make them practical instead of theoretical, and we shall have a grand fulfillment of a glorious promise. We want the aid of both political parties, if we can have it; but, if the power in the hands of men will not bring us justice, we must create a new party and work against both, or carry our cause to the courts. We have sought to conciliate these parties long enough; we have gone down on our knees before them, praying to be heard; we have spent our time, our strength and our money in speeches, in tracts and in conventions to educate the public up to this work, at the same time that our sons have gone out from our homes to join the common enemy against us; we have sent petitions to our State Legislatures, which have remained unnoticed, so far as any practical result is attained; we have besought Congress in petitions miles in length, and all to no purpose as yet; and it is time we took other measures and sought other means for the accomplishment of the great end to be gained. Our cause has very materially changed within a few years; it has grown from babyhood into giant proportions since the passage of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. We have seen other parties similarly situated walking into the full enjoyments of the most sacred rights, with all benefits to be derived therefrom, while we and the cause in which our lives are most earnestly absorbed are treated with cold contempt and our grievances find no redress.

We have been tauntingly asked by some of our leading politicians why we do not take our rights; and probably there never was so great an attempt to do this as there has been this present year.

The Enforcement act passed by Congress in May, 1870, together with the Ku-Klux bill, and the proclamation just issued by the President to enforce this bill and the Fourteenth Amendment, are teaching the public that our republican principles are as broad as the country and must protect all citizens, and teach all States that their laws must be subject to the United States.

Under the provisions of these acts Mrs. Nannette B. Gardner, of Detroit, Mich., on the 4th of April, cast her first vote. I think at that moment, could our eyes have been open to see and our ears to hear, sweetly solemn sights and sounds would have greeted our longing senses from those halls

where justice holds her courts. But a question arises. How are the men of Michigan different from the men in other States? For other women attempted to vote in different States, but were denied the privilege. In Hammonon, N. J., fifteen women offered their votes at a late town election, but were refused. In other States—in Ohio and Washington—this attempt was made with the same result. In Connecticut, several women—myself included—made application to be registered at the time and place required by law, and our names were taken; but when we presented ourselves before the Board of Registration "to be made" voters, we were denied the right. One woman besides myself then made affidavit before a "justice of the peace" that we had been wrongfully prevented from performing the necessary pre-requisite or qualification of a voter, and with this affidavit we presented ourselves at the Town Hall on election day and asked permission to deposit our votes. After a delay and argument of half an hour we were denied the right.

We took this course under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, and the provisions of the "Enforcement Act" of May, 1870. I stated to the Board of Registration and to the Moderator that we did not apply under our State laws, but under the United State laws; that as the word "white" in our State Constitution became null and void under the Fifteenth Amendment; so the word "male" became null and void under the Fourteenth. These officers coolly told me that they were "acting under State laws, and not under the authority of the United States; and that the United States had no right to take away their liberties as State officers." They did not care that my liberty as a citizen was entirely gone, under their assumed State rights. What we want now is the power to teach the States, and their officers, submission to the United State's Constitution as the supreme law of the land. If this is done every right will be given us, and I think it can be done by following the example of the ladies of Washington, and the ladies of Hemmorton; that is, prosecuting the officers of elections and carrying the case even to the supreme court of the land, if necessary. It seems to me disgraceful that we are obliged to do this, but we have the advice and counsel of able lawyers and statesmen. For the benefit of those women who are earnest, and ready to work in this cause, but who may not know what authority we may have besides the last two amendments (and those ought to be sufficient), I would advise them to procure copies of the Enforcement Act of 1870, and the Ku-Klux bill, which is entitled "An act to enforce the provision of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes."

With this high authority sustaining us, let every woman take the matter into her own hand and present herself for registration at the time appointed in her respective State, and, nothing daunted if refused, let her with affidavit force her way to the polls, remembering that in doing this she is not merely securing the rights of citizenship to herself, but she is aiding in that political revolution which will cause the establishment of equity and justice all over our land. I advise this unless Congress will immediately pass a declaratory act enforcing the Fourteenth Amendment in our favor all over our land. Let us remember, too, that in taking this course—in making this demand we are encroaching upon the rights of no other class, nor rebelling against any acknowledged power.

The glorious Sumner—though like the Constitution he leaves out the special word women—has said it all for us when he declares the following: "What I especially ask is impartial suffrage, which is, of course, embraced in universal suffrage. For the present, I simply insist that all shall be equal before the law, so that in the enjoyment of this right there shall be no restriction which is not equally applied to all. I have no hesitation in saying that universal suffrage is a universal right, subject only to such regulations as the safety of society may require. These may concern age, residence, character, registration. These temporary restrictions do not in any way interfere with the right of suffrage, for they leave it absolutely accessible to all. No matter under what depression of poverty, in what depth of obscurity or with what diversity of complexion you have been born, you are nevertheless a citizen—the peer of every other citizen, and the ballot is your inalienable right." In a late excellent editorial article in the *Golden Age*, we are told that "many of the representative men and women who have charge of the woman's movement, speak and write and print as if the elective franchise were the sum-total of woman's demand." "Important," he says, "as we believe the political aspect of the woman question to be, we believe that other aspects of the question are still more important." The woman's movement, instead of being all summed up in the claim for the "elective franchise is the whole broad question of woman's rights." As thankful as we should all be for every word spoken or written in aid of our cause, yet I hardly think we can forget that it is not the square inch of white paper that we call the ballot that we are, after all, caring so much for; but it is the equality, the justice, the educational advantages, the reformation in social matters, and all that may result from the ballot. And without the ballot we cannot have these matters properly adjusted. There are not men enough in the United States or the world to represent the necessities of women. We can only represent ourselves. Shall we be humble mendicants at the feet of men for all these blessings that can only come to us through the ballot, or an equal share with them in governmental matters. We want the ballot as a means to accomplish a great end; and for this reason I have presented to you the political phase of this question, because if woman's share in politics is not of the greatest and last importance, the elective franchise is certainly of the first importance, as the instrument for the accomplishment of that greater and mightier social and moral reform, which is needed as much for man as for woman. And with aspirations like the swift eagle, ready to mount upward and cleave the air in our progress when the prison-doors shall be unbarred—ready also to bear our captors to the mountain eyrie of true national greatness—how can we be longer held as manacled slaves when the laws of our country, written in human blood and suffering, call to us and point the way; while the spirit of justice from on high, with the balance in one hand and hope's shining anchor in the other, beckon us on to victory! Oh, Columbia! thy daughters, as well as thy sons, would be thy loyal subjects. Strike thou through the wisdom of our rulers every chain from thy disfranchised children!

THE completest pun in the records of literature is produced in the following words, which were inscribed on a tea chest: "Tu doces," which is the second person singular, present tense, of the Latin verb *docere*, I teach, and when literally translated, becomes "thou teachest."

POOR HUMANITY.

More than half a century ago, the following lines were found in the Royal College of Surgeons, London, beside a skeleton, remarkable for its symmetry of form. They were subsequently published in the *London Morning Chronicle*, and a vain effort made to ascertain the author, even offering a reward of fifty guineas:

Behold this ruin! 'Twas a skull
Once of ethereal spirit full.
This narrow cell was life's retreat;
This space was thought's mysterious seat.
What beauteous visions filled this spot
With dreams of pleasure long forgot!
Nor hope, nor joy, nor love nor fear,
Have left one trace of record here.

Beneath this mouldering canopy,
Once shone the bright and busy eye;
But start not at the dismal void!
If social love that eye employed;
If with no lawless fire it gleamed;
But through the dews of kindness beamed;
That eye shall be forever bright,
When sun and stars are sunk in night.

With in this hollow cavern hung
The ready, swift, and tuneful tongue;
If falsehood's honey it disdained,
And when it could not praise, was chained;
If bold in virtue's cause it spoke,
Yet gentle concord never broke;
The silent tongue shall plead for thee,
When time unveils eternity.

Say, did these fingers delve the mine,
Or with the envid rubies shine?
To hew the rock, or rub the gem,
Can little now avail to them.
But if the page of truth they sought,
Or comfort, to the mourner brought,
These hands a richer meed shall claim
Than all that wait on wealth or fame.

Avails it whether bare or shod,
These feet the path of duty trod?
If from the bowers of ease they fled,
To seek afflictions humble shed;
If grandeur's guilty bribe they spurned,
And home to virtue's cot returned—
These feet with angel's wings shall rise,
And tread the palace of the skies.

The People's Reform Party in Convention.

On Saturday last, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, the members of the People's Reform Party met in Convention at Philadelphia, and organized by electing Damon Y. Kilgore, Esq., President, and L. C. Wanamaker, Esq., Secretary.

SPEECH OF MR. KILGORE.

On taking the chair, Mr. Kilgore addressed the convention as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION: In a government of the people, no man should be an office-seeker, nor should he shun any responsibilities his fellow-citizens thrust upon him. Thanking you for this expression of your confidence, let us proceed at once to the work before us. While we realize the fact that the two great political parties of the country have done much good, we know they have become selfish and venal, and to a great extent are controlled by dishonest and corrupt men. The Democratic party sustained an oligarchy of slave-holders, until it almost destroyed the government. The Republican party now upholds, by its legislation, a moneyed aristocracy, as dangerous to the liberty of white men as the slave oligarchy was dangerous to the liberty of the blacks. Instead of making laws for the protection of the poor and weak, they legislate in the interest of huge moneyed corporations, soulless and heartless, which strike down the liberty and rights of the citizens, turn justice aside, and oppress the people. History warns us in vain if we do not unite to put an end to the power of these corporations unjustly obtained in fraud of the rights of the American people. Organize, and win. Combine the working classes, and all obstacles to the emancipation of labor will disappear. Continue inactive or divided, and multitudes will soon throng your streets, clamoring for bread. In a republic, no man should be destitute of work, or deprived of a just compensation for its performance.

The government should not only cease to place temptation to crime before its citizens, but the great avenues of evil should be closed. Not only should every child be protected against the evils of intemperance, but should be furnished with a good English education. The institutions of freedom must rest upon the intelligence and virtue of the people. No man should vote who cannot read and write his ballot. Dishonesty in office should be punished with disfranchisement. The man who labors for the public should be well paid. His salary should be proportionate to the services rendered, but he should never be allowed to dictate a policy to his employers, or to interfere with their rights in order to secure a new lease of office.

Our system of taxation should be so changed that no man should be allowed to become a millionaire in a single year, while every dollar of his gains above a fair compensation is wrung from the hard earnings of the laboring poor. In Philadelphia one per cent. of the population own half of the real estate and personal property in the city, while the other half is distributed to the ninety-nine. Thus one man who does nothing for the good of society, equals in property ninety-nine men who do all the work. While the national banks are getting from fifteen to twenty per cent. upon their capital, the mechanic cannot obtain employment, and thousands all over the country are destitute of the necessities of life because they cannot get work. All this comes of partial legislation in favor of money and against men.

Gentlemen, I trust you will adopt a platform which will be broad enough for all races of men and women. It will be severely tried. Let it be one of principle, and so strong that corrupt politicians, aided by countless millions of capital, and a venal press, cannot destroy it. The good and patriotic of both political parties will soon join our ranks. Let them find patriotism and true statesmanship, principles of equality and justice, instead of the corruption, dishonesty and selfishness so omnipotent in both the Democratic and Republican parties.

THE PLATFORM.

After the various committees were appointed, the Committee on Platform reported the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the government has no right to deprive any human being of physical life, but should sacredly protect every human person in its enjoyment. To this end, all personal and international disputes should be settled without resort to physical violence.

Resolved, That the manufacture of alcohol, except for medicinal and mechanical purposes, should be prohibited.

Resolved, That the present policy of donating the public lands to moneyed corporations is hostile to the rights and interests of the people at large. The national territory should be held in trust to be disposed of in small tracts to actual settlers. Land should be owned by those who till it, and all speculation therein, as well as in those products of the soil used for human food, should be prohibited.

Resolved, That the present system of taxation is unjust; it checks industry and robs the poor. It is most burdensome to those least able to bear it, and should be so changed that the productive wealth of the nation should pay the expenses of government.

Resolved, That all public officers should be chosen directly by the electors they represent. The compensation should be fixed by law at a salary proportionate to the services rendered, and all fees, profits or income of the offices should be paid into the public treasury.

Resolved, That all public officers guilty of defrauding the government should be disfranchised, and be disqualified from holding any office of trust or profit under the government thereafter.

Resolved, That the national currency should be based upon labor, and upon that alone. It should, at all times, be at par with gold, and receivable in payment of all debts. All legislation in favor of banks and other moneyed corporations oppressive to the laboring classes should be abolished.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the government to secure to every minor a good English education, and to every adult suitable employment, and a just compensation for the work done.

Resolved, That every person twenty-one years of age capable of reading and writing the English language irrespective of sex, birthplace or nationality, should be allowed to vote in all elections of public officers, State or National.

After the appointment of several committees, the convention adjourned to meet at the call of the President.

HOW A WILL WAS FOUND.

An instance of the renewal in sleep of an impression of memory called up an apparition to enforce it (it is the impression which causes the apparition, not the apparition which conveys the impression) occurred near Bath, half a century ago, and is related by Miss Cobbe in an article on "Unconscious Celebration."

Sir John Miller, a very wealthy gentleman, died, leaving no children. His widow had always understood that she was to have the use of his house for her life, with a very large jointure; but no will making such provision could be found after his death.

The heir-at-law, a distant connection, naturally claimed his rights, but kindly allowed lady Miller to remain for six months in the house to complete her search for the missing papers. The six months drew at last to a close, and the poor widow had spent fruitless days and weeks in examining every possible place of deposit for the lost document, till at last she came to the conclusion that her memory must have deceived her, and that her husband could have made no such promise as she supposed, or to have neglected to fulfill it had he made one.

The very last day of her tenure of the house had just dawned, when, in the gray of the morning, Lady Miller drove up to the door of her man of business in Bath, and rushed excitedly to his bedroom door, calling out "Come to me! I have seen Sir John! There is a will!" The lawyer hastened to accompany her back to her house. All she could tell him was that her deceased husband had appeared to her in the night, standing by her bedside, and had said solemnly, "There is a will!" Where it was remained as uncertain as before.

Once more the house was searched in vain from cellar to loft, till finally, wearied and in despair, the lady and her friend found themselves in a garret at the top of the house. "It is all over," Lady Miller said; "I give it up. My husband deceived me, and I am ruined." At that time she looked at the table over which she was leaning weeping. "This table was in his study once; let us examine it." They looked, and the missing will, duly signed and sealed, was within it, and the widow was rich to the end of her days. It needs no conjuror to explain how her anxiety called up the myth of Sir John Miller's apparition, and made him say precisely what he had once before really said to her, but of which her memory had waxed faint.

It is said that women, being more sensual than men, in stigate these foul blots upon humanity to satisfy their lust. Never was a baser or meaner lie invented by even the devil himself than this. It is one of the most rascally imputations ever hurled at the superior chastity and virtue of woman-kind. Women who have been driven out of society for imagined wrongs or indiscretions; women who have been ruined by designing fiends in the shape of men, these are they who make up the bulk of the abandoned. These unfortunates who deserve our pity and help, rather than our supreme scorn and contempt, are they whom men prey upon like wild beasts and transform to hideous monstrosities of vice.

Think of the rascality of registering prostitutes and compelling examinations at stated intervals, as is done in one of our cities, while the scourge of God—the accursed venereal virus—is stalking everywhere throughout the same city, shrouded in foreign broad-cloth and immaculate linen. What sort of justice is this? In God's name, why should not abandoned men—broad-cloth prostitutes—be registered as well as women? A man who will degrade himself to the degree of promiscuous "crib" patronage, is none too good to be registered or hung.

We protest against loading this terrible evil upon woman, for we are well assured that man and the unchristian course of society toward women are the main causes of this humiliating curse. We appeal to Christian men and Christian women to exercise more of the broad charity of Jesus Christ toward women, and more justice toward men. Remember what Jesus said to the woman, and know that to learn you to save souls by following His sublime examples was the great object and aim of all His teaching.—*Pennsylvania and Real Estate Journal.*

MORE EDITORIAL HONESTY.

HENRY C. BOWEN, EDITOR OF THE "INDEPENDENT," AFFIRMS WHEREOF HE KNOWS NOTHING.

IGNORANCE, DUPLICITY AND WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION.

Last week we gave the editor of the Cleveland *Leader* the advantage of our columns to spread before the country the evidence of his editorial honesty. This week we extend the same courtesy to the editor of the *Independent* for the same purpose:

Mr. Bowen says:

WOMEN AND SUFFRAGE.

No subject discussed during Anniversary Week excited so much attention as the question of the suffrage for women. There were, everywhere, comments friendly and unfriendly, arguments scriptural and unscriptural, applause and jeers. The excitement was not a little fanned by the sudden revelation of facts in the private life of the somewhat notorious Mrs. Woodhull. The facts were no secret before, but legal proceedings brought them into the press. The *Tribune*, which knows how to be as thoroughly partizan and unfair in some questions as it is great in others, made the most of this case. Prejudice manufactured of such material is more effective with a certain class than argument. And insinuation is so much cheaper than logic.

Let us, for the good of the cause, speak the truth frankly. The "New York Association," as it is popularly called—the section of advocates of the suffrage who are now known as the "Union Woman's Suffrage Association," and now as the convention under the auspices of the "National Committee"—have written their history in a series of unwise acts. They have mixed the suffrage question with almost every other sort of question. They made bargains with the Democrats, as though the Philistines could ever be the friends of progress. They took on board George Francis Train, who is enough to sink any boat that carries him. They have given a prominent place to Mrs. Woodhull, about whose private affairs all gossip is needless. WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY, with its coarse treatment of all the sacred things of social life, is enough to condemn any one whose name is associated with it. The very fact that modest Mrs. Woodhull apes Mr. Train in the poor trick of pushing herself for President should have warned those who sought to be leaders of the suffrage movement to give her a wide berth.

We know the argument on the other side. We could not help knowing it; for, did not the Apollo Hall Convention, of which Mrs. Woodhull was a member, frame it into a resolution? Substantially it is this: "In politics you take anybody's help. You do not ask what a man's private life is in time of war; but you ask whether he is willing to fight the common enemy." The argument is well put, but bad. The objection to Mrs. Woodhull's being a recognized leader is precisely that she does more harm than good. For there are thousands of people who will never be able to distinguish between Mrs. Stanton, who advocates suffrage from principle, and Mrs. Spurge, who advocates suffrage from a sheer love of sensation and notoriety. If Mrs. Stanton praises Mrs. Spurge, if Miss Anthony endorses Mrs. Spurge, and if Mrs. Hooker co-operates with Mrs. Spurge, how shall plain people know the difference between Mrs. Spurge, who makes herself prominent as a suffrage leader, and owns a paper that makes her ridiculous by nominating her for President, and that publishes free-love articles from the pen of Stephen Pearl Andrews—how shall the public make the distinction between this Spurge & Co., whose private affairs scandalize the public in police reports, and Mrs. Hooker, who is a noble woman and a devoted wife? How shall the unreasoning public, which thinks all reformers free-lovers, distinguish between matronly Mrs. Stanton and miscellaneous Mrs. Spurge? There must be offenses in every movement. There will be fanatical women in pantaloons, who will push themselves on platforms where they are not wanted. People who are fools, and people who are fanatics, and people who are worse than fools or fanatics, will be found around every really live movement. But we need not nurse an impudent offense.

We have said this in no spirit of unfriendliness to the women who managed the convention of Apollo Hall. After each period of unwise management they change their name, but they do not cease to compromise their cause. No one shall yield to us in admiration for the right royal ability of Elizabeth Cady Stanton. With whatever there may be that we hesitate to receive in some of her doctrines, with all the mistakes that she persists in making in her management of the movement, Mrs. Stanton must have credit for having done more for the cause of oppressed women than any other person in America. From the time that her girlish heart was touched by the story of the wrongs of women who were her father's clients, she has concentrated her great gifts to secure the modification or abolition of the cruel laws that bore so hard on some classes of married women; and it is to her, more than any other, that we owe the great improvements in the laws of New York bearing upon this subject. Her whitening hairs always seem to us a wreath of honor. That she is not a wise political manager only proves that God has not given all kinds of ability to one woman. And we know how noble is the courage, the zeal and the disinterestedness of Susan Anthony. The world laughs now, and will build a monument to her hereafter. Of Mrs. Hooker we have often spoken in the highest praise. But neither of this trio of great women has been able to avoid acts which enable crafty and self-seeking persons to compromise their cause.

Have we proved, then, that some of the greatest women are unfit for political life? So are some of the greatest men. Great soldiers are not generally great presidents, and the greatest orators have sometimes proven the worst party leaders. While the American Suffrage Association, the headquarters of which are at Boston, and which met this year in Steinway Hall, in this city, sails on to success, it cannot be said that women have no talent for political management. Mrs. Livermore is capable of statesmanship of a very high order. Both in the Sanitary Commission and in the conduct of the woman's movement she has shown herself capable of making a capital president of the United States. Magnetic and commanding in her presence, persuasive in her

oratory, suave in her manners, never losing sight of her central purpose, making everything and everybody serve it, she is a standing proof that a woman can be a great politician. Mrs. Lucy Stone, with her sweetly plain and homelike face, her everything that is high and heavenly, having a poet's insight in the highest degree, listened to by sages and by the simple-minded alike—is she not a higher and more ideal character than we have ever seen in public life? And all the chance her country has ever given her to serve it officially is in her recent appointment as a justice of the peace! Massachusetts never had such an one before!

Because it will elevate politics, because it will elevate women, because women need it, because the country needs it, and because it is in accordance with the American idea, we are in favor of the franchise for women. The movement to secure it has more to fear from the mistakes of its advocates than from the opposition of its enemies. We were sorry to hear broached upon the platform of the American Association a proposition to co-operate with the Democracy in a remote contingency. Better sense will repudiate such tactics.

The *Independent's* article contains many contradictory statements, at which we are not surprised after having listened to one of its editors before the Women's Convention in Steinway Hall.

Passing over these, we immediately denounce the whole article as lying and slanderous in spirit, neutralizing even its modicum of fact by its false inferences. If a slanderer why not a murderer? A man who will assassinate a reputation is only protected by his cowardice from murder. He is a murderer at heart.

What are the "facts in the private life of the notorious" Mrs. Woodhull to which this virtuous editor refers, and which he makes the basis of his "gentlemanly" remarks. Mrs. Woodhull was married and divorced. Has Mr. Bowen any "facts" regarding this divorce damaging to Mrs. Woodhull? The law of the land gives the right of divorce. Mrs. Woodhull being free to marry, did marry. It is notorious that there are many persons known and endorsed by the *Independent* who have been married and divorced one or more times; some, indeed, have not always taken the trouble to obtain legal divorces previous to entering upon new relations.

Oh, but she calls herself Mrs. Woodhull while the wife of Colonel Blood. Does Mrs. Woodhull conceal this fact, or has she attempted to do so. If Mrs. Woodhull and Colonel Blood are agreed as to that, does the *Independent* object? Is there any law which they transgress, or is society scandalized?

Perhaps Mr. Bowen is horrified because Mrs. Woodhull permits her former husband to reside under the same roof with herself, which she has permitted for nearly six years, regardless of what meddling people have said, but in the performance of a sacred duty she owed, both to him and to their unfortunate child, from which duty no law could absolve her. And people had better withhold the shafts, which they would hurl at her on this account, lest they be found fighting against a courageous devotion to principle which it is impossible for common minds to comprehend.

However much Mr. Bowen, or others, may denounce and vilify Mrs. Woodhull for this, she is perfectly indifferent thereto, and will continue to do what she knows to be right if the whole world denounce her therefor.

Or is it that Mrs. Woodhull is so unfortunate as to have unprincipled relatives, from whom she has suffered everything but death, that Mr. Bowen takes exceptions to her as a leader in the cause of women? In this matter also, Mrs. Woodhull has duties to perform. It does not matter how far others may forget their duties, it can be no excuse for her, and she will not attempt to make it such, under any circumstances. On the contrary, she will always appear where justice calls, even if that be in the police court, and will speak the truth when so-called, if to do so should cause every suffragist to denounce her. Mrs. Woodhull does not believe that she should be condemned for the acts of others any more than many public men should be condemned, on account of their friends—some of whom, at least, are equally unfortunate with Mrs. Woodhull.

She has opinions and convictions, and also the courage to live up to them. She is a life-long Spiritualist, and owes all she is to the education and constant guidance of spirit influences. To deny this would be like Peter denying Christ. Through all the obloquy and condemnation which have been showered upon her for this faith, she has come unscathed. She also believes in and advocates free-love in the high, the best sense (as distinguished from lust) as the only cure for the immorality, lewdness and licentiousness which now corrupt the holy institution of the Sexual Relation. Many of those who sit in judgment over her preach against free-love openly, but practice free-love secretly. To all outward seeming, they are fair and pure; while inwardly they are full of "dead men's bones and all manner of uncleanness." "Hypocrisy is the tribute paid by vice to virtue." If this must be so, Mrs. Woodhull declines to stand up as "the frightful example," or to be made the scape-goat to be offered in sacrifice by those who seek to cover the foulness of their lives and the feculence of their thoughts and words with a hypocritical mantle, the object of which she long since discovered.

Those who slanderously assail Mrs. Woodhull must make good their allegations, or stand condemned before the world, and Mrs. Woodhull now denounces them and all others of like pretensions, as black-hearted, cravenly cowards, who, being unable to refute the doctrines she advocates or the methods she proposes, seek, by vilifying her private life, to divert attention from that part of her career which belongs to

the public to that which belongs to herself; in order that by so doing her doctrines and methods may be rendered less effective.

The main object of the *Independent* article would seem to be to uphold the Steinway Hall Convention, and to nominate Mrs. Livermore for a woman President. To this end it is essential to break down Victoria C. Woodhull. This is done by slander and aspersion.

To all Mr. Bowen's badinage about women in pantaloons, fools, fanatics, and worse than fools and fanatics, we are perfectly indifferent. As between Mr. Bowen and Mrs. Woodhull, we are perfectly willing the public shall decide which is nearer fool or fanatic.

It seems to us that Mr. Bowen adopts his own suggestion regarding the *Tribune*, that "prejudice manufactured is more effective with a certain class than argument, and that insinuation is so much cheaper than logic."

In all the good things said of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony and Isabella Beecher Hooker, we most cordially join, regretting only that our acquaintance and co-operation with them should have begun so late. But we have a superior opinion of these persons to what Mr. Bowen has, knowing them to be competent to conduct any movement, political or otherwise, without danger of suffering from the "craft of self-seeking persons."

Mrs. Woodhull feels amply repaid for the ridicule she has received from her self-nomination, in the fact that it has developed in such a brain as Mr. Bowen's the idea that a woman could be president. We have no doubt of Mrs. Livermore's capacity to make a competent administratrix of national affairs, and should she be the nominee of the National Convention, none will be found more cordial in their support than this journal. If her conduct of the Sanitary Commission is to be taken as a criterion, it is certain she would be a complete success in one way at least. This, however, would rather indicate her special capacity as head of the Treasury Department than for general administrative ability.

It was said at Steinway Hall that if this movement did not mean perfect liberty and equality for women, it meant nothing. If, then, it do not comprehend the right to her person and its proceeds, whether of labor or progeny, according to the law of natural justice, we cannot tell what it does mean.

We have no disposition to enter into a rigid analysis of the capacities of the leaders of the Suffrage movement as represented in their speeches at the recent conventions; but we have copious notes, and are ready for that ordeal. We would much prefer to move on harmoniously; to see less selfishness, more humility, more humanity, more justice, less cant and pretension. Division and dissension only distract and weaken, and make us despicable in the eyes of our common enemies. Whatever else we do, one woman should not pull down and labor to destroy another woman while our common wrongs are pressing all of us into the earth.

As to Mrs. Woodhull herself, and her standing and importance in the woman's rights movement:

Mrs. Woodhull claims the right, and will exercise it, to advocate and practice whatever principles she feels to be just and right. If they conflict with commonly accepted rules, customs and forms, she cannot help it; she will not desist. Neither will she require the assistance of Mr. Bowen to determine what her relations of private life shall be. These, she claims, belong alone to herself, and she will act accordingly.

She inaugurated no suffrage organization, and lays no claim to the merit. She did not force herself on the National Suffrage Association. She did not go to it. She did not ask leave of any of them to start her paper, to petition Congress, to make an argument, and she has paid her own personal expenses in whatever she has done. She never asked and never expects to ask their endorsement of either her paper or sentiments or life any further than they are compelled to yield it by the force of her logic.

But we beg to differ with Mr. Bowen in regard to "the series of unwise acts," believing that the facility with which these people accommodate themselves to new circumstances, stamps them as wise, consistent, and progressive. In this we hope the association, with which Mrs. Woodhull has had the privilege of acting, will ever differ from that made up of persons so pure and holy as to be in danger of becoming defiled by contact with such as Mrs. Woodhull, and who thank God that they are not as other people are. It is at least to be seriously questioned, whether the I-am-holier-than-thou kind of persons are any better christians in these days than they were in the time of Jesus. Neither do we think it definitely settled whether this kind of piety is not nearer the chin than the heart. Our convictions are that it is, but we are only "publicans" and should not presume to express an opinion of the self-elected of Christ, lest we be doomed to that hell out of which it is said, the Great Leader of the self-styled true suffragists (so declared to be by the Steinway Hall Convention) knocked the bottom not long since.

To convince Mr. Bowen how little he comprehends the present condition of humanity, and how stupid a public teacher he is, we quote the following extract from an editorial in the *Tribune* of May 12, which evinces a true appreciation of the mental condition of that part of the people

who will not much longer be held in servile bondage to any institution or to any authority other than that of their own consciences, representative of God in humanity:

"The failure yesterday of the Woodhull-Anthony-Stanton Suffrage party to defend or even to advert to the advanced views of their leader on matrimony and kindred questions is truly mournful. Are we to understand that the subject was considered too dangerous to be mentioned? Was the excellent Mrs. Hooker, for example, unwilling to let the waiting public know her estimate of the liberal opinions so boldly defended by her co-laborer in Washington—the lady whose intellectual ability and high moral worth she lately indorsed? For ourselves, we toss our hats in air for Woodhull. She has the courage of her opinions! She means business. She intends to head a new rebellion, form a new constitution, and begin a revolution beside which the late war will seem but a bagatelle, if within exactly one year from this day and hour of grace her demands be not granted out of hand. This is a spirit to respect, perhaps to fear, certainly not to be laughed at. Would that the rest of those who burden themselves with the enfranchisement of one-half our whole population, now lying in chains and slavery, but had her sagacious courage."

Now we desire to put a home question to Mr. Bowen. Should there come a person who would convince him that by pursuing a certain course different from that adopted, he could run the *Independent* at one-half the expense, and with greater results, what would he do? Would he make the adoption of the recommendation dependant upon anything in his past life? As a business man, would Mr. Bowen discard his advice and himself because of such antecedents? Further, should that person desire admission to the church, would Mr. Bowen object? And should he prove himself a talented, effective, and useful co-worker would he discard him? And should he suggest a better method of converting the world than had been practiced, would he refuse to listen to him and accept him as an assistant therein? But we are inclined to the belief that Mr. Bowen will not find a great many who will agree with him that Mrs. Woodhull has done suffrage more harm than good. We know the movement has become wondrously active since she became prominent in it. But this we leave for others to settle as they think proper. We know that Mrs. Woodhull has done what she conceived it her duty to do, and nothing more. And we therefore are in a position to say to Mr. Bowen, when he asserts inferentially that Mrs. Woodhull, whom he personates as Mrs. Splurge, advocates suffrage from a sheer love of sensation and notoriety, that he either deliberately states what he knows to be false, or that he states something of which it is impossible for him to know the truth, which is equally culpable.

Victoria C. Woodhull's personal and individual private life is something entirely distinct from her public position. Daniel Webster and William Pitt were *bon vivants*; they were also great statesmen. The two phases of life are perfectly distinct. Their fitness or unfitness for public office did not hinge on their wine-bibbing. The editor of the *Independent* may or may not be a worthy member of society in private, and lead a virtuous life; that has nothing to do with the *Independent*.

The *Independent* maintains that it is expedient to identify private life and virtue with public employment and character, which indeed is a very proper and highly moral proposition. We are content. It is part of the governmental theory steadily advocated in the columns of this paper. Only let us all live up to our professions.

But coming down from an independent, self-reliant position far above the reach of envy, malice, hatred and revenge, Mrs. Woodhull will meet editors upon their own ground and defy them, as she defies all their dirty sarcasm and insinuation, for which they know they have no justification. She will denounce them to all the world for the despicable things they are—brave to stand within their defenses, and, in their pharisaical godliness, thinking themselves secure to hurl upon her their shafts; but too ignoble and cowardly and dastardly to come out upon the open ground where equality is possible.

She does not desire to resort to any unmasking of the hypocrisy which we know to exist in certain quarters, but she will not permit people who live in glass houses, in which are concealed the very "crimes" they profess to decry, to throw stones without returning something more than turf. There is altogether too much appearance and profession of virtue without the reality in the community to permit editors, ministers, bank presidents and others high in social position and confidence, their license unrebuked, when, without cause or provocation, they seek to heap infamy upon the head of an earnest worker in the cause of humanity.

If Mrs. Woodhull has valuable ideas of the principles of government, a clear perception of their legitimate application to the present condition of things, or a better proposition than is yet advanced to obtain what women are seeking, what has her past history to do with them? Whatever that may have been, whether good, bad or indifferent, does it detract from the good or the ill of the present? It seems to us that a good thing, coming from a source previously very bad, should be a cause of general rejoicing, and a bad thing coming from a previously good source should occasion mourning. The fatted calf was killed on the return of the prodigal and not for him who had remained in the fold. And so, too, should these righteous ones kill the fatted calf for Mrs. Woodhull, if, as they profess, she has been prodigal, and is now returned from "the bad" to the good. For, be it known, they do not condemn what she does for its lack

of merit, but because it is Mrs. Woodhull who performs it. It is the person, not the principle, which they see. The truth however, is, that the same old story is repeated—the professed Christians are practical hypocrites. Professing the doctrine and acts of Christ, they keep them on the tongue, but deny them in practice. Instead of saying to the woman, "Go and sin no more," every one who has sinned gathers stones and casts them. But such canting hypocrisy only exposes the true animos of those who use it. They know that the subject they would defame is beyond their reproach, and, maddened that she is, in their rage unwittingly expose their true character. The old adage, "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad" is again strikingly exemplified. In their eagerness to render Mrs. Woodhull powerless for good they expose themselves to the fire of all who may have a home-thrust to give.

But, halt a moment! We have a word to say, a warning to give, not to Henry C. Bowen alone, nor mainly, though we have a shot in the locker for him also, but to *whomsoever it may concern*. Three weeks ago we stated in good faith that we did not propose to deal in personalities and private histories. We meant what we said then, and we mean what we say now; and we now say just the contrary. We are converts, through the merciless treatment we are receiving, to the necessity of carrying the war into Africa," and we issue this preliminary protocol in view of an early formal declaration of war, and war to the knife, on this hypocritical and slanderous community. And when we move in this direction, let those who dwell in brittle tenements stand from under. In the phrase of Bismarck: "You can't make an omelette without breaking some eggs." E. H. Haywood was probably prophetic when he said at Apollo Hall, "that we are on the verge of the great Universal Washing Day, when everybody's dirty linen will be paraded, and when the leaders of sham morality in high places will find that it will cost more than seventy-five cents a dozen."

The respectability of the magnates of this hypocritical Sodom stands on a volcano. Civilization, rotten to the core and festering to the bursting point in our great cities, and notably in New York and Brooklyn, needs only to urge us by a little added outrage to enact the part of a volunteer surgeon, to puncture the sore spots, and spirt the vile stuff into the daylight.

Forbearance may cease to be a virtue. Men and women of the noblest spiritual and moral endowments, who have devoted their lives to easing the transition from the Old False Civilization to a higher purity of Life and Freedom, as the first condition of purity, by stating Principles, have been habitually blackened and slandered by exactly those editors, preachers and reformers, whose own lives needed to be guarded by raising a hue and cry in some other direction. But these victims of abuse have not been idle. They have provided for the possibility of having to make a "change of venue" from the forum of principle to that of Fact and Personality.

The whole social state is honeycombed with social irregularities and outrages; everybody knows the fact, and yet everybody pretends to conceal it; everybody knows that everybody else knows it, and yet everybody pretends to conceal the fact that anybody knows it. Hypocrisy is settling like a mildew on every individual character. When the veil is pulled off, when the nightmare is dispelled, when men and women are justified to themselves and dare state their convictions, and live their own lives in freedom; men and women who are now crouching in abject fear before a false public opinion, which they are themselves helping to create and intensify, will join in one universal Hallelujah to their deliverers. There is a skeleton in every house! an incubus on every free breath! a reign of terror in every household!

At this very moment awful and herculean efforts are being made to suppress the most terrific scandal in a neighboring city, which has ever astounded and convulsed any community. Clergy, congregation and community will be alike hurled into more than all the consternation which the great explosion in Paris carried to that unfortunate city, if this effort at suppression fail.

In the assemblage of the over-righteous pharisees on the Steinway Hall platform, one familiar with private histories and scandals embodied in that little group of women and men, might unfold more than went to the making up of the "Mysteries of Paris," and we speak by the book, and have the inventory of discarded husbands and wives, and lovers, with date, circumstance and embellishment!

Bankers in Wall street, and Great Railroad men, come early on the schedule. Confidences which are no confidences abound; publicity ranges in the little clique, but is tremulously guarded from the great public. One offers, confidentially, Fifty or even a Hundred Thousand Dollars to any decent comer who will take a daughter of "damaged reputation" off his hands—a minister of the Gospel the seducer—he, himself, leading the loosest life of prostitution, a girl of fourteen one of his mistresses. Another boasting that he visits, surreptitiously, the wife of his own minister.

But the instances of social infidelities and of new and strange alliances—some of them highly honorable to the parties, if society did not force them to hypocritical pretences—are too numerous to be more than hinted at. Notably one case, in which a little community of social affinities, a common stock of marital affections exists in high life which only needs some *train* of slight circumstances to be

fixed to release the parties from *durance* vile and enable them to stand erect as pioneers of a higher civilization.

In conclusion, Mrs. Woodhull does not desire to shelter herself under the miserable rejoinder of "*Tu quoque*." What she does in the corner she is willing to proclaim on the housetop. But as the *Independent* affects to condemn her without even putting her on trial, she would remind Mr. Bowen that who breaks the law in one particular breaks the whole law. She would then ask does Mr. Bowen keep the whole law. Does he cheat, lie, slander? Does he live up to his own profession? Is his life temperate and chaste? Is he honest and just to his inferiors? Does he fawn and cringe to his superiors? Does the *Independent* for its own interests countenance and indorse any persons male or female whom its editors know to be chargeable with the very offenses that "the religious paper" denounces. Mrs. Woodhull does not acknowledge the self-constituted jurisdiction of this religious commercial paper; this free-love miscegenate of Catechism cartoons, dry goods and orthodoxy. But she recognizes that the *Independent's* rule, if good, must work both ways, and as private life is to be impeached for opinion's sake she would like Mr. Bowen or his associate editors to step up and tell their "experiences"—their lives will be a more effectual teaching, than their strictures.

THE BIBLE AND MARRIAGE.

FOR THOSE WHO ARE DRAGGING THE BIBLE INTO THE SUFFRAGE CONTROVERSY.

Marriage, or the union of the sexes for reproduction, and for that alone, was made a perpetual statute in and by Nature (God, if you like) prior to any civil government, statute law or special infallible revelations.

2. Any attempt to compel or continue that relation for any other purpose, or contrary to the mutual and cordial consent of each party to the contract, is clearly an infraction of an original, inherent, and therefore inalienable, right.

3. That which is right in nature cannot be made wrong by statute law. The only legitimate right of civil law is to prevent the abuse of one party by the other.

4. Moses, the divine and infallible law-giver, provides no special ceremony or legal form. God made Eve out of a rib taken from the side of Adam (poor material) and brought her unto the man; no ceremony about it; not a word from poor Eve—Adam did all the talking.

5. Cain had no formula; he only "knew his wife" in the land of Nod. Geographically where, the book does not say, nor yet whose daughter she was, nor whether she was anybody's daughter. The inference is palpable that she was his own sister, or near relative, the descendant of the union of brother and sister. For it is evident that the first multiplication of the race must have been by the marriage of brother and sister, then cousins, then second cousins, and thus, by a process known by stock-raisers as breeding "in-and-in," did the peopling of our planet commence, and without legal form.

6. The Sons of God took them wives of all which they chose. The women had no voice in the matter.

7. Abraham, the father of the faithful, had Sarah and Hagar; the latter at first by the consent of the former, and no legal ceremony.

8. Jacob had four women—two wives, for which he paid a consideration (fourteen years of service), and two concubines, by consent of the two purchased wives. Laban, the father-in-law, cheated Jacob in the women, forcing on him the one he did not love nor contract for, and then gave him her sister, thus sanctioning the marrying two living sisters, obtained by purchase, and without any ceremony except the act of the father, who not only sold his daughters, but forces one of them into adultery by an unwilling match, on the part of Jacob at least.

9. David, the man after God's own heart, had a plurality of wives, committed murder to secure the wife of Uriah after he had seduced her, sat in judgment on and condemned himself, and repented only after he was exposed, as do many in modern times.

10. But Solomon, who chose wisdom above all things, and was rewarded therefor with great honor and riches, eclipsed all the fathers of the faithful named in the genealogies by taking seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines, and not a ceremony over one of them.

11. Abraham's chief servant selected the wife of Isaac; contract made without consulting the woman—not a day allowed for considering whether she would become the wife of a man she had never seen, perhaps never heard of.

12. If a man died without children the surviving brother must take the relict, love or no love, and raise up children to his dead brother or be disgraced before all Israel, and thus depriving him of the right to raise them for himself.

13. The act of adultery by married persons was punishable with death.

14. If a woman found no favor in the sight of her lord, the man could put her away by simply writing "bill of divorce," and the woman had no remedy.

We are curious to know if this Bible law were applied now how many men would escape the death penalty, how many women would submit to the yoke of the lords of creation, and whether society would be improved thereby.

THE WEEKLY BULLETIN

OF THE

PANTARCHY.

INDIVIDUALITY AND PANTARCHISM.

I was present recently at a social evening party of social reformers, at the house of a banker in this city, distinguished for his interest in such subjects. After partaking of the collation, and when we were assembled in the spacious parlor, the host informed us that he had recently received from a friend in Boston a small pamphlet, written and published nearly twenty years ago, which contained ideas to which, it seemed to him, that the most advanced thinkers of to-day are only now slowly arriving. He proposed to read the document before announcing the name of the writer, submitting it, also, before announcing the name, to an individual expression of opinion as to its merits. When through with the reading, he began, seemingly by chance, with the party sitting at my left hand, obtaining his verdict, then going to the next, and so on till he arrived at my right, having gone round the circle. Every person present was laudatory of the paper, and no one so much so as another distinguished banker and political economist who was present, and who had supposed that he stood at my antipodes in opinion, knowing me only as the advocate of Organization and Pantarchism, while he stands on the extreme ground of Individuality, so emphatically defined in the document. This gentleman abounded in praises of the paper just read, and in expressions of surprise that so clear a statement of the doctrine of Individuality could have emanated from any one so far back, saying that the writer was remarkably in advance of his age.

Our host then, instead of asking my opinion, announced my name as the writer of the paper, much to the surprise of those present, who regarded me as the representative of the opposite views. Indeed, until the reading was considerably advanced, I had not myself recognized its authorship. I had completely forgotten that I had ever written that particular paper, although the views were mine. Our host of the evening informed me that he had received it, along with other old documents, from Mr. JOSIAH WARREN, the veteran Social Reformer, of Massachusetts.

Meeting Mr. WARREN the other day, at the Anniversary of the Labor League, I requested him to forward me a copy of this document. He has just done so, and I hasten to transfer it to the columns of the Bulletin of the Pantarchy, for the study and use of its readers.

It is a misapprehension that I often meet, because I now advocate Organization, and the Centralizing of the Reform Movement at large, that I have therefore abandoned the doctrine of Individuality and the Sovereignty of the Individual, to the maintenance of which I devoted so many years of my life. On the contrary, I wish to reaffirm and emphasize every word I have ever said or published on that side of the question. If I could "I would double on every syllable of it."

The trouble is that most people's minds are simplistic; that they can see and apprehend only one side of a subject. The culmination and natural sequence of Individuality is in Individuality of Lead. These are the two Poles of the same Principle. People are not fit to be organized in the higher, the true socialistic sense of Organization, till they are first completely individualized; the act of coming into organization, under discipline, into subordination, under a proper leadership, should be the free act of a developed individuality; and the freedom should always be reserved, at every hour, to withdraw from the allegiance, for any cause deemed sufficient by the individual.

In this simple complexity is the solution of the whole question of true government; the reconciliation of freedom with order or organization.

When people are sufficiently individualized, if they still wish to secure ends which depend on their co-operative or combined action, they must organize to that end. They must have their generalissimo, and their proper ranks and functions. The more perfect the individuality of each, and the more perfect the unity of all, the more perfect the society so constituted. This is the fundamental thought of Pantarchism, and if people are not prepared for a Pantarchy it is mainly because they are not yet sufficiently individualized to be proper members of it.

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

CLIFTONDALE, MASS.

DEAR ANDREWS—I forward to you one copy of that article. I have more if they are wanted.

Much to my regret, I was obliged to leave the meeting without hearing Mrs. Woodhull or speaking to you, but I hope the future will make amends for this, and for being obliged to hurry this off to the mail without another word.

Affectionately yours,

JOSIAH WARREN.

DICKENS says: "I have known vast quantities of nonsense talked about bad men not looking you in the face. Don't trust to that conventional idea. Dishonesty will stare you out of countenance any day in the week, if there is anything to be got by it."

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

BY S. P. A.

The logical and legitimate termination of the democratic idea is in the sovereignty of every individual, within the limit that it is not to be exercised at the cost of others, or, in such a manner as to throw burdensome consequences on them. "The sovereignty of the individual to be exercised at one's own cost" is, therefore, a two-edged sword, cutting both ways, and defining what one may not, as well as what one may do. It is the sovereignty of every individual limited by the equal sovereignty of every other, and consequently without encroachment. It is self-government, by the aid of a principle, and in the only sense in which self-government has significance or value. Self-government, in the vulgar democratic sense of submission to the will of a majority, being a mockery and a cheat.

The limitation above stated is sufficiently implied by the simple formula, "the sovereignty of every individual," since the admission of the sovereignty of others, within the domain of their own personal affairs, necessitates a corresponding restriction upon our own.

The sovereignty of the individual is the foundation principle of social order and harmony. It is the simplest, and yet the most radical and revolutionary of principles. It is no true objection to the doctrine to affirm that nothing can be done at one's own cost, since the solidarity of mankind is such that every act of the individual affects more or less remotely the interests of the race. This unity of "the grand man" is doubtless a profound truth, of the same kind as the unity of all the planets, and of all the particles of matter in all the planets in one grand material system, all the parts of which mutually relate to and affect each other. The truth upon which the objection rests belongs, therefore, to what may be denominated the science of social astronomy, and is wholly inapplicable in the sphere of social physics or mechanical science. If an objector were to urge the impossibility of building a steamboat because every bar of iron and every stick of timber is affected by gravitation, and because the whole gravitation of the universe is liable to be disturbed by the jumping of a fly upon the planet Jupiter, the absurdity of the objection would be obvious, although the statement might be theoretically true. It is an absurdity of the same glaring kind to deny that interests can be substantially individualized, or to urge against the assumption by each individual of his own responsibilities, that every act affects the race. Sociology is a science of actual appreciable relations, and not of remote and attenuated theories. I deny, for all practical purposes, that if I burn my finger the Emperor of China will suffer in consequence. I deny the unity of the race in any such sense as would interfere with the possibility of practically adjusting individual rights.

In America and elsewhere, the sovereignty of the individual has already received both a theoretical and practical interpretation in some of its applications, as, for example, to worship. The right of a man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience is fully recognized, precisely limited, as it should be, by the inhibition of encroachment. Nobody finds any difficulty in the practical application of the principle. If any one should insist that the worshippers at a given church should kneel in prayer, or that those of another faith should not kneel, and propose forcibly to compel the acceptance of his own dogma on the subject, the moral sense of the community would be shocked. No such invasion of personal rights would be tolerated for a moment in this country, and in this age, because the whole world recognizes, among us, that the individual is himself, the sole umpire over his own conduct in this particular. In other words, the doctrine of the sovereignty of every individual is already accepted and applied in certain countries and upon a given point; and, whenever it is so, and because it is so, the bloody religious feuds of other times and other lands are extinguished; intolerance, bigotry and persecution are allayed, and mutual respect and harmony secured. It has thus proved itself, so far as adopted, what it will prove itself in the end, universally the foundation principle of order in the social world. It is nothing more and nothing less than that simple dictate of common sense and good breeding which requires that every one should abstain from intrusion into other peoples affairs.

Any argument, however specious, against this broad tolerance of all the forms of worship, based on the ground that the slightest individual action is a link in the universal chain of events, and possibly liable, therefore, to bring disaster upon the race, would be at once rejected by every liberal mind. Any interference upon such slender pretensions of right would be indignantly repelled. It is known and felt that in order to justify constraint from without, the conduct of the individual must be in some way a serious, palpable and direct infringement of the rights of others, and not merely remotely, contingently or possibly injurious to them.

The sovereignty of the individual, as a philosophical and political dogma, is simply the claim for the extension of the same degree of freedom to every department of social life. It is the assertion of the individual to be "a law unto himself" just so fast and so far as he demonstrates in his conduct the ability to use that freedom without encroachment upon the equal freedom of others. It is the principle of non-intervention in private affairs, precisely as that principle is now universally understood between national sovereign-

ities. It is the principle of peerage, or equality of participation in the common rights of self-direction and control.

The admission of the right of individual self-government does not imply that every individual is qualified to exercise that right, or is likely to exercise it wisely for himself. Freedom is demanded as a basis. Wisdom and good taste in the use of freedom come afterwards, form the combination of all good influences. Freedom is demanded also as a right, or as a denial of the right of others to interfere, whether it be used well or ill, provided always that the bad use of it does not extend to encroachment.

From the nature of the position set forth in the preceding paragraph, the sovereignty of the individual is open to the objection that it is the assertion of a right to do wrong, which involves both a contradiction of terms and a seeming profligacy of moral sentiment. The liability to this imputation rests upon the poverty of language, and the fact that the word "right" is necessarily employed in various senses.

The civic right to do a given act is quite distinct from the moral right or wrong of the act in question. Thus, the civic right of locomotion belongs equally to the citizen who travels with a good or bad motive, and the right of free speech and freedom of the press, equally to the man who speaks or prints pernicious and destructive opinions, as to him who announces the sublimest and most beneficial truths. To assert this, however, is very different from affirming that it is morally right to travel for a bad purpose, or to speak or print pernicious and destructive opinions.

The sovereignty of the individual is, therefore, the assertion of a civic or political right, in the exercise of which the individual may, if he will, do many things which the judgment of others, or even his own conscience, may not approve.

Evil consequences are attached to every wrong act, as the natural correctives of the tendency to do wrong, and the individual may be entitled for the completion of his moral education, to a further experience of the evil which his conduct provokes.

Except in the case of actual encroachment, society has no more right to interfere with the morality of individual conduct than it has to interfere with the orthodoxy of individual belief. Neither comes within the jurisdiction of third persons except at the point where encroachment begins.

The question of civic right is, therefore, a question of jurisdiction, the limitation of which belongs to the political or sociological department of science. The right or wrong of a special action is, on the other hand, a question of morality, pertaining to the department of Ethics, and subject solely to the jurisdiction of the individual, within the limit of which sociology defines. It is, therefore, true that the individual has a civic right to do what is morally wrong; or a right, in other words, to the application of the principle of non-intervention, even when doing that which a sound morality condemns.

In its application to nations, the doctrine of distinct sovereignty and special jurisdiction, over questions of right within their respective dominions, is familiar and approved. In this sense a nation has the right, relatively to other nations, to maintain slavery, to oppress its own citizens, and to do other things which are morally wrong. The concession of this right is the only basis of plan and peace—is the necessary condition for the operation of other influences more elevating and more conducive to the ends of morality than physical force.

The principle is equally true and equally important in its application to individuals. The concession of the right to do wrong with one's own, without authorizing the interference of any external police, is a condition precedent to any and all harmonious intercourse. It is the simple courtesy of admitting that other men have consciences and standards of right as well as we, and which may equally chance to be right.

Thus defined, all freedom consists, in fact, in the right to do wrong, since where no choice is permitted between good and evil, there is no freedom.

It is not enough, therefore, to affirm that we claim the right to do right, since there is neither merit nor dignity in a correctness of deportment for which there is no alternative.

Let us begin, therefore, by trusting humanity to the extent to which, in all the theologies, God himself is represented as trusting it. Let us concede freely the choice between good and evil, and claim it for ourselves. Until a foundation is laid in freedom, no true virtue is possible; or, if it exist, it cannot be known, since the opposite conduct was inhibited. Remove, then, for once, the fetters from humanity, and consent that she shall exhibit herself precisely as she is. If a pandemonium results it will be something to know by experiment that the gloomy theologians are right. If, on the other hand, the experiment shall prove that the pandemonium we now have comes in part from constraint, and the strife engendered thereby, and that the fruits of freedom are contentment, and peace, and joy, with the ultimate elevation and refinement of the individual and the race, it will then be seen how badly the world could have afforded to be longer without the toleration of freedom.

The double aspect of the sovereignty of the individual was noticed above.

It is the claim on the one side of one's own right to personality and selfhood. It is the concession on the other of the same right to all others.

These two aspects of the doctrine are so distinct and so

opposite, that some technical terminology is needed to signalize their difference. Comte has furnished the words *Egoist* and *Altroist* to designate the love of self and the love of the neighbor, or the selfish and benevolent impulse. Adopting these terms, the egoist aspect of the sovereignty of the individual protects a right, and the altroist prescribes a duty. The first emancipates the individual from an over-weening subservience to authority and traditional assumptions, and teaches a prompt resistance of invasions of all sorts, whether instigated by hostility, or by an amiable and well-meant but intrusive and misdirected friendship. The second becomes for those who intelligently accept it, a veritable religion of deference for the slightest manifestation of desire, and of abstinence from every possible incumbrance of the absolute freedom of others.

It recognises that the individual has an absolute right to himself, a right to his own time, to a companionship of his own choice, to his own habits and characteristics, to the privilege even of whimsical inconsistency and unreasonable conduct of every shade and variety, provided it be not of a kind to invade the sovereignty of others.

In this latter aspect, the sovereignty of the individual is the practical love of the neighbor equally as of one's self, rectified by a scientific knowledge of the limits of encroachment. It is a new chivalry, teaching to all men and all women the most delicate respect for the personality of all others.

This largeness of toleration, it must be repeated again, does not rest in any degree upon the assumption that the conduct so tolerated will be in all respects, or any respect, abstractly or morally right. It rests on this other proposition, that the jurisdiction of the moral question belongs of right to the individual himself, in the same sense as Protestant Christendom entrusts to the rights of private judgment, in matters of faith, questions, involving as it believes, the eternal salvation of millions of souls. It rests, likewise, upon the necessity as a policy for the individual to concede to others what he claims or desires for himself, and the intellectual perception that our own freedom is enlarged precisely in proportion as we tolerate the freedom of others; and, finally, it rests as already observed, upon another intellectual perception, namely, that in order to give place to other and higher influences, tending to elevate and refine the individual and the race, we must discard the pretention of forcing men to adopt that line of conduct which we individually deem to be right.

It results from all that has been said, that the sovereignty of the individual is the basis of harmonious intercourse among equals, precisely as the equal sovereignty of States is the basis of harmonious intercourse between nations mutually recognizing their independence of each other. If there are circumstances and relations which authorize the assumption of despotic power, as one State may claim the dependence and allegiance of another; if children, who cannot yet assume the burden of their own support, are rightfully denied the exercise of a sovereignty which they cannot maintain; if it be contended even that inferior races of men require to be placed under pupilage to superior races, or ignorant and undeveloped persons of the same race under a similar pupilage, as we all constitute ourselves guardians of idiots and the insane, the fact, if admitted, does not in any manner affect the doctrine in question in its just application as between those who begin by admitting an equal right to self-government. If self-government is affirmed, then the sovereignty of the individual is the fundamental law of that species of government. If the right of self-government is denied, then another and a different question is raised, which it may be only possible to settle by an appeal to physical force.

If man, for example, openly claims the ownership of woman, and a paramount authority over her by virtue of a superior wisdom which rightfully vests in him the title to reign, this is a question of fact, to be settled upon its own appropriate grounds. If, on the other hand, man comes first up to a knowledge of the equal dignity of the sex, let him perceive intellectually what it is he admits, and be fully prepared to accept every consequence which logically flows from the previous admission. The assumption of equality, and of the right of self-government as a basis of intercourse, is the assumption of the sovereignty of the individual. The doctrine in all its plenitude and all its development, is nothing in addition, but simply a greater exactitude of definition and a greater variety and minuteness of application.

MISS EVANS (George Eliot), who is engaged on a new novel for Blackwood, is a most laborious and pains-taking writer, bestowing as much pains upon a single book as ordinary authors do upon six. Her handwriting illustrates this. It is bold, round, as easy to read as print, and scarcely an erasure is to be met with in the manuscript of a whole volume. This is owing to the fact that she carefully sketches beforehand what she intends to write, and then copies it elaborately. The printers keep her manuscript clean, and after the proofs have been corrected it is returned to her. She has the MSS. of all her books bound in red morocco, and they form one of the most interesting features of her library. She sold "Adam Bede" to Blackwood for \$1,500, but its success prompted her publishers to present her \$7,500 besides. For "Felix Holt" she received the large sum of \$30,000. She is described by a European correspondent as one of the most interesting and captivating of English women.

[The following extracts are made from a mass of curious papers, upon which I may find occasion to speak further, published originally at Salem, N. J., by the author, Mr. Robert Sinnickson.—S. P. A.]

COLLECTION
OF
"CRAZY" CONTRIBUTIONS
TO A COUNTRY JOURNAL, &c.,
INDICATING THE
COMING MAN-FORMATION,
OR
"KINGDOM OF HEAVEN" ON EARTH—
NATURAL SUCCESSOR TO THE REPUBLIC
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA.
(WHICH IS THE HIGHEST BEAST-FORM PRECEDING MAN.)
A POINT OF DIFFERENCE;
CONSISTING IN
A REPRESENTATION OF CLASSES INSTEAD OF LOCALITIES.
BY ROBERT SINNICKSON.

"The good time is coming—it's almost here.
'Twas long, long, long on the way."

The present political, religious, and social structures of the world are losing their vitality, and becoming mere shams—soulless shells—enveloping rottenness within, which would make the people stand aghast, if they could get a whiff of their contents. In vulgar parlance, they might be called "bad eggs."

When the political leaders of a country or the world buy their positions in the head or government, and sell their services after they get there; when the religious leaders spend months of time and millions of money in trying to prove the "infallibility" of imbecility! and when the social leaders find it necessary to justify the most dastardly murders in order to uphold the dignity of their basal institution—it is time for the PEOPLE to open their eyes, and look about them for a more substantial foundation upon which to build a "future State."

If those "pious fools" who so dolefully bewail the "Social Evil," would scan their own firesides and bedrooms, they might discover the cause of it. If the "respectable," "law-abiding," "moral" and "religious" men of this country could see their social acts in the light of Nature, and as their wives do see them, they would be ashamed to look an honest woman in the face.

Those delicate Christians who may feel shocked at the ideas here publicly advanced, I would refer to a passage in the New Testament of their own Bible:

"TO THE PURE, ALL THINGS ARE PURE."

And I would further remind them, that TRUTH can never be injured by discussion. Error only dreads investigation.

A man may repeat a lie, until himself believes it to be true—as a people may practice usury, until they believe it to be just. The correspondence may be carried on in social life, and elsewhere.

I would advise the WOMEN of America to husband their means (instead of themselves and their daughters), and establish independent, industrial communitary homes of their own; where they may entertain their friends in their own ways, and rear and support their own children—regardless of the effete laws and customs promulgated by the masculine prostitutes who now constitute the political "powers that be"—and where their present despotic overseers (husbands, fathers or brothers) will not have even the flimsy pretext of a legal right to enter without their permission. They will be aided in such efforts by the best men in the country.

Do the blocks at the head of this nation or people know that the BALLOT is the foundation of a REPUBLIC? And do they further know that when the foundation of any structure becomes rotten, the structure must fall, as a logical sequence? And would they shut their eyes to the transparent fact that the system of balloting which placed them where they are, is rotten to the core? When a "Pilot" employed on the "ship (or broken raft) of State" publicly asserts that he "knows that from twenty to forty dollars a vote was given" in the late election of a present member of Congress, honest officers would have sufficient grounds for a legal investigation of the case. [See "Notes from the National Capital," in *National Standard*, Salem, N. J., of June 15, 1870—on file in Salem County Clerk's Office, according to law.] But if all similar cases were brought to light, how many members would lawfully hold their seats in Congress? Would there be one left? If so, who is he? Barnum wants him.

A MILLENNIAL DISCOVERY.

The physiological principle of MALE CONTINENCE, as applied to the relation of the sexes is destined, as it spreads to work a great revolution in society.

It solves, in the first place, the population question, and extinguishes Malthus and Restell, and all other professors of the "dismal science," by placing propagation under full and natural control.

It opens the way for improvement of the race by scientific procreation.

With a due amount of religion, it makes association practicable.

It reconciles the sexes, and promotes, in the highest degree, true fellowship and union between them.

It removes the curse from women, and beautifies instead of blasting them.

It is healthful for man.

It gives to woman her original position as a "helpmeet" to man, thereby diminishing his cares and burdens, and doubling his resources and happiness.

It was discovered in connection with Communism, and belongs appropriately to it: but, so far as adopted, it will also tend to relieve and elevate marriage.

Its recipe for the poor man is—"If you wish to thrive, stop having children, and take your wife into partnership."

Let society adopt this principle in connection with Communism, and then:

No more broken-down women, worn out by over-breeding and excessive family care;

No more neglected and half-bred children growing up in vice and want from the inability of parents to look after them;

No more neglected and forlorn "old maids;"

No more overworked men toiling alone for the support of an undesired but ever-coming family increase;

No more reaction and disgust between the sexes growing out of uncontrolled passion.

On the other hand:

Children, born by choice, and under the best conditions attainable, with the care and interest of the whole Community exercised on their culture and welfare; and

Such a limitation of propagation as will not exhaust society, but will be consistent with its highest vigor and beauty; and

Boundless, ever-improving respect and love between men and women as exponents to each other of the life and love of God.—*Oneida Circular*.

If there were one language for the whole world it would add, in effect, one third part to the life of the human race. *Leibnitz, vol. i., Sixth Geneva edition, p. 297.*

All other attempts at a universal language by Leibnitz, Bishop Wilkins, Vidal, Denis de L., Ochander and others have been contrivances or inventions; *Alwato* is a DISCOVERY. The difference between these two things is immense. A language *invented* has a thousand chances to one against being adopted; a language *discovered* MUST be adopted, cannot fail to be adopted, is inevitable.

There was a time when the world had music as a fact, but no scientific music, no science of music. Hitherto we have had language as a fact, imperfect, blundering, chance-directed; but no scientifically constructed language, no language embodying the discovered science of language. *Alwato* is the scientific or true form of human speech—not a true form, but *the* true form—the lingually embodied discovery of the science of speech. *Study Alwato.*

Alwato is a new and universal language; but is not that merely. It is infinitely more than a mere language, as the word is now understood. It is the God-invented instrument for *the intimate expression of thought*; the instrument for *the infinite development and training of the human mind*—beyond anything heretofore conceived of. *The Primary Synopsis of Universology*, just published, contains the Elements of *Alwato*, and its inception. Every reader of the *Bulletin* should commence at once the study of *The Primary Synopsis*. See advertisement.

LABOR.

Hark how creation's deep musical chorus,
Unintermitting goes up into heaven!
Never the ocean wave falters in flowing,
Never the little seed stops in its growing;
More and more richly the rose-heart keeps glowing
Till from its nourishing stem it is riven!

Labor is life—'tis the still water falleth;
Idleness ever despaireth, bewalleth;
Keep the watch wound, for the dark rust assaileth;
Flowers droop and die in the stillness of noon.
Labor is glory—the flying cloud brightens;
Idle hearts only the dark future frightens.—
Play the sweet keys wouldst thou keep them in tune.

Labor is worship! the robin is singing—
Labor is worship! the wild bee is ringing;
Listen! that eloquent whisper upspringing,
Speaks to thy soul from out nature's heart.

Work! and pure slumbers shall wait on thy pillow—
Work! thou shalt ride over care's coming billow,
Lie not down wearied 'neath woe's weeping willow,—
Work with a stout heart and resolute will!

Work for some good, be it ever so slowly—
Cherish some flower, be it ever so lowly—
Labor! All Labor is noble and Holy!

DR. NEWMAN, last Sunday evening at Washington, said from his pulpit, "I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, yet I venture this prediction: Within the next decade, aye, within the next five years, Christianity will be tried as it has never been tried before. There are men in England and America to-day, who will bring to the assault, a ripeness of scholarship, a power of intellect, and a breadth of view, unequalled by the past. These assaults will continue, and there are men and women before me to-night, their faith terribly shaken."

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE. One copy for one year \$2 00 One copy for six months 1 00 Single copies 5 FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTION. CAN BE MADE TO THE AGENCY OF THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, LONDON ENGLAND. One copy for one year \$3 00 One copy for six months 1 50 RATES OF ADVERTISING. Per line (according to location) - From \$1 00 to 2 50 Time, column and page advertisements by special contract. Special place in advertising columns cannot be permanently given. Advertiser's bills will be collected from the office of the paper, and must, in all cases, bear the signature of WOODHULL, CLAFLIN & CO. Specimen copies sent free. News-dealers supplied by the American News Company, No. 121 Nassau street, New York.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—All communications intended for publication must be written on one side only. The editors will not be accountable for manuscript not accepted.

All communications, business or editorial, must be addressed

Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly, 44 Broad Street, New York City.

WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY.

JOURNALISTIC JUSTICE.

Now that Justice Ledwith has rendered his decision in the case wherein Col. Blood was charged by Annie Claflin with assault, will the press, which was so eager to put the charge before the public, be as eager to give his justification and acquittal?

Especially do we call attention of certain papers which published a libellous affidavit as that upon which the order of arrest was granted to the fact that said affidavit was never before the court. If they were deceived in supposing it was, would they not show wisdom by making the amende honorable without delay. Or will they assume the responsibility? If they published it, hoping that the trial would develop the supposed scandal and have been disappointed, let them say so; especially those which assumed their truth and enlarged upon them editorially.

A NEW GOVERNMENT AND THE COSMOPOLITICAL PARTY.

No. VI.

MONEY—FINANCE—EQUILIBRIUM.

[CONTINUED.]

Money and wealth, then, are not synonymous terms—do not mean the same thing. Wealth includes all things resulting from labor which are of use, comfort and convenience to the people. People make use of gold; it is, therefore, wealth; so also is cotton and corn, but no less so. But money is something entirely different from this, both as to character and intrinsic value. All wealth has value in itself. Money has no value in itself, else our analysis is false.

Money is used for the purpose of facilitating the exchange of wealth; therefore whatever portion of the common wealth is exchanged, the money used in effecting it must be its representative. That is to say, a person possessing wealth in the form of flour, transfers it to another person for a sum of money, which represents that wealth. Money, then, in its last analysis, is the representative of wealth, or it is the representative of true value, but not itself that value. For, as we stated before, money cannot, at one and the same time, be both value and its representative. Gold is value; it is the result of labor, and can be exchanged for other value, but not by other value. The means of making the exchange is not value. Those means, in whatever form they are used, are representatives of value. And all representations of value are money, whether in the form of currency, bank checks, notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or what not, because they stand for value.

Gold is wealth, but not all wealth; and it is no more entitled to the position to which it has been assigned in the financial world than any other product of labor. Cotton purchases and pays for more European imports than gold—to say nothing of the large amounts of other wealth used in the same way. Our annual production of wealth in gold is about \$40,000,000. Our annual production of cotton is \$150,000,000. While other products swell the grand aggregate to an almost inconceivable sum.

There has been one fatal mistake made and persevered in which has been productive of more financial ills and consequent individual injustice to the producers of wealth than all other causes, and that is in making land, wealth. Land is no more entitled to be classed with wealth than gold is to

be called money. Wealth is that which is produced. Land exists. All improvements made upon land are wealth; but the land proper, never. In this fatal mistake, which is fundamental in its character, is found the basis upon which the vast disparities, in distribution of wealth, rest, and which gives to certain favored individuals the means of realizing immense fortunes, without resorting to the usual methods of production. There are numerous examples of this kind of wealth. People hold lands which, by favorable location, have come into great demand, and have risen in value from one dollar per acre to hundreds of thousands of dollars per acre. By what right should a person holding such lands be entitled to this vast increase? To be so entitled is to possess an advantage over others to which no just communal government should consent. It is against all principles of equality and justice, and is the great error of the present regarding the rights of property.

This matter of land monopoly was referred to in this connection to establish a comparison. Land in its present uses bears the same arbitrary relation to real wealth that gold does to real money; with this distinction in favor of gold, that gold is wealth while land is not. But, says an objector and worshiper of the gold god, how can it be said that gold is only wealth along with other products of labor, such as are produced and consumed yearly—such as houses and all kinds of internal improvements, which are subjects of decay, while gold, so to speak, is not a subject of disintegration, but, so far as is yet known, is one of the elements?

This is one of the most commonly made and generally supposed sweeping arguments against the crusade against gold, but in reality it has no bearing, whatever, upon the question. We have not pretended that gold was not wealth, but on the contrary that it is wealth in the very best sense of that term; and the most desirable form of wealth to acquire, from the fact of its durability. We are not arguing against gold as wealth, but against it as money, and here is just where all the confusion in finance finds its entering place, from which we shall never be free until people learn the real distinction between wealth and money—the first being value, the last convenience.

There is one more unanswerable reason why gold cannot answer the requirements of money, found in the degrees of value which attach to different products of labor, and which are universally determined by the sacrifice required to produce them. That is to say, all other things being equal, the relative value of two different products is determined by the time and labor required to produce them. The increase in value of manufactured articles is in exact proportion to the time required and wealth consumed in their production. The value of gold is determined in precisely the same manner, and it is foolish to say that the value of gold never changes. Suppose there should be immense fields of gold suddenly developed all over the country, so that it would become as common and plentiful as iron or coal, would it not decrease in value? That is to say, would an ounce of gold then, possess as great a proportionate value to other products as it now does? None will pretend it. Then gold is just as much the subject of fluctuation as any other product of labor; and for just the same reasons—demand and supply—which are the great arbitrators of values in all parts of the world.

Everybody know that for a certain quantity of gold a certain quantity of cotton can be obtained; and for a certain quantity of corn, a horse. The horse being obtainable by the corn does not convert the corn into money; neither anymore does gold become money because the cotton can be obtained thereby. The gold for the time is equal in value to the cotton; so also is the corn to the horse. But neither the gold or corn represents the cotton or the horse. Now what is required of money is this: Suppose the gold, cotton, corn, and the horse to be of equal value, a person possessing an amount of money, representing either of the four, can at his discretion purchase which ever he choose. Hence the money would equally represent the gold, cotton, corn, and the horse, and anything that cannot do this is not money.

We are now prepared to inquire, what will best perform the functions for which money is required. The basis of values is the capacity for production; and productions are values. The people who produce and those who consume are not at all times contiguous to each other, and they require some other means of exchanging their respective products than by direct delivery and receipt, and this means is called money. Real money is something that can stand representative of these several products, so that there may be the utmost facility in their exchange.

A person may possess value to the amount of ten thousand dollars, upon which he may issue his certificates or representatives promising to pay ten thousand dollars. These representatives would circulate among those who believed in the capacity and the willingness of the utterer to give up to the possessor that which they represent. This is the basis of the system of uttering bank notes. But there is an insuperable objection to this representation being called real money, because the vicissitudes of life and circumstances often produce such changes as make it impossible for those who have uttered such representatives of value to redeem them, consequently holders find themselves with bits of paper representing nothing, but for which they have parted with their value and lost it. So far as this is a transaction confined to individuals, in which there is no other assurance than the supposed capacity and intention of the individual, it

is perfectly just and right; for one individual, upon his personal judgment, accepts the representations of another individual, which, if they prove bad, he has himself alone to blame for the loss as coming from an error of judgment.

But when banks are organized under certain forms of law framed by the people or their representatives, through government, the people accept their notes or representatives, not because they have a special confidence in the individuals who compose the management, but because they have conformed to certain requirements of law, which it is supposed render them safe. The government then indirectly gives credit to the banks, and currency to their issues, and the people accept them because the government has done so. But suppose these banks are mismanaged, or managed by designing men, who make use of the governmental sanction to swindle the people, and they do swindle the people, as many times they have, where can the people look for redress? They should look to the government, for they relied on its sanction and found it valueless.

Now this is precisely our objection to any and all forms of bank issues. There can be no arrangement made, perfect in security to the people that will permit the profits that the banks must have. In absolute security there can be no profit. Profit comes of speculating in some way, either upon the confidences, or the money, of the people, neither of which is legitimate. We hold, then, that all bank notes are frauds upon the people.

The substitute for these bank notes, as the money for the people, should be the PEOPLES' MONEY—a national currency, whose basis of value, would be the productive capacity of the whole country which the government represents. If there is any reliance to be placed in a currency issued by a portion of the people based upon their wealth, of which they are liable at all times to be deprived, how much better would be the reliance to be placed upon a currency issued by the government based upon the entire wealth of the whole country, which, no matter how much it might change among the individuals comprising the nation, could never depart from the country. Here, then, is the true basis for a currency for the people. It would be their own money which they would possess, and which could never be made valueless except the country should be destroyed. Such a currency would cost nothing. Whatever interest there would be paid for its use should be received by the government, and thus reduce the general taxation by just that amount. By proper arrangements for distribution and accommodation, the revenue to the government from this source could be made sufficient to maintain all the necessary expenses of government, and would transfer the immense profits now realized by a few bank owners to the vaults of the people's treasury.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

OUR GOLD RESOURCES.

Whatever medium different nations, at various epochs in their history, may have seen proper to constitute a legal tender in payment of obligations between individuals, there has never been but one solvent of balances between nations.

In view of this irrevocable law, the present heavy adverse commercial balance, coupled with the large amount of American securities held abroad, the interest of which is continually maturing, makes an examination of our gold resources an important as well as interesting study.

We give the official statement of imports and exports for thirteen years, sufficiently long to afford a correct data for the future:

	Total imports of coin.	Total Exports.	Total Re-exports.
1853	\$19,271,496	\$424,724	\$10,225,901
1859	7,434,789	57,502,307	6,385,106
1860	8,550,135	56,946,851	9,599,358
1861	48,339,611	23,799,870	5,991,320
1862	16,415,052	31,044,851	5,842,305
1864	9,584,105	55,693,562	8,165,046
1864	13,115,612	10,321,271	4,922,979
1865	9,810,072	64,618,124	3,331,941
1866	10,700,092	82,643,374	3,401,697
1867	22,070,475	34,976,196	5,892,176
1868	14,188,363	84,197,920	10,032,127
1869	19,807,876	42,915,966	14,222,424
1870	26,419,179	43,883,802	14,471,864
Total	\$223,700,862	\$741,251,233	\$102,287,167

At the commencement of this period the country was on a specie basis—now currency—and the people have lost that large amount of coin which was in daily circulation. The exact sum cannot be accurately determined, but as the issue of fractional currency is in excess of \$40,000,000, it cannot be less than \$100,000,000; indeed, many statisticians place it at double this figure. Assuming it to be one hundred millions, it undoubtedly furnished that amount of the exports, leaving about \$520,000,000 as the production of the country in thirteen years, beyond its consumption in arts, or \$40,000,000 per annum. There is nothing in the present that warrants the supposition of an increase in this production in the near future, while the only reserve fund is the gold in the Sub-Treasury, now under \$100,000,000, of which a large amount cannot be sold without exciting questions concerning the stability of the future interest. By no possibility can the Sub-Treasury sell over the actual amount belonging to it, which, after deducting coin certificates and accrued in-

terest, is now about \$35,000,000. This would give \$75,000,000 as the limit which for the present year can be made contingent use of, leaving only the coin production for the following year.

The important question now arises, Can a drain to this amount be brought against the country? Let the history of the past few years answer. According to ex-Commissioner Wells, the amount of "governments" held out of the United States, in the autumn of 1869, was one thousand million. According to General Butler, in 1870 it was \$1,200,000; while, in 1871, the *New York Economist* places it at \$1,300,000. These bonds had no existence nine years ago. Europe also holds a large amount of miscellaneous securities, variously estimated from \$300 to 2,000 million. Many popular railways were built during and since the rebellion, and many of the city and State debts are the result of the late rebellion, while a still larger amount of paper value is the offspring of that infatuation, "the watering process."

Certainly \$2,000,000,000 of these various obligations have gone abroad within eight years, or \$250,000,000 per annum, and that because Europe had a claim upon us to this amount, after taking everything the country could produce, including gold.

The interest account alone now amounts to \$120,000,000 in gold.

That the immediate future will witness a settlement in any other manner than in the past it is impossible to determine, though exchange is now at a very high point, and threatens a settlement. Still it may be deferred, and further new debt incurred.

If Europe should demand only interest in coin, instead of accepting railway or government obligations therefor, our coin production and Mr. Boutwell's surplus would be engulfed during the present year.

If Europe should require the settlement of trade balances, including interest as it accrues, the supply of coin would be exhausted during the coming summer.

Should Europe enforce a liquidation of her call loans and accrued claims, there is not sufficient coin in the Treasury to comply with her demand.

That the financial dangers which menace the country are known to Mr. Boutwell is apparent through his action in regard to the delivery of coin to bankers for shipment; for he well knows that when the export is on a scale commensurate with their claims he will lose control of the market. Europe will get all the gold, we will have all the paper, and then for the first time will the people realize the smothered volcano over which they have been resting, because they will then begin to see the eruption, which shall spread dismay and desolation where now there is a false security, which has been and is being engendered by the financial policy of a government in leading the nation blindly on to the coming destruction, of which it must either be aware or it is criminally ignorant.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS vs. THE RIGHTS OF THE COMMUNITY.

THE TEST OF GOVERNMENTAL CONTROL.

THE APPLICATION TO SOCIAL ORDER.

No. IV.

Governments, then, are organized to perform duty. They have no rights except the right to perform just what the people require of them. They may require a certain sort of duty to be rendered this year, and a very different sort of duty hereafter. Constitutions are merely to confine the execution of the duties of government within certain channels.

But constitutions are always the subjects of the will of the people who frame them. It is the very cheapest argument to say, that because our fathers formed a wise foundation for government, that we, their descendants, must never change it. Undoubtedly it was the best that could be applied then. It certainly is a great deal better than is the application made of it now. It is therefore laid down as unanswerable that the people themselves are always superior to any constitution and to any laws. They have inherent rights, of which no constitution or law can dispossess them, and which if an attempt be so made, it is not only the right but the duty of the objects of the attempt to denounce and rebel against such assumption of power never conferred by the people. It does not matter if this attempt include a single person, or a large aggregate of persons, the principle sacrificed is the same, and any government practicing such authority is a bogus government.

Our government has been gradually passing from a representative form, with the power in the people, into that in which the representatives seek to become the power, or toward a centralized government. It is not without cause that Democrats cry out against Republican centralization, but they entirely mistake the reality, and are as far upon the opposite side of the true standard as the Republicans are removed from it.

The Republicans have endeavored to increase the central power, that they may better execute the central will. The

true standard should be an increase of central power, that the will of the people may be better executed.

The Democrats affect to believe in the rights of individual members of the Union as superior to the rights of the Union. The true standard is that individual members can never freely exercise their rights as such, unless protected from encroachment by the power of the Union.

In other words the government is a vast machine, in the movements of which each separate part must act in harmony with every other part, which truth must upset both the Republican and Democratic theory, as expressed by present parties. Nor can the machine be cumbered with members and parts which have no connection with itself. If such exist in it, its motion will surely be, more or less, interfered with by such parts, and must finally be so clogged by them as to cease its movements, or be worn out by their weight.

Everything within an organized body must be utilized and turned into channels which will contribute to the public good. No body can carry an inanimate load without becoming affected by the disintegration which attaches to all bodies, whether active or passive in their connections. The liver cannot indefinitely perform its own functions and be laden with those of the kidneys; but it can assist the kidneys if, for any reason, they become temporarily impaired and unfitted to perform their whole duty. So also it is with society and governments having individualized powers, of which they are made up, they must be recognized and assigned to their proper position in the general economy, so that all the comprehensive elements may be reduced to the service of the general whole, in the promotion of whose good the good of the individual parts is always best subserved.

It becomes apparent, then, that government must consist of just that variety of general methods which will guide the movements of the governed, so that no interests will clash. And equally apparent that any special methods which cannot apply to the whole body of the governed, must, from their nature, bear upon, and interfere with, the general methods established; for if put in operation they must, for the time being, supplant the operations of the general. Therefore all special legislation is subversive of the common rights of the people, and, in reality, is null and void, and if imposed upon the people, compel a departure from a republican form of government and an approach to assumed authority.

There are other than special laws which trespass upon the rights of the people, and display a want of faith in the common honesty of the individual. Any organization, under any general form prescribed by the will of the people, enables those taking advantage thereof to co-operate to better purposes than if they acted merely upon individual right. All incorporated bodies are illustrations; granting peculiar advantages to the organization, it is the duty of the government to protect the community of individuals from their impositions. They are in no danger from individuals, but they may become dangerous to individuals. This fact government has entirely ignored, and the country is now suffering from the despotism of corporations.

This illustration is introduced here, not for the purpose of following it to its legitimate deductions—that must be done elsewhere at other times—but to open the way to the comprehension of where legitimate control over individuals begins and ceases. In all contracts individuals enter into with corporations, government should protect them; but with the contract between individuals, who derive no power from the government to make them, government has nothing to do. In these the honor of the individual must be the only determining power. Being entered upon by individuals, as individuals they must make their exit therefrom, and never call upon the community to protect them from the legitimate results of their own acts.

TENNIE C. CLAFLIN.

DENOMINATIONAL ENDOWMENTS.—Perfect freedom of religious opinion is guaranteed by the governmental theory of this nation. It is even charged against the nation that the republic has no God. It is of the very essence of American freedom that no religious opinion should be enforced on any citizen. This necessarily involves that there should be no undue encouragement of religious opinion. The State is not indifferent, but it is perfectly impartial, and guarantees to every individual the absolute and untrammelled right of private judgment. The Protestant sects are content with this let-alone arrangement. The Catholics desire perfect freedom, but they also claim State support. There is unquestionably a great and growing comparative increase in the Catholic population of the United States. It is said that from one-sixteenth in 1820, they have advanced to one-sixth in 1870. The next census reports will give us correct figures.

We sometimes have to go far afield to learn what is going on at home. A controversy now going on at Knoxville throws some light on the relations of the Catholic citizen to the State. The question is of school grants and educational system. The same battle is going on throughout the country. Father Finnegan, an able writer, comes squarely out and says: "It is argued we can teach our children their peculiar form of religion on Sunday. We are not satisfied with this arrangement. We believe that certain things are necessary for the soul's salvation. These things are very numerous and require constant and careful inculcation, and no school

can be satisfactory, except where the teaching of these things go hand in hand with secular education."

This is the whole issue—shall the common schools be Catholic? Shall education be bond or free? It is not only a question of education, although education is the main thing. The Catholics, as Catholics, receive aid and comfort by a thousand channels, direct and indirect. Their religious system is one of works, and their institutions are maintained at the cost of the whole State, ostensibly for the sake of public charity, but really for the sake of charity to the exercise of which Catholicism is the recipient is a condition precedent. In Europe Catholicism, though alive and active, has received a deadly wound. It is no longer sustained by State policy. With the profound craft that always has distinguished Romish rule, Rome seeks to turn our free system to her own profit. The good of the Church is the prime motive of every Catholic, and if there be a question between Catholicism and citizenship, we cannot doubt which will go to the wall. The *Knoxville Chronicle*, in its comments on the controversy, points the moral at the expense of New York: "If we turn to New York city, now under the control of the most corrupt and intolerant ring ever known in this country, we find its government practically under the control of the Romish Church. The voters in that city upon which Hoffman, Tweed and Hall rely are Irish Catholics. They are under the control of the priests, and whatever is ordered to be done, they willingly and slavishly do. They are practically in control of the public schools of that city. They control indirectly the State Legislature and the immense revenues of the city. In appropriations made for asylums, churches and schools they get the lion's share. What they have secured in New York through the connivance and aid of the Democracy, the party with which they invariably act, they seek to secure elsewhere. The same contest we are now to meet they have pressed everywhere. They 'demand' their share of public moneys, to be used not through public agents for the public good, but through their own priests for their own purposes."

THE CLAFLIN CONSPIRACY.

[From the Citizen and Round Table.]

The Claflin conspiracy has the merit of being the sublimest piece of impudence ever yet hatched by the red-hot malevolence of a mother-in-law. For twenty-four or more "unattached" members of the corps to enter calmly with baggage-wagons and equipments, and sit down and appropriate the mess of the regular fighting army, in present active service, was cool to a freezing extent; but for the same undaunted braves to insist on a court-martial to try the besieged ones for mildly suggesting that the paymistress objected, was a *coup de grace* of surprising brilliancy. The conception was grand, and the capital stroke of carrying off the aged and garrulous *vivandiere*, to testify against those who paid her board, showed military *finesse* of no mean calibre.

We trust that we may record our sympathy with Mrs. Woodhull and Miss Claflin without having an avalanche of anathemas hurled at our heads by an infuriated press, who, according to their views of the eternal fitness of things, argue that because the defendants are women, they must necessarily be all in the wrong in any case, and because they are women they must be tried, not according to the lights of justice and equity, but according to the standard of their personal virtue.

We have never seen either of the ladies. We know nothing, or scarcely anything, about them; but we are not going to apologize for tendering them the same amount of sympathy we would to two hard-working men in the same predicament. As to Col. Blood, we do think it hard that his mother-in-law should pound on his door the livelong night, and yell abuse at him in and out of season, and that he should purchase boots for an outrageous loafer to walk to court in to swear abominably against his wife and himself; that he should board the said mother-in-law in fine style and pay all her bills, while she was preparing a most diabolical torment for him.

THAT CONSPIRACY.

The first conspiracy was such a miserable failure that its promoters are stung to attempt a second. So be it. The fate of the next will be like that of the first—only more so.

Country gentlemen and Wall-street men had better invest their spare cash in a more profitable enterprise. This "won't pay."

JOHN SWINTON wakes up to a sense of the outer world. He thinks it is time to begin to think of woman suffrage. He gives mankind an organon, a philosophical, analytic method on which to examine the expediency of woman suffrage. Too late! too late! The cause is safe; the day of the previous question is over. What to do! is settled; the only point is, How to do it!

The Root of the Matter, or the Bible in the Role of the Old Mythologies.

BY C. B. P.

No. XV.

In Calmet's old Dictionary of the Bible there is a woman in the head of the Hebrew cherubim, as represented in the plate of the same. In the Hebrew cherubim, Egyptian or Grecian Sphinx, she was the same mystical woman who went "bobbing around" in the midst of the riddles and dark sayings of the old mythologies. She might be the mother of God or his bride. From the head of the cherubim she might speak with most miraculous organ, and open her mouth in parable to proclaim the voice from heaven. To unriddle her was to understand the mystery of the word in the wisdom of God. In ancient times, as per Cudworth, the "ungodding of the sun, and moon, and stars, was looked upon by the vulgar as nothing less than absolute atheism." It was the personification of these as the parts of the whole that constituted the fullness of the Godhead bodily, the Lord God of hosts who sat in the midst of heaven, having the earth his footstool—the invisible things being clearly seen and understood by the mode in which the sun and his ten thousand saints with fiery law in hand put in an appearance. The secret things which belong to God were veiled from the groundlings, lest the Lord break forth upon them, and many of them perish. As too much light is hurtful for weak eyes, not every one was permitted to enter into the Holy of Holies to disembowel sacred mysteries, and find Christ in the secret chambers by ungodding the sun. The multitude of the heavenly host lived, moved, and had their being with the sun, the visible angles, mediators and stars of the God of heaven, who "giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding, he revealeth the deep and secret things. He knoweth what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with him," as in the solar and astro-mythical romance of Daniel, with enough of historic reference interwoven without ungodding the sun, moon and stars, where "the heavens do rule."

Among the demons slain by solar deities, Muller finds the "shaggy one," who would seem to answer to the biblical goat, which, like the Shekinah, sometimes abode in a cloud. As per Gliddon, in appendix to "Types of Mankind," the goat may be translated either God or the Devil. As the scapegoat to be sent off to the wilderness, he would seem to have been that same old Satan on the brink of everlasting woe—the far-downer *Capricornus*, whose seat in this aspect was in the blackness of darkness forever at the winter solstice. Then let poor sinners stop and think before they further go, lest they shoot over *Capricorn* to everlasting woe.

The "shaggy one" sometimes took Michael in flank, to fight it out on that line, if it took from morn till noon, from noon till dewy eve, a summer's day; or rather from eve till midnight, from midnight till break of day, when the Lord awakened, as one out of sleep, and smote his enemies in their hinder parts. Daniel's "shaggy one," whether goat or ram, performs in the mythic drama. Here the myth-devil, Ahri-man, the Prince of the kingdom of Persia, put down the brakes one and twenty days, till Michael, one of the chief princes, came up to the help of the Lord against the mighty. In vain did the devil have understanding of dark sentences and see the light shine unto the darkness, while he himself hovered under the cope of hell. He could not shine where Michael is your prince.

In this spacious firmament on high, with all its blue ethereal sky, "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever."

Thus it would appear that, in having understanding of dark sentences, one may see how Lucifer, son of the morning, might have a root in the offspring of David, and be transformed into the bright and morning star, an angel of Jesus, to testify unto you these things in the churches.

Michael, as the chief Prince or Sun, was the Illuminator, the Animator, or the Mediator, and might equally take the name of the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost. Throughout all the old theologues, whatever the name, it was always as one with God, or performing the part assigned by the *Deus ex Machina*, whether in sextile, trine, and square and opposite. As the Illuminator, Shekinah, or the Sun, God was continually playing fast and loose among the clouds, sometimes hiding his face in wrath for a little season, and then radiating with the light of his countenance, being very pitiful and tender of mercy. Manifestations being so personified that under a cloud we must read the wrath of the Lamb.

God dwelling among the clouds was sometimes the black demon, who withheld the early and the later rains. It was in this guise that Milton saw him rattling on over the Caspian, with heaven's artillery fraught, and thundering marvellously with his voice. As per Muller, the cloud is sometimes the "black-skin," and this may have been the Ethiopian woman whom Moses married—the Lord himself coming down in the cloud to make Miriam leprous seven days for her dislike of the "black-skin." Night, too, could be personified as the "black-skin," and Miriam, or Mary, equivalent to the Dawn, might claim that the Lord spake to her to open the gates to let the King of Glory come in. In accompaniment with her timbrel she might sing the morning psalm, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted

up ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in, the Lord strong and mighty in battle"—the same Sun and King of Glory who put the devil to the worse in a free and open encounter.

The horses of the Sun, with their necks clothed with thunder, smelt the battle afar off, and rushed at the black demon of the clouds and of night, who made darkness his secret place—his pavilion round about him dark waters and thick clouds of the sky; or there might be the lighter tissue-work sufficing to veil his presence. But whether the God of the firmament above, or the waters under the earth, all were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized with Moses in the cloud and in the sea, there being the same spiritual meat and the same spiritual drink for those who knew how to partake of manna from heaven. From the spiritual Rock one might suck the sincere milk of the Word, with honey out of the rock and oil out of the flinty rock. From the cleft in the Rock one might also see the shady side of God, while His brightness was too much to look upon.

The black demon of the clouds was often the Prince of this world; but let loose only for a little season so to veil the Sun as to make him refuse to give his light, or to cause the Moon to be turned into blood. He was the demon who walked in darkness and wasted at noonday, raining down great stones from heaven, the Destroyer, the Adversary, the Leviathan, that crooked serpent in that day of the Lord till Michael, "with his sore and great and strong sword," flanked him, and thus slew the Dragon that is in the sea and walloped him out of heaven.

There was manifest the rainbow of our Lord, mingled with gall, and running purple to the sea, from the deep wound made in his side by the black demon of the clouds. Nevertheless it was the bow of promise and of victory that the Lord would shine again. The blood of the wounded Sun was the blood shed for the redemption of man. As the Devil departed for a season, so would angels minister unto the Lord, and everywhere appear the quickening spirit in the newness of life. He would be the resurrection and the life for all who put their trust in him; but while the strong meat was of the personified and dramatic heavens, the babes in Christ stood not on the order of their receiving, but stood gazing up into heaven to see the hero-person come in clouds. To these babes in Christ, or fledglings of the Word, Mother Goose in Israel sang wondrous ditties all a summer's day.

How much blood-theology we have had from the blood of the wounded Sun, streaming across the ancient sky and sweating the same on earth. With so much vesture dipped in blood, need we wonder that much more than rams and goats, and calves, the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin. Need we wonder that, so much blood in the dying agony of the Sun, or "Tragedy of Nature," spouted from the wine press, or ran purple along the sky even up to the bridles of the Lord's chariot horses. Judas, the night devil, prepared the way for the Lord's descent into hell, nor could John forbear to wonder with great admiration when he saw the woman on the scarlet beast in the same great wine press of the wrath of God.

Sometimes the ram and the goat ran into each other in the same shaggy cloud; and it may be difficult to decide whether one or both came up to the help of the Lord against the mighty, or to do each other on the plains of heaven, while the Lord looked out from the pillar of a cloud. It would seem that Gabriel held the stakes, and instructed Daniel into the kingdom of heaven—"forasmuch as an excellent spirit, and knowledge, and understanding, interpreting dreams, and shewing of hard sentences, and dissolving of doubts, were found in the same Daniel." As per Muller, on the mythology of the further East—"While thus the cloud itself is spoken of as a black-skin, the demon of the cloud, or the cloud personified, appears in the Veda as a ram, *i. e.*, as a shaggy, hairy animal."

The Lamb of God cometh with clouds, and the Mosaic "ram of consecration" would seem to have been fleeced in the same shaggy cloud. The demon of the thicket may have put in an appearance to save Isaac from the offering to the Sun. Thus the demon who dwelt in the thick darkness played fast and loose with the Shekinah who also abode in the cloud.

The demon clothed with the black cloud—we may suppose the Lamb of God to have been fleeced with the white, and the marriage to his Wife, like the marriage of Oedipus to Iocaste—was just as in the Sanskrit hymns India is called the husband of the Dawn, and sometimes her son. "In fact," says Mr. Cox, "the whole nature of the gods in these very ancient poems is still transparent. There are no genealogies or settled marriages. The father is sometimes the son, the brother is the husband, and she who in one hymn is the mother is in another the wife."

Parallel to this runs much of the mythology of old Jewry. The Mother of God is clothed with the Sun. She is also his Wife in the sign of the Lamb. She may be the supposed wife of Joseph in the old sign of Taurus, but Gabriel instructs her into the kingdom of heaven, and she is the Spirit Bride in the New Jerusalem. Father, Son and Holy Ghost may have a large range of the ancient heaven as well as the demon of the black cloud among the sons of God. Adam and Eve play fast and loose in the wisdom of the Serpent. Adam knew his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain, and so she got a man from the Lord. Cain went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod. He, too, knew his wife, who grew, like Topsy, in the Nod-land, where

she put in an appearance quite as naturally as Eve from the rib. Adah and Zillah also were in the secret of the Lord by bearing Tubal-Cain as the doer in brass and iron, and is mystically one with Vulcan, who also worked in iron and brass, and may have had somewhat to do in making the Brazen Serpent. It was in these days that men began to call upon the name of the Lord, or, as per Calmet, "called themselves by the name of Jehovah."

Noah, at five hundred years old, has a wife on the other side of the flood, and the myth-gatherer sets him afloat with his sons, and wife, and his sons' wives, with beasts, fowls and every creeping thing, in twos and in sevens. This *omnium gatherum* into the Ark would seem to have been a sore trial for the harmonial philosophy, for, as per "Book of Jasher," the happy family were "tossed about like pottage in a caldron." However, the Ark sufficed as a *pons asinorum*, or asses' bridge, for Thomas Bolin, his wife and wife's mother, all to get over the flood together.

Abram and Sarai, Isaac and Rebecca, Jacob and his wives play the same role in different ways as the heroes and mystical women of Gentile mythology—the Hebrew mythology using the same machinery to work with, but having its own peculiar way for the *Deus ex Machina*. Leslie, in "Origin of Man," finds Abraham, Isaac and Jacob mythical, and when every scribe is instructed into the kingdom of heaven it may be discovered of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures that much of the Godhead is in mythical relations with the Sun and heavenly host—that Christ, the day-star of the soul, was also a name of the sun, and the wife of his mystical marriage the pure heaven in white, or her garment changeably tinted, or fringed with blue, golden and purple. Her crown of twelve stars were the twelve of the Zodiac, and as the poetic virgin of Israel, she was as lovely as any of the daughters of God.

Two thousand years before our era the Sun was in the bull-sign to eat the Passover at the Easter equinox, and take away the sins of the world, instead of the Ram of God; but whether the "Golden Ox" or the "Golden Fleece" of the Lamb, either would be Son of God as clothed with the Sun, the same as St. John's woman who was so clothed. In Egypt Typhon is that same old serpent called the Devil and Satan, but Isis, the virgin of Egypt, is victorious over him, like St. John's woman over the dragon when the earth helped her. In Egypt, per St. John, our Lord was mystically crucified, and there too was the great Dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers. Nor do we fail to make acquaintance with the "Gilded Ox," the leader up of the seven fat and seven lean kine in the sign of Joseph, or Taurus—the same cross being the symbol of the Bull or "Gilded Ox," as the Lamb who afterwards took away the sins of the world. As per Wilkinson, the Bull Apis was "an excellent interpretation of futurity." No less did the Ram in the latter day, with his golden fleece of clouds, betoken the Coming Man or Messiah, to feed his people in the large place of Him who was and is, and is to come. Did he not feed thousands with loaves and fishes from the Zodiacal baskets, and so the Redeemer in his latter days upon the earth.

The spiritualists of ancient Egypt sought as much as possible to live upon the bread from heaven. The nature worshippers, or students of nature, were much averse to gluttony, "that their bodies may sit as light about their souls as possible, in order that their mortal part may not oppress and weigh down the more divine and immortal," as per Wilkinson.

A DOUBTING HEART.

BY ADELAIDE ANNE PROCTOR.

Where are the swallows fled?
Frozen and dead,
Perchance upon some bleak and stormy shore,
O doubting heart!
Far over the purple seas
They wait in sunny ease,
The balmy southern breeze
To bring them to their northern homes once more.

Why must the flowers die?
Prisoned they lie
In the cold tomb, heedless of tears or rain,
O, doubting heart!
They only sleep below
The soft white ermine snow,
While winter winds shall blow,
To breathe and smile upon you soon again.

The sun hath hid its rays
These many days;
Will dreary hours never leave the earth?
Oh, doubting heart!
The stormy clouds on high
Veil the same summer sky
That soon for spring is nigh,
Shall wake the summer into mirth.

Fair hope is dead and light
Is quenched in night;
What sound can break the silence of despair?
Oh, doubting heart!
The sky is overcast,
Yet stars shall rise at last,
Brighter for darkness past,
And angels' silver voices stir the air.

PLAIN HAIR is rapidly becoming fashionable. Ladies who have ruined their hair by a long course of hot iron and crimping pins, will now be necessitated to wear "false fronts" to hide their deficiency of hair.

ADVANCE SHEETS FROM THE PROVIDENCE,
R. I., "NEW WORLD."

PAULINA WRIGHT DAVIS, EDITOR.

FREEDOM TO DO RIGHT.

"Resolved, That the basis of order is freedom from bondage; not, indeed, of such 'order' as reigned in Warsaw, which grew out of the bondage; but of such order as reigns in Heaven, which grows out of that developed manhood and womanhood in which each becomes 'a law unto himself.'"

"Resolved, That freedom is a principle, and that as such it may be trusted to ultimate in harmonious social results, as in America, in harmonious and beneficent political results; that it has not hitherto been adequately trusted in the social domain, and that the woman's movement means no less than the complete social as well as the political enfranchisement of mankind."

"Resolved, That the evils, sufferings and disabilities of women, as well as of men, are social still more than they are political, and that a statement of woman's rights which ignores the right of self-ownership as the first of all rights is insufficient to meet the demand, and is ceasing to enlist the enthusiasm and even the common interest of the most intelligent portion of the community."

"Resolved, That the principle of freedom is one of principle, and not a collection of many different and unrelated principles; that there is not at bottom one principle of freedom of conscience as in Protestantism, and another principle of freedom from slavery as in Abolitionism, another of freedom of locomotion as in our dispensing in America with the passport system of Europe, another of the freedom of the press as in Great Britain and America, and still another of social freedom at large, but that freedom is one and indivisible, and that slavery is so also; that freedom and bondage, or restriction, is the alternative and the issue alike in every case; and that if freedom is good in one case it is good in all; that we in America have builded on freedom, politically, and that we cannot consistently recoil from that expansion of freedom which shall make it the basis of all our institutions; and finally, that so far as we have trusted it, it has proved in the main, safe and profitable."

We presented the above resolutions as an expression of our thought on freedom, at the recent Woman Suffrage Convention in New York:

We presented them as the advanced thought, knowing them likely to be misunderstood, carped about, and possibly condemned utterly by some of the progressive minds of to-day; but we also knew that until the line was broken, those in the rear could take no step forward, and we would not that they should take a flying leap over our heads and land, possibly, in the mud; possibly on heights where it might take time for us to reach them. It is the business of some one to launch new ideas, not one of which is ever lost.

Regarding freedom as a principle, we hold that a person in order to be a law unto himself or herself, must be absolutely free, that is without physical restraint.

We will illustrate by the human system. If it is healthy and in natural conditions, the whole complex organization works without friction. The brain takes no cognizance of the stomach, of the heart, or liver; the blood courses through veins and arteries, the capillary and all action is steady and regular as though there were no law in existence, because the whole organism is in harmony with God's law. Now tie a ligature around the arms, take a stimulant into the stomach, breathe an impure, vitiated atmosphere, and see what a commotion is raised, and how soon the brain is cognizant of laws violated. A febrile action is set up, the heart, the lungs, the brain—all the higher organs enter an indignant protest against this violation of the harmonies. Being free, each organ chooses what is best for it. Constrained by physical force, they are thrown into confusion.

We come together in voluntary associations or organizations, and all is harmonious. Some individual, possessed with a love of power, ties a ligature on an arm, compresses the lungs, stimulates the stomach, and then friction begins.

It is usurpation of authority, an incessant demand for legislation that is fretting and chafing human souls. Things seem out of joint and wrong: without seeing the cause we fly to external law to cure the ill, prohibition or license of an evil, making a penalty of dollars and cents or brief imprisonment the remedy, and then the public conscience is at rest. The mind and will of the offender—that part of us which, by provision or fore-knowledge of scientific principles, must accept or reject evil—is still either unconvinced or untamed.

The Egyptian priesthood arbitrarily and without any scientific knowledge, prescribed to each class and caste just what they should eat and drink. Modern science presents the physiological laws and becomes, per force, regulative, for the free will yields voluntary obedience to laws founded in nature.

What can be done for the health and happiness of the individual, by scientific knowledge, may be done for the whole body politic by teaching self-preservation and self-government.

With the vast amount of taxes levied to punish crime, let us begin prevention. Let there be free halls where lectures on all departments of science shall be given to the masses. Give the drama free to the people; the opera to those who love music; free baths, and the free schools made so attractive that children will need no compulsion to make them attend. A look toward prevention is found in the union for Christian work, the free amusement room, the reading-room and the varied forms of instruction, has saved many young lads from a down-hill course.

It is an admitted postulate, that the human system needs stimulus, but it is by no means a scientific certainty that that stimulus should be wine or alcohol. On the other hand science proves clearly that alcohol, in any form, never is incorporated into the system, but always acts as a foreign substance. Give to the brain and heart the mental stimulus it demands, and you have obviated the necessity, the craving for alcohol.

Freedom on the temperance question may be trusted if science is made a basis of teaching; and on the one live question of the day, viz., the woman question freedom is the one demand.

A true, high, pure nature, never asks if the law allows this or that—it follows its own intuitions; it avoids evil, just as the sheep browsing on the hillside turns away from the poison laurel and feeds only on the wholesome and nutritious herb.

No mother says, "I must take care of my babe, and love my husband because the law says so." She never thinks of

the law. She never grudges or charges her babe six cents, per pint for its milk. She obeys the laws of her nature, which may be trusted. No statute could compel this love, this devotion which gives freely of the life-blood—she is free to love or hate. Law can coerce the external, and hold her bound only in the outward. If these relations become hateful, the interior bond falls asunder like flax touched by fire. If, then, the interior law—that written by the author of all sciences on the soul—is so much higher and stronger than the statute laws, are people safe in social relations when hatred, strife and malice are engendered by close proximity? The law may compel them to eat the flesh, to drink the blood and pick the bones in these social relations, if it choose, but it cannot sanctify what is sinful, nor make harmonies out of discord and compulsion. Self-ownership is the first demand for all the relations of life and self-government on scientific principles, the basic line for all humanity.

OUR INDIAN TROUBLES.

THEIR CAUSES, COST AND CURE.

BY JOHN B. WOLFF.

No. V.

The Minnesota massacre was occasioned by long-continued injustice and frauds practised by the whites, in the shape of agents, traders, and speculators of every class, who took advantage of the ignorance and necessities of the Indians until forbearance ceased to be a virtue with them, and in regular Indian fashion they retaliated on the guilty and innocent alike. Let us not forget that with all our boasted justice and christian kindness, we are gradually crushing out these children of the forest, not by natural necessity, but by abnormal and unnecessary methods, and they see and feel all this—fully comprehend the situation. We, therefore do wrong when we charge these outbreaks to their immediate and proximate incidents.

There is always a lurking feeling of hostility, the natural result of years of abuse, which, like a magazine of powder, is ready to explode from a very small spark. There prevails, for the reason named, a strong feeling of dissatisfaction and animosity, among all the wild tribes who have been thus wronged, and which it will be very difficult to eradicate. With this feeling, if a soldier or citizen kills an Indian, or does some other obnoxious act, the Indian seeks the easiest method and first opportunity of revenge; and thus are Indian wars inaugurated, which might easily be avoided. It will be remembered that the Indians captured and hung for the massacre in Minnesota, showed by every act, to the last, that they felt they had done nobly and bravely. All the wild tribes have been fully informed in regard to that execution, and it will remain a festering sore for a generation to come.

The next general outbreak was on the Platte and Arkansas Rivers, which was hastened and intensified by the Minnesota affair. In the year of 1849 the overland emigration to California commenced, mostly over the Platte and Arkansas River roads. It 1858 it commenced to Colorado, and in 1859 it became a great tide, numbered by tens of thousands, traveling in every possible shape.

At this time the Cheyennes and Arapahoe Indians of the plains had laid claims of unpaid balances due from the government and withheld for years. All this travel and the necessary and unnecessary destruction of game, and the withholding of the annuities, and other grievances, were endured, and no outrages committed on those routes until an unprovoked attack was made by a squad of soldiers in the neighborhood of the City of Denver, Colorado. A small band of Indians were found in possession of stock supposed to be stolen, but alleged plausibly by them to have been found astray, and they were then taking the stock to the settlements for identification. Their guns were demanded and refused. Whereupon they were fired upon and some of them killed. This was the spark that cost hundreds of lives and millions of property. But it is not to be denied that there was a growing dissatisfaction, for causes above named, and only needed this incident to inflame it into destructive fury.

The Land Creek massacre, which, unlike the Minnesota (Indians by white old men, women, and children), in real Indian style, was one of the sequels of the former unjust and impolitic conduct of an irresponsible military captain, which culminated an intensification of the barbarities of that protracted and disastrous conflict. It is, perhaps, true that there were Indians in that camp who had been guilty of depredations, but it is also true that they had been called to the adjacent fort by the Governor and furnished food and protection, and had not been detected in any acts of hostility after this quasi treaty had been made. It is further true that they were driven away from the fort by military orders, that they were in camp, and seeking to prevent starvation by hunting, and that they had asked to remain near the post on the Arkansas, where they would have been directly under the eye of the military. To butcher these Indians and not be able to follow up the victory, provided they were hostile, was only to call down greater vengeance in other quarters, which was the fact.

Then came the massacre by Custer, under Sheridan, of Black Kettle and his band—an Indian who had never lifted

his hand against his white brother—had always been his friend, and had resigned his position in the tribe to escape the necessity of taking part in the raids on the settlements, and always counselled peace. All the glory that Sheridan acquired in the late war was eclipsed by this act of perfidy and murder. These facts are again alluded to for the purpose of showing that we are indebted largely to the presence of the military in the Indian country for a large per cent. of the provocations; and to their wanton and injudicious exercise of their powers, for the actual commencement of hostilities, as well as the perpetuation of the memory of unmerited outrages, as compounding interest to be collected from future generations. We have some startling revelations to make in regard to these same military operations which ought to arouse the whole nation. In our next we shall begin the financial part of the subject.

A WORD IN SEASON.

An agitation meeting is to be held at a private house in this city to-day, to discuss the movements of both the associations of wild women, who lately held convalescence at Steinway and Apollo Halls. Certain members of the little clique of women who represent the County Suffrage Association, it is presumed will attempt to call Miss Anthony, Miss Lozier and others who gave Mrs. Woodhull the right hand of fellowship on the platform of the National Association, to account for their temerity, and attempt to vindicate their own moral and social status by the wholesale condemnation of their course.

It is very funny. The reproving ring are of that sort which suggests the familiar quotation—"Satan reproving sin." It is an old saying that "Whoso liveth in a house of glass should not be ready to throw stones." But women are ever ready to forget the homely adage, and in the endeavor to maintain even an uncertain position on the outskirts of the "best society," into which they are struggling to enter, will often attempt to assure their own position by pulling other folks down. Our opinions concerning the leader of the Apollo Hall suffragists have been well ventilated. We advise, however, the three or four women who have been chewing gall for the last week, because they were apparently put in the shade by both conventions, to keep quiet. Be just as virtuous and exclusive and proper and nice as you possibly can in your private lives and conversation, but don't make too much parade and talk of it before the world. Your little histories, we are told, are jotted down in the annals of halls of learning; are chronicled among the free-love spiritualists, to which one of you belong; are the laughing stock of the journalistic circle on which another is a parasite. A little too much "stand-back-I-am-holier-than-thou" talk even to Mrs. Woodhull-Blood, or criticism of Miss Anthony, Mesdames Hallock, Lozier and Stanton, for recognizing her, may arouse some indignant person to give three or four little histories to the world which would make quite as much stir in the ranks of suffrage, journalism and sorosis, as the clishmaclaver about your Sister Woodhull has done. Keep quiet, dears. "Soiling another will never make yourself clean," you know.—*Star*.

DEATH.

A SONNET.

O Death! why do men fear thee and surround
Thy name with terrors, that the stout heart fears
With creeping flesh the chill ill-omened sound,
Though he would meet thee, nameless, free from tears,
Nor sigh as sounds die on his bloodless ears,
And fainter grows the forms of friends around?
When thou dost summon us, we leave this coil
Of changeful earth to be resolved, may be,
To grass or flowers or elemental soil;
The living soul to fleshly garb set free
Like the gay fly that bursts his wintry tomb,
Man knows a brighter and more genial day,
And finds a happier sempiternal home.

—*Intellectual Repository.*

THE NEW YORK Code amendments call for some strong strictures from the learned in the law. Judge Dwight is out with some cogent remarks on the subject of that mysterious and most indefinable offense, "contempt of court." Anything may be a contempt of court if a judge is only sensitive enough. The power of the court contemned is absolute and irresponsible. Whether the court knows itself or not, it cannot be contemned. The Erie judges are as safe from contempt as Kent or Story. The judge may squint at justice ever so obliquely, may be totally unable to see it, but contempt, however strong, must not be expressed. The penalties are irreversible; nothing short of purging will be accepted. The Code proposes to define when the court is contemptible.

MISS KATE STANTON will enter the lecture-field next fall with a lecture entitled "Whom to Marry," and she says she shall study her subject all summer. Miss Stanton is, we believe, a young lady, and she never had a husband in her life; wherefore her lecture will probably be—we will say interesting. During the summer, however, her loneliness may be remedied; and in that case she will have to tear up her old lecture and write another and entirely different one, which may be valuable. It isn't a bad idea, occasionally, for one to know what one is talking about.

HENRY WARD BEECHER says, "It will scarcely be denied that men are superior to women, as men; and that women are immeasurably superior to men, as women; while both of them together are more than a match for either of them separately." That is a sound platform.

