

# The American Spiritualist.

PHENOMENAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL.

VOL. V: No. 4.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 3, 1872.

\$2.50 PER YEAR.

## The Orthodox Churchist and the Progressive Spiritualist:

OR, WHAT ARE YOU? AND WHO AM I?

BY WILLIAM BRUNTON.

What are you who go to church, where the wealth and fashion go,  
Fair and gay in summer sun, well and warm in winter snow?  
You believe the doctrines taught, love her way to heaven and hell,  
Love to hear the story told, how the race in Adam fell,  
Love to hear the parson say, "'Tis, my friends, no earthly use,  
Thinking works and deeds can save, grapes like these produce no juice!"  
Yes, you trust his honored word, spite of carnal reason's say,  
Walk this pleasant path and find saving blessing day by day.  
"You can read your title clear to the mansions in the sky,"  
"Feast the feast of endless days" with the saints of years gone by;  
Smile at danger, come what will, since you count among the flock,  
All through being fixed and firm like the good old meeting clock!  
Thus, you tell me what you are, cast aside our common care,  
Find salvation, peace and joy in the churches, grace and prayer.

I, a poor, sad outcast soul, once like you, did go to church,  
Took to reading books and such, till I left her in the lurch;  
Hard I tried to credit all, failed with biggest heft of try,  
Found the creeds so mighty small, let the whole ship load go by.  
God was beat with devil and men, even angels scorched their wings,  
Till I said, 'tis old wives fables, can't accept these foolish things;  
Turned to see if nought remained in our world but food like this:  
Saw and heard the spirits talk, with a palpitating bliss;  
For it made the world my home, pure and perfect in its time,  
Men, my brothers, bold and true, toiling up to heights sublime;  
Love was plain as stars and flowers, all the earth rejoiced in love,  
Life was life, the same in kind as the life of worlds above!  
Yes, I took the truth at once, prize it now as jewels rare,  
Love it more than all your creeds, all your churches, faith and prayer!

Yes, you retort, 'tis well enough, talking this in easy style,  
Just because my heart is bad, full of satan's secret guile,  
You retire from gun-shot range, when the speaking grows so free,  
Seeking shelter in the fold where the wolves can never be!  
You ne'er list to Radicals, Denton, Peebles, or their kind;  
No, nor read our literature lest it might convert your mind;  
Think it wise to leave the world working evil, while you pray,  
Pray that God will come and do what His duteous children may,  
Means of grace are all your grace, Faith alone the saving power,  
Bible still your only hope, with its mystic papal dower.  
There you stand, let science teach, knowledge proving worst or best,  
You are safe in Noah's ark, safe in Zion's peaceful rest;  
Tact and talent win the day, pay religion is your plan,  
You are called a saint, of course, I a wicked worldly man!

You present the people chaff, inspirations old and dried,  
I, the living principles, past and present well supplied;  
You in simpers give assent, I debate the things I hear,  
You are lost in fogs and mist, I am reaching regions clear,  
You persist in ancient rules, I in Nature's living heart,  
You are dreaming far-off "ifs," I to-day perform my part!  
So, don't tell the tale again, orthodox with crowning boast,  
I'm the fish that swims the sea, you the shells upon the coast;  
I am that and you are this, each pursuing what seems right,  
Neither worthy praise or blame, only as we look for light:  
Church can't make a man a man, books can't make the leper clean,  
Facts are fresh as April skies, here the pith of life is seen:  
Come and help to make them known, ceasing scorn and foolish ban,  
In the church or out the church, help the cause of God and man!

LAST Saturday evening was the one set apart in the saintly calendar as sacred to the memory of St. Agnes who, after suffering every kind of persecution that fiendish cruelty could invent, gave her young life to martyrdom for her faith in Christ, in the reign of the Emperor Diocletian, on the 21 of January, 304.

## Extracts from Debatable Land--By Robert Dale Owen.

A VOLUME TREATING ON A SUBJECT INTIMATELY CONNECTED WITH THE PRESENT ATTITUDE OF THE RELIGIOUS WORLD, AND DEDICATED TO THE PROTESTANT CLERGY.

"To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven."—ECCLESIASTES.

For every man, according to his light and conviction, there exists a certain duty to society, be it humble or elevated, evinced in words or in daily acts. If, after jealous watch set on motive and strict diligence in probing the verity and weighing the worth of what one may have to say, the conviction still abides that it ought to be said, one may be unfaithful in remaining silent. With such care and under such impression I tender to you what follows.

My work has this one claim, at least, on your attention, that what is therein set forth, alloyed with misconception and circumscribed by short-sight though it be, has been written religiously under the dictate of candor and of conscience, as if every word were to be laid at the foot of the Almighty's throne.

You will admit the grave importance of my subject-matter, since it refers, first to the present state of theology and the religious needs of the world; incidentally to the reality of plenary inspiration; again, to the character of what, in the gospels and the epistles, are termed sometimes signs and wonders, sometimes spiritual gifts; and, finally and specially, to the question whether phenomena analogous to these have come to light in the present age.

A just view of these subjects, vital beyond measure as they are, is unspeakably essential to the advancement of man's spiritual part. It is to you we may properly turn for this. Your office, in itself considered and looking to the eminence of its duties, is the highest upon earth; for the spiritual part is the man—is and will be in other phase of life than this. You ought to be the leaders of mankind. But zeal, learning, and the sincerest piety even, suffice not for the maintenance of such a position. As the world grows older, the letter of the ancient law, ecclesiastical or secular, governs less, and the spirit of the age more. They only can lead the world's advance who act upon this truth.

A layman, inviting your attention as I do, has this apology: that, within the immunities of your churches, you are not favorably situated to hear outside truth. I think you hear less of it than any other body of men. It is a privilege fraught with temptation to speak once a week, year after year, secure against challenge or reply: for it tends to mislead speaker and hearers alike. Among those who approach you the greater number mistake submissive acquiescence for respect: but the best token of respect, in addressing any man, or any class of men, is outspoken frankness and plain dealing.

The common result of your position is to restrict, within sectarian limits, your habitual periscope. And thus others, transgressing routine bounds, may have come upon fields of research which you, within the pale, disparaging them as barren, never see. If, for example, any among you have given as much time and thought as I to the question whether, in our own day as in times gone by, denizens of another world occasionally influence for good or evil, the concerns of this, it has not been my good fortune to

know it. Yet, discreetly pursued, there is no inquiry more legitimate, none reaching farther in its ethical and religious results. Nor is it we, pursuing such studies, who should defend our course: it is they that neglect them who may properly be called upon to show warrant for their neglect.

It is a belief justified by the history of the world that God permits man to acquire fresh knowledge in measure commensurate with his wants, and at the times when he becomes able to bear it.\* Every age has its special needs, industrial, political, social, spiritual. I think there are strong reasons for the opinion that, at the present time, we lack, to sustain wholesome, reformatory faiths and to correct old errors that have been mixed up with these, direct aid from spiritual sources. If the history written by the Evangelists be a record with any valid claim to authenticity, it enters into God's economy to grant unto men, at certain times, such aid. It is a question of fact to be decided by proper evidence, whether He is supplying it now. Certain it is that the historical records of two thousand years ago, standing alone, fail to bring home to the free-inquiring mind of to-day the same convictions which they wrought in our ancestors.† Modern belief in the unseen urgently needs freshening and additional support.

This will appear the rather, if we scan dispassionately the actual position of the religious world; its attitude toward science and the dilemma in which it finds itself, whether it accepts or rejects the accredited discoveries of the day. The more thoughtful among your number cannot have failed to mark the signs of the times. They must feel that a stationary policy is no longer practicable. Scepticism is silently, but surely, undermining once popular doctrines: the old ground is giving way under our feet.

Not that there is cause for alarm except to those who think the world can be saved by dint of drag-chains only. Religion is in no more danger of subversion than are the eternal hills of sinking away, for its foundations in the soul are firmer than theirs in the solid earth: but opinions that cannot stand before the world's growth must, sooner or later, be subverted, do what you will in their defence. It is in vain that we cling to antiquated perplexities of doctrine, if it shall prove that these have become as much out of place under the lights of the nineteenth century as would be the belief of five hundred years ago that the pillars of Hercules marked the western boundary of the earth.

Beyond doubt many of your number are earnest in their convictions that what they deem Orthodoxy needs no spiritual influx to sustain its progress or rectify its errors; that it has no unphilosophical spirit to be reformed, nor any pernicious fallacies to be retracted. But if they are right in this, some problems connected with the history of Protestantism are of very difficult solution.

I allude to certain incidents for which we must go back some three hundred and fifty years, and which connect themselves with the rise and progress of the great REFORMATION—with its wonderful successes and its remarkable reverses—especially during the first century and a quarter of its growth.

\*John xvi. 12.

† "Doubts to the world's child-heart unknown  
Question us now from star and stone;  
Too little or too much we know,  
And sight is swift and faith is slow:  
The power is lost to self-deceive  
With shallow forms of make-believe."

—WHITTIER: *The Meeting.*



## VICTORIA C. WOODHULL'S SPEECH,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hold, then, that I was right in going to Congress to demand redress; and I further hold that everything that has since occurred, connected with this question as relating to women, proves that I was right—proves that we have no hope whatever for redress by any other means. In a State where men specially desire to invite the immigration of women, they were denied an amendment to the state constitution by a vote of six to one. If that is to be taken as a sample of what men will

do where they should be specially favorable to women on account of their scarcity, what may we expect in States where women predominate? Do you, my friends, see any hope that way? I confess I do not.

Turn you to Wyoming, and what do we see there as a result of the theory that citizens may be enfranchised and disfranchised at will simply because they don't choose to vote as it is desired that they should vote? Is that the kind of Republicanism under which you want to live? Do you want your State to grant you suffrage one day, and take it away the next? Have men ever undertaken to play that game with their own sex? Not a bit of it. And, were it ever attempted, I think I can name a hundred Congressmen who would launch their oratorical thunder, till the whole country should ring with its echoes. And it would be right. It would be ignoble in them not to do so. But in our case—why, it is quite a different matter. They don't deem it quite expedient. They don't know exactly what use we shall make of the ballot if they permit us to get it. We are only women, you know—between whom and men, it is said, there is an impassable political gulf fixed. But let me simply say to those expedient Congressmen, who think more of their positions and prospects than they do of justice, that they cannot afford to maintain that position.

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

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

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

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

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

But, as I have said, the question is now narrowed down to a very small point—a single point—but around it are grouped several important questions which, it appears to me, must have been either totally ignored, or, at best, but casually observed by those who established it, as the position from which to resist the attack of Woman Suffrage, under the Constitution as it is. It has seemed to me ever since I thought upon this subject that we had a queer sort of a Republican form of government whose Constitution had to be amended



in order to meet each new contingency. It appeared to me that "We the people" included all the people. But our wise governors seated in the Capitol inform us quite to the contrary. They tell us that "We the people" are only those persons whom from time to time their graciousness permits the privilege of interest in government.

That is to say, though our Constitution is based upon individual equality, exact justice and perpetual freedom, yet those whom men choose to legislate have the right to decide who are to be the recipients of these blessings which the Constitution was ordained to guard, protect and defend. Some of you may be able to comprehend such a position, and see its benign results; but, for my part, I freely confess I am too obtuse. I can understand the simple propositions of the theory of our government; but, for the life of me, I lose sight of the theory altogether if I attempt to grasp the application which is made of it in practice—since the paradox is too obscure for me to discover its truth. And this Republican Paradox, enunciated by Senator Carpenter, became to me still more enveloped in clouds and fogs after it passed the searching ordeal of Justice Cartter's logic. The Paradox, as stated by Mr. Carpenter (as far as can be discovered from his language), is this: We have a Republican form of government because we are compelled by the Constitution to have it, and it consists of the right of States to deny the right to vote to any citizen, except male negroes, which, after passing through the judicial furnace of Justice Cartter's brain, becomes still further attenuated—since, he says, that to admit the theory that the right to self-government is an inherent right is to destroy our civilization—hence the right don't exist.

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

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

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

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

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

But how are we to know whether the States ever had a Republican form of government? Mr. Carpenter says: "The Courts would undoubtedly have held that the States under the old Constitution were Republican;" but, unfortunately, that question was never raised, and

of course it was never decided. It seems to me, however, that Mr. Madison did not so understand the matter, since he said: "Some States might regulate the elections on the principle of equality, and others might regulate them otherwise. Should the people of any State by any means be deprived of suffrage, it is deemed proper that it should be remedied by the General Government."

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

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

A Republican form of government means a government guaranteeing equality of rights among its citizens exercising the right of self-government, in opposition to a monarchical form, in which citizens submit to be ruled by a monarch, as women submit to be ruled in this country by men. There is no making due meaning of these terms. There is no chance left for equality, reservation, or interpretation. Ours is either a monarchical or a Republican government, and there is no half-way house at which to stop. Leaving a monarchy, we must go to the other extreme, practice a cheat either upon rights or upon credulity. And I do not mean that men shall any longer think it is upon my credit that they are practicing. I am for exposing this monstrous credulity for compelling the enforcement of that provision of the Constitution which demands a Republican form of government in every State of the Union.

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

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

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

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

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

Now, then, let us see about that second section, upon which Senator Carpenter makes so magnificent a retreat, saying, "Although all citizens have been made voters by the first section, the second section clearly recognizes the right of the States to exclude a portion of the same from voting." If a portion only, why not the whole—but if only a portion, what portion? "Oh! but—but—but it doesn't tell us who may be excluded. That, you know, we left for the States to decide." And who, pray, are the States? Do they consist of men only, and is it for them, having usurped the power to do so, to say that all women are the portion who may be excluded? Is that the magnificent result obtained by all the wisdom expended since the war in legislation, to which Congress has been almost exclusively devoted? It seems to me that



such an abortion is better described by that little game, "first you see it, and then you don't," than anything else that ever emanated from Congressional brains. For the sake of ushering negroes into the mysteries of citizenship, Congress set themselves to work and made everybody citizens; but, being frightened at the grandeur and extent of the result, straightway they turned about and gave the States the right to exclude a portion of the newly-made voters from voting, and magnanimously left it to the States to say that that portion should be women. Such patriots; such lovers of their country; such devoted adherents to the right of the States, to do whatever they please with citizens of the United States so that they let men alone is truly astonishing. And Mr. Carpenter, the Raphael of the nineteenth century, presents them to us in such life-like colors and in such grandeur, that we fain must bow down and worship at their shrine.

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

But again: this provision is in the form of a penalty; it provides if any State shall do a certain thing to certain citizens of the United States that it shall suffer a certain penalty. Now that is all that can be made of the language. And it may be well to remember that that only is law which is written; *ita lex scripta est* is the rule everywhere. It is the only safeguard to law, since if we are at liberty to infer anything we please, then we might as well have no law at all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

"But," says Senator Carpenter, "the Fifteenth Amendment is equally damaging to the right of female suffrage, since if by the Fourteenth Amendment the elective franchise had been secured to every citizen the Fifteenth Amendment would have been unnecessary." Now mark the consistency of the three points of his argument which we have reached: First, he informs us that the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment secured the right to vote to all citizens, black and white male and female; second, that all persons having been enfranchised the second section of the same Amendment confers the power upon the States to disfranchise any citizens, for any reason whatever; and that since the States continued to disfranchise male negroes, the Fifteenth Amendment was necessary to take that power away from the States. Now, if it was the intention of Congress from the first to arrive at this end, why did they proceed by such a roundabout way

Why did they not at once specifically state that all this legislation was for the purpose of securing the votes of male negroes, since that, according to Senator Carpenter, is the final result. The States may deny the right to vote to any citizens except to male negroes. Suffrage in all other cases stands just as it did before the Amendments, the fact of all persons having been made citizens counting for nothing.

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

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

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

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

What we ask, is there any language in these Amendments by which particular persons are excluded from suffrage "by positive law covering the particular persons" whose rights are involved. On the contrary, there is no direct exclusion made to women whatever, and no particular persons excluded. By still another argument we are compelled to conclude that since women in common with all other persons are made citizens, and consequently voters, all women are voters, with the exception of those who have been excluded by express constitutional provisions.

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

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

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

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

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

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



legally be excluded, except such exclusion is made in express terms, so as to specially declare who are excluded.

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

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

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

Our State constitutions provide that male citizens are electors. Why may we not just as reasonably assume that some male citizens may be excluded for other reasons than simply because they are males? Men say that the women are excluded for other reasons than because they belong to a race. We say that men may also be excluded by the same rule for other reason than because they are males. Is not that statement clear? The several races include all people, and the right to vote cannot be denied on account of race. But a part of the race are denied because they are women. Now, by the other proposition, all men are included in the phrase, "all male citizens," and they cannot be denied the right to vote, but a part of all male citizens, even the negro part, may be excluded for any other reason it may be convenient to invent. That would not be excluding them because they are males, but because they had a certain colored hair, or because they were not a certain number of feet in height, or for any other reason of which use might be made to compel arbitrary distinctions. This would be the same rule which men now apply to the term race. Women are not excluded because they belong to the African, or any other race, but because they are women, who are a part of race; as different colored haired men are a part of the sum total of men; and as different sized men are a part of the sum total of men. But while exclusions are made on account of sex, they are not made upon the other accounts simply because men don't choose to make them; which resolves the whole question into its real position: that men exclude women from voting because they have got the power to do so, and that is the sum and substance and all there is of it since it completes the argument, and the conclusion is impossible of escape.

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

We are all aware of the desperate strait in which the Democratic party find themselves. They are seeking in every direction for an escape from the toils the Republicans have woven about them; they supposed themselves "foundered" on the rock of a Centralized Government, from which there was no chance of escape except to accept the situation and make a "New Departure." Even the astute and learned, and legal and excessively constitutional New York *World* lately acknowledged that it was not only the intent, but the effect of the Amendments to vest the control of citizenship in the General Government, and to put it entirely beyond the control of the States. Now, I do not state this of my own

knowledge, but I have been privately informed, that Senator Carpenter is ambitious to be the next President, and since he saw that in the Republican party there was no chance for him, he put forth this new doctrine reviving the theory of States Rights as a bid for the Democratic nomination. As I said, I cannot state that this is so, but this I can say: He ought to have it, since he has had the temerity to assert in a new form a doctrine which the most earnest old line Democrats had abandoned not only as impracticable but obsolete.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are several other points in Senator Carpenter's "New Departure," which, with these examined, are equally felicitous. But I

(Continued on Twelfth Page.)



## OUR FUTURE HOME.

BY THE PRODIGAL SON.

Out of range of mortal vision  
 There's a glorious realm elysian,  
 Where the dearly-loved departed, dwell in peace forevermore.  
 And my spirit's inward seeing,  
 Closed to all of outward being  
 Reveled for a time in beauty on that loved celestial shore.

There were crystal-flowing fountains,  
 Lovely vales and radiant mountains,  
 Fairy groves, and angels walking in their pathways hand-in-hand,  
 Birds of golden plumage singing,  
 Gladsome thoughts to mortals bringing,  
 As their chords of thrilling music echoed through the better land.

As I stood in rapture gazing  
 In the glory round me blazing,  
 Came there to my side an angel, dweller in that shining zone,  
 And in accents soft and tender,  
 Such as only angels render,  
 Said, "Here behold the open portal, brother, to thy future home.

Then I woke to real seeming  
 From my rapturous day-dreaming,  
 And the vision faded from me, faded to return no more.  
 So I wait beside the portal  
 If the land of life immortal,  
 For the coming of the boatman who, ere long, will bear me o'er.

## Pacific Coast Mission.

BY PROF. W. H. CHANEY.

Yes, I feel that I am a missionary going forth to preach the gospel of truth, and here I find an extensive field of labor. Bro. Todd, after working it for a year or two, abandoned it in disgust. His experience has differed widely from mine, but still I look upon him as an important help in our great labor of reform. His sledge hammer blows on old orthodoxy, have told most beautifully, and I witness the fruit of his labors wherever I go.

SALEM.

This beautiful city, the capital of Oregon, is emphatically the "city of churches." Add to this the fact of a university, with a swarm of clergymen for professors, and the imagination readily fills up the picture of a community that is genteelly and scientifically priest-ridden. Before lecturing in Salem, I published a challenge to Prof. Rogers to meet me in public debate, stating that I would maintain that Abraham was a planet, Sarah a star, and not individuals at all. My challenge was published three weeks, and finally extended to any person for acceptance without eliciting the slightest notice save from an enterprising firm who advertised their ready-made clothing under the head of "Abraham a Planet."

True, my challenge aroused curiosity, but with the exception of Bro. Hawkins, a devout Spiritualist, the leading liberals conceived the idea that I was an impostor, and so refused to attend my lectures. Thus I was like a shepherd without a flock, and old orthodoxy laughed at my small audiences the first two lectures. But I persevered, my number of hearers steadily increasing until my ninth lecture, when I was told that I had a larger audience than was ever seen in Salem to hear any person speak. The subject of my last lecture was "Life and Immortality," and although on Sunday night, when all the churches were running, there were scores of their members among my hearers who sat in rapt silence for two hours, while I discoursed on our beautiful philosophy.

One of the greatest moral triumphs of my whole life was achieved in Salem, and I have a right to feel proud of it. I found Spiritualism at a low ebb; not more than a dozen or twenty would go to hear Bro. Todd in his last lectures there; yet from five to six hundred attended my last lectures. Pecuniarily, however, my course of lectures was a fearful failure, having cost me nearly a month's time and twenty-five dollars out of pocket, although Bro. Hawkins kindly gave me food and shelter during the whole time. But

I hired the Opera House and depended solely upon voluntary contribution. Hence the deficit.

But I must disclaim all credit for being public-spirited in this labor, for self-preservation actually compelled me to do as I did. My name was a by-word in Salem, rarely pronounced unless associated with the word "humbug." I was a "star-gazer," "moon-struck," and "crack-brained." This impression must be removed at the capital, or the State at large would treat me with silent contempt. My astrology was offensive in the nostrils of the learned professors, and I must establish it against the severest criticisms. So I gave tests continually before my audiences, until nearly all opposition was silenced, even if the parties were not convinced, and I learned, when leaving, that a class was nearly made up to take lessons in the Astral Science.

## A SAD CASE OF CRUELTY.

And now I must tell you of an event which recently transpired in Clackamas county, within a day's ride of Salem. In this rural district reside an aged couple, Josiah and Sarah Franklin, with an adopted daughter, Sarah Childers, all devout members of the Methodist church. Until recently, another adopted child, Amanda A. Callahan, a little girl of six years, has lived with the family. She was removed on account of the cruelty practiced upon her by these two Sarahs, followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, who never taught anything save love and kindness. I have the particulars from Mr. Dolan, the counsel employed for the prosecution against this "Mother in Israel" and her worthy adopted namesake.

The sworn testimony disclosed that Sarah Childers, although not more than twelve or thirteen years old, manifested the most precocious fiendishness imaginable. Her conduct fairly staggers my disbelief in total depravity. Being a favorite with Mrs. Franklin as well as a sister in the same church, she had the ready ear of the old lady, and enjoyed her fullest confidence. It seems that she would accuse Amanda of stealing small articles from the house, and as the articles were missing, the old lady would allow her to tie a rope to Amanda, and taking a stick, whip and drive her about, until the poor little thing would sink down utterly exhausted. This was a frequent occurrence, and the zeal with which the youthful Christian performed her duty, "showed of a truth that she had been with Jesus." But what shall we say of the perversity of spirit manifested by the unconverted Amanda? In no instance did the little sinner go to the place where she had concealed the missing articles, although told that her punishment should instantly cease if she would. What a striking evidence that the devil was tempting her to sin! But when the wicked Amanda would fall, covered with wounds and bruises, unable to rise, then the angelic Sarah would go straight to where the missing article was concealed, waving it aloft as conclusive evidence of Amanda's guilt. Then Sarah, the elder, moved by that maxim of divine inspiration, "spare the rod and spoil the child," would seize the stick and belabor the already mangled and bleeding victim.

By way of varying these Christian exercises, the juvenile Sarah would accuse Amanda of acts so revolting that I cannot write the details. Suffice it to say, this babe of six years was charged with a crime forbidden in the Bible and punishable with death. See Leviticus xx., 16. The young Christian told the story with such minuteness of disgusting detail that her word was not doubted, and the old lady, feeling herself a servant of the Lord, to execute vengeance, proceeded to heat some water, with a view to compelling the little Amanda to sit down in it, and so scald the child as to prevent a repetition of the crime. But I am glad to be able to write, for the credit of humanity, that this barbarism was not executed. On second thought she decided that the death of the accused mastiff would answer the same purpose. Accordingly,

the dog was slaughtered and Amanda's punishment commuted to a terrible whipping.

"Poor dog, Tray!" The victim of a base conspiracy, Christian slander sent him to an untimely grave.

The prosecution, to which I have alluded, simply charged assault and battery, for it was uncertain how much they would be able to prove. Fifty dollars fine and costs were adjudged, but the matter may yet be brought before the grand jury, while some of the enthusiastic Christians feel that nothing short of lynch law can mete out justice to the imbecile old woman.

## MY OWN VIEWS.

I hold popular Christianity responsible for this shameful affair. Christians claim to be the called and chosen of God, therefore his servants are in duty bound to execute his law. A literal rendering of the Bible is supposed to be the law of God. Hence the cruelties which have been practised by professed Christians from earliest ages. The *autodafe*, the dungeon, the rack, the gallows, and the burning stake are all Christian inventions, constructed for the glory of God and to take vengeance upon his enemies. This may be denominated "serving God on a grand scale." In a smaller way, but actuated by the same spirit, the drunkard has been confined in the pillory, with his ear nailed to the rugged wood; the insane have been showered, flogged, and tortured; witches have been put to death (Leviticus, xx., 27); men have been imprisoned for debt; husbands have been tolerated in whipping their wives, while parents, guardians and teachers have conceived it to be their *duty* to maltreat and torture little children.

It may be urged in reply, that Christians are the devoted followers of Christ; that Christ opposed all violence, and, therefore, my charge against Christians is an infamous and malicious libel. Well, that is pretty good sophistry and has deceived thousands. But the argument, if worthy to be called an argument, is founded purely in a theory which is contradicted by facts. My statement is sustained by history and daily observation. It is true. Christians know it is true; for if false, then they would disprove it by facts. Not being able to do this, they dodge the issue which I make and substitute a shadowy theory which is entirely beyond the reach of reason and argument. Then they completely captivate their dupes by eloquently describing the beautiful philosophy of the New Testament, and go into ecstasies over the sublime morality contained in "the golden rule," notwithstanding it was uttered by Confucius, a pagan philosopher, more than five hundred years before the pretended birth of the Nazarene.

But the limits of this communication forbid my pursuing the argument. I will only add that I hold myself in readiness, at all times, to maintain by tongue or pen that Christianity, as it has been *practiced* (not the *teachings* of the New Testament, for most of these I hold in the highest esteem), but that Christianity which has been *practiced* by the authority of the church for nearly two thousand years, has been an impediment to science, the bane of civilization, and a curse to mankind. What answer will the "Bible-bangers" make to this challenge? Will they meet the issue fairly? No; they will dodge into their pulpits, denounce me as a vile infidel, a horrible blasphemer, and advise their dupes to avoid me as one accursed of God and the high-priest of satan. *O tempora! O mores!*

When I first heard of the tortures which had been inflicted upon poor little Amanda, all the violence of my nature rose to the surface, and for several minutes I felt as though I would be one to assist in taking sweet vengeance upon poor old imbecile Sarah and her impish namesake. But the bitterness soon passed and I realized that it sprang from a sudden excitement of the baser group of faculties. The higher order of intellect revolted at the thought. To have sought vengeance would have been to place passion upon the



throne of reason. In a word, to have come down upon the plane of *practical* Christianity.

No, no, no. I pity both the misguided Sarahs. How cruel they must be by nature, in spite of grace. That nature was a fearful inheritance, transmitted through ancestral sin. They can no more change that nature than the lunatic can change his lunacy to reason. Friends might do much to ameliorate their conditions. But they have been terribly deceived and wronged. They have been made to believe that they have been born again and become fit tabernacles for the indwelling of the holy spirit. Like all feeble-minded persons, they think highly of themselves, and have no doubt but they have passed from death unto life. Wheedled into this visionary superstition, they naturally conclude that they are the especial favorites of God who has chosen them to assist him in the management of the unregenerate, and if so chosen, of course he sends his holy spirits to enlighten their understanding. Hence, any imaginings or promptings of their natures are imputed to a direct providential interference. Thus they might have committed the most horrible crimes, vainly supposing themselves God's faithful servants. Here is the key to the bloody persecutions which have disgraced every epoch of Christianity. Men of brilliant genius, but weak in moral, have thus wheedled those of feeble intellects, deluging this fair earth with tears and blood.

Had these two Sarahs been schooled in our beautiful philosophy instead of Christianity, they might have been saved from staining their souls with this foul blot. Therefore I hold practical Christianity responsible for the deception put upon them, ending in consequences so deplorable.

Kind reader, give not all your sympathy to little Amanda. Her flesh may have been bruised, but her soul was not tarnished. Not so with her tormentors. A dark cloud has risen up and obscured their spiritual sunshine. For years, perhaps ages, their souls must wander in darkness, while the pure spirit of Amanda, bursting from the old, bruised casket, purified by trial and suffering, will enter joyously upon that heavenly eternity which has no beginning nor yet an end.

### The Situation.

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

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

"The individual is no judge of what is truth. The private conscience is no proper guide," says the Catholic Church. Yet Protestantism can point to her more intelligent and energetic peoples, to her scientists, philanthropists, poets and statesmen, who throw the meagre merits of priest-ridden communities far into the background. And republicanism has held her own, in spite of the hordes of the ignorant cast on her shores by monarchy. So far, it is proven that freedom in politics and religion has been a success, has fulfilled the prophecies of the saints and martyrs over whose bleeding forms we have walked to reach the desired goal. Now the time has arrived, and thousands read the signs distinctly, when no farther progress can be made, no higher development be attained until social freedom is proclaimed and the pure sunlight and generous air be admitted into that system of respectable misery and legalized vice called "mar-

riage," into the distracted and desolate places we are accustomed to call our "homes" (a word which now has a beautiful significance only to the children, whose relation to it is more true and natural than is often that of their parents). We do not wonder at the shout of rage and derision which greets the messengers who would inaugurate the reign of purity and peace. Every social reformer in the past was charged with licentious motives, and can we, with our social evil, our labor slaves and whisky palaces, be expected to take a wiser course? Socrates, Jesus, Luther, Garrison and all other saints and martyrs had to endure this base suspicion.

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

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

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

Then authorities on prostitution\* tell us that "owing to an invincible necessity in man"—mark that, owing to an invincible necessity in the sons of us mothers—a certain number of our daughters, and those the most beautiful and

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

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

S. B. S.

\* Sanger.

—[Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly.]

### VOICES OF CORRESPONDENTS.

FRAZEYSBURGH, OHIO.—H. E. W. writes: "Enclosed find \$2.50 for one year's subscription for THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST and Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly. I have read several works of A. J. Davis, and I see more freedom in Spiritualism than sectarian religion. They have entirely converted me, as I have been a strong Methodist."

WINTERSSET, IOWA.—J. P. E. W. writes: "Enclosed find two dollars and a half, to continue my subscription to THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST and Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly. I hope you will outlive and live down all revilers of Spiritualism. Bro. Peebles' review of Rev. Walk's review in this week's SPIRITUALIST is worth the cost of the paper for a twelve month. The reverend gentleman (?) will find it a problematical case to "Walk" against Time and Space with a Peebles to furnish posters."

WOOSTER, OHIO.—Bro. O. L. Sutliff writes: "Dear Bro. Wheelock—I am glad to see THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST growing into so favorable a reputation, and also to see the demand for its weekly visit, instead of semi-monthly. You deserve to be well sustained by every Spiritualist in Ohio for the earnestness and zeal you have manifested in working up from chaos a paper, whose spiritual life and light is being felt throughout the land. I send you a post-office order for five dollars for a renewal of mine and J. R. Naylor's subscription. Please send us Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly also. Stand by the right and the angels will stand by you."

CARDINGTON, OHIO.—L. F. Hager writes: "The Sherman mediums are holding cabinet seances at T. M. Ewing's, near Cardington, where the skeptics are being dumbfounded, as the spirits present hands, arms, and faces of various sizes and color, from the African to the refined tinge of the Anglo-American lady, and in size varying from those of a giant to the tender infant, and among them is presented the noted physiognomy of Mother Ann Lee; and what is the most remarkable, they are willing to be handled with gentle criticism and naked hands. The mediums go to Fredericktown next week."

NEOSHO FALLS, KANSAS.—J. G. writes: "Enclosed find subscription for THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST and Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly. Had I known of the offer sooner, I should have subscribed sooner, but I hope not to be damned for a sin of ignorance. I never saw your excellent paper until just now—some careless Spiritualist dropped it on my table, and I hope by the power of steam and Sunday mails to reach you, and if I am lucky enough to get the both papers, I shall thank my stars, and you, and that careless chap that left me the paper. There is not much Spiritualism here, but I intend to preach the New Gospel to the benighted sinners, and spread the glad tidings wherever I can."



## THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

BY THE

American Spiritualist Publishing Company.

CENTRAL OFFICE—NEW YORK.

TERMS—\$2.50 PER YEAR, IN ADVANCE.

J. M. PEEBLES,  
GEORGE A. BACON, } EDITORS.

A. A. WHEELLOCK, Managing Editor.

Spirit is causation.—“The spirit giveth life.”—Paul.

“RESOLVED, That we are Spiritualists, \* \* \* and that any other prefix or suffix is calculated only to retard and injure us.”

UNDERSTAND IT.—Subscriptions, Advertisements, &c., can be left with our agents at either of our Offices, or sent direct to the Central Office—but all other matters of business, and communications for insertion in THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST, must be sent to  
A. A. Wheellock,  
29 BEEKMAN ST., NEW YORK CITY.

## Modern Spiritualism.

[The following excellent statement from the pen of A. E. Newton, has been published in tract form by the American Liberal Tract Society—constituting No. 18 of their series of tracts. This organization is making itself felt as a power in the land, and is every way worthy of generous support from all the liberal minded and progressive people.—Eds.]

Modern Spiritualism, distinctively so called, took its rise from certain phenomena, alleged to be caused by disembodied spirits, and believed to signalize the opening of intelligible intercourse between the earthly and spiritual states of existence. These phenomena first attracted special attention in the western part of the State of New York in the year 1848, and have since spread, in various forms, throughout almost all parts of the civilized world.

It is computed that from three to five millions of the people of the United States alone have become convinced of their reality and their spiritual origin.

The following definitions and summary of opinions were adopted by the Fifth Annual Convention of American Spiritualists, and represents the claims generally put forth by Spiritualists:

Spiritualism, in its broad sense, as a philosophical system, embraces whatever relates to spirit, spiritual existences, and spiritual forces; especially all truths relative to the human spirit, its nature, capacities, laws of manifestation, its disembodied existence, the conditions of that existence, and the modes of communication between that and earth-life. It is thus a system of universal philosophy, embracing in its ample scope all phenomena of life, motion, and development; all causation, immediate or remote all existence, animal, human, and divine. It has, consequently, its phenomenal philosophical, and theological departments.

But in neither of these departments is it as yet clearly and completely defined to general acceptance. Hence there is no distinct system now before the public which can with propriety be called Spiritualism, or the spiritual philosophy, and for which Spiritualists, as such, can be held responsible.

Modern Spiritualism, more specifically, may be defined as that belief or conviction which is peculiar to, and universally held by, the people now called Spiritualists. This may be stated in the single proposition—

That disembodied human spirits sometimes manifest themselves, or make known their presence and power, to persons in the earthly body, and hold realized communication with them.

Whoever believes this one fact, whatever else he may believe or disbelieve in theology, philosophy, or morals, is a Spiritualist, according to the modern use of the term. Hence there are wide differences

among Spiritualists on theological questions. There are those who regard the Bible as divinely inspired and authoritative; though, in the light of modern revelation, they interpret its teachings somewhat differently from any of the prominent sects of Christendom. There are others who esteem it simply as an historic record, embracing the religious ideas, spiritual manifestations, etc., of the Jewish people and early Christians, having no higher claims to reliability or authority than have other histories. The subjoined summary embodies the views on a variety of topics generally prevalent among the more intelligent class of Spiritualists.

## I. THEORETICAL.

1. That man has a spiritual nature as well as a corporeal; in other words, that the real man is a spirit, which spirit has an organized form, composed of sublimated material, with parts and organs corresponding to those of the corporeal body.

2. That man as a spirit is immortal. Being found to survive that change called physical death, it may be reasonably supposed that he will survive all vicissitudes.

3. That there is a spiritual world, or state, with its substantial realities, objective as well as subjective.

4. That the process of physical death in no way essentially transforms the mental constitution or the moral character of those who experience it, else it would destroy their identity.

5. That happiness or suffering in the spiritual state, as in this depends not on arbitrary decree or special provision, but on character, aspirations, and degree of harmonization, or of personal conformity to universal and divine law.

6. Hence that the experiences and attainments of the present life lay the foundation on which the next commences.

7. That since growth is the law of the human being in the present life, and since the process called death is in fact but a birth into another condition of life, retaining all the advantages gained in the experiences of this life, it may be inferred that growth, development expansion, or progression is the endless destiny of the human spirit.

8. That the spiritual world is not far off, but near, around, or interblended with our present state of existence; and hence that we are constantly under the cognizance of spiritual beings.

9. That, as individuals are passing from the earthly to the spiritual state, in all stages of mental and moral growth, that state includes all grades of character, from the lowest to the highest.

10. That happiness and misery depend on internal states rather than on external surroundings: there are as many gradations of each as there are shades of character,—each one gravitating to his own place by natural law of affinity.

11. That communications from the spiritual world, whether by mental impression, inspiration, or any other mode of transmission, are not necessarily infallible truth, but, on the contrary, partake unavoidably of the imperfections of the minds from which they emanate, and of the channels through which they come, and are, moreover, liable to misinterpretation by those to whom they are addressed.

12. Hence that no inspired communication, in this or any age (whatever claims may have been set up as to its source), is authoritative any further than it expresses truth to the individual consciousness,—which last is the final standard to which all inspired or spiritual teachings must be brought for judgment.

13. That inspiration, or influx of ideas and promptings from the spiritual realm, is not a miracle of a past age, but a perpetual fact,—the careless method of the divine economy for human elevation.

14. That all angelic and all demonic beings which have manifested themselves, or interposed in human affairs in the past, were simply disembodied human spirits, in different grades of advancement,

15. That all authentic miracles (so-called) in the past—such as the raising of the apparently dead, the healing of the sick by the laying on of hands or other simple means, unharmed contact with poisons, the movement of physical objects without visible instrumentality, etc., etc.—have been produced in harmony with universal laws, and hence may be repeated at any time under suitable conditions.

16. That the causes of all phenomena—the sources of all power, life, and intelligence—are to be sought for in the internal or spiritual realm, not in the external or material.

17. That the chain of causation leads inevitably to a creative spirit, who must be not only a fount of life (Love), but a forming principle (Wisdom),—thus sustaining the dual parental relations of father and mother to all finite intelligence, who, of course, are all brethren.

18. That man, as the offspring of this Infinite Parent, is in some sense—His image or finite embodiment; and that, by virtue of this parentage, each human being is or has, in his inmost, a germ of divinity,—an incorruptible offshoot of the Divine Essence, which is ever prompting to good and right, and which in time will free itself from all imperfections incident to a rudimental or earthly condition, and will finally triumph over evil.

19. That all evil is disharmony, greater or less, with this divine principle; and hence, whatever prompts and aids man to bring his external nature into subjection to, and harmony with, the divine in him, in whatever religious system or formula it may be embodied, is a “means of salvation” from evil.

## II. PRACTICAL.

The hearty and intelligent conviction of these truths, with a realization of spirit-communion, tends

1. To enkindle lofty desires and spiritual aspirations,—on effect opposite to that of a grovelling materialism which limits existence to the present life.

2. To deliver from painful fears of death, and dread of imaginary evils, consequent thereupon, as well as to prevent inordinate sorrow and mourning for deceased friends.

3. To give a rational and inviting conception of the after-life to those who use the present worthily.

4. To stimulate to the highest and worthiest possible employment of the present life, in view of its momentous relations to the future.

5. To energize the soul in all that is good and elevating, and to restrain the passions from all that is evil and impure. This must result, according to the laws of moral influence, from a knowledge of the constant presence or cognizance of the loved and pure.

6. To prompt our earnest endeavors, by purity of life, by unselfishness, and by loftiness of aspiration, to live constantly *en rapport* with the highest conditions of spirit life and thought.

7. To stimulate the mind to the largest investigation and the freest thought on all subjects—especially on the vital themes of a spiritual philosophy and all cognate matters,—that it may be qualified to judge for itself what is right and true.

8. To deliver from all bondage to authority, whether vested in creed, book, or church, except that of perceived truth.

9. To cultivate self-reliance and careful investigation by taking away the support of authorities, and leaving each mind to exercise its own truth-determining powers.

10. To quicken all philanthropic impulses, stimulating to enlightened and unselfish labors for universal human good, under the encouraging assurance that the redeemed and exalted spirits of our race, instead of retiring to idle away an eternity of inglorious ease, are encompassing about as a great cloud of witnesses, inspiring us to the work, and aiding it forward to a certain and glorious issue.



## James Fisk, Jr., Communicates.

The following has been given us from a reliable and trustworthy source. A lady and gentleman called at Dr. Slade's 210 43d street, when the lady was influenced, and declared that if they could have sittings with Dr. Slade, the spirit of Col. Fisk would appear so as to be recognized. The spirits indicated that it would be well to obtain something which Col. Fisk had in his possession when shot, to bring them in closer and more direct rapport with his spirit's condition. The gentleman called at the Erie office and obtained a key which Fisk wore when he was assassinated. They then repaired to Dr. Slade's office. The first sitting was Monday evening, January 17th. Not very much was obtained. Second sitting, Wednesday evening, January 24th; present—Dr. Slade, Dr. Palmer, of New York, and Mrs. Daniels, of Boston.—The first thing seen was a hand and arm appearing at the aperture, plainly seen by all three of these persons. In a few moments more came the face, with the features unmistakable, of James Fisk, Jr., and remained for several moments! He appeared in his military dress, with cap, etc., all equipped, and with the same spirit and determination which characterized him in life, as if determined to make himself seen and known. He made his appearance at this sitting thus clearly to all three of the persons present, they say, ten or twelve times.

Now, what are we to conclude? The face and features of the "Prince of Erie" are not easily counterfeited, nor would they be taken in this world or any other, for any other person. The three persons, who say they sat quietly and deliberately looking at this phenomena, marvelous as it may seem to some, are all intelligent, and, as far as we are able to learn, most trustworthy and reliable persons. Is there any possible way by which, from cause known or unknown, all three could have been hallucinated at the same time to see something that was not there in reality?

If not, we see no escaping the conclusion, that the "Prince of Erie" must have been there.

## Murder and Religion.

Friday morning, January 26th, George Botts, the murderer of Oliver S. Halstead, at Newark, N. J., was duly executed.

The circumstances of the crime are doubtless well remembered. Botts was the discarded paramour of a woman by the name of Wilson. His successful rival was a married man of wealth and position—familiarily known as "Pet" Halstead. There was no other cause for the malicious act. Botts could not brook opposition upon so tender a point. It does not appear that he shot Halstead for any wrong that he had done to him, but because the woman Wilson had changed her feeling, and allowed her lustful desires to go after some other man than Botts.

A New Jersey jury have decided that such cause was insufficient to justify Botts in sending his rival on the same road with a bullet, that Botts has just entered upon at the end of a halter! What a New York jury would do, no one knoweth, but that Botts committed a murder, black and infamous, and has answered the penalty, is a matter of history now.

It is not of the causes, immediate and remote, which led to the foul deed, that we would now speak, but of the disgusting practice of Christian ministers in attempting to make out that such a bloodthirsty wretch "dies penitent and is fortified by religion!"

Three clergymen attended the culprit with their ceaseless mockery of everything pure and good, by silly and useless so-called religious exercises in which it is stated, "the wretched man joined with a fervor amounting almost to enthusiasm," which being continued, this new candidate for heavenly honors finally begins to enjoy the "consolation of religion!"

What that "consolation" was, may be gathered from a declaration by one of the piety-performers, who said in behalf of the cowardly, crime-stained saint

who stood trembling, with blood of a fellow-mortal still dripping from his garments, "he forgives all his enemies and dies in the Lord Jesus Christ!"

A palpable falsehood on its face! How could that bloody wretch, on the verge of that change most dreadful and dreaded by the criminal, forgive any one? He who was in the death-clutch of the law, what power had he to forgive?

Again is the declaration false that he "died in the Lord Jesus Christ!" There is not a particle of evidence to show that the Lord Jesus Christ was in the State of New Jersey at that time! From the amount of impudent assumption and false assertions made by the pretended followers of that distinguished personage, we conclude, he did not attend the pious hanging-performance at all.

When will the day come that this senseless mockery, in the name of religion, shall cease! When will ministers and other people learn (including murderers on the scaffold) that there is *no forgiveness of sin!* Crime once committed, no one but the offender can settle the account. And herein is infinite wisdom displayed, not by furnishing an innocent second or third party to suffer for another and "in their stead," but by the grand, infinite law of compensation requiring every one to suffer for their own transgressions! If there is not time enough in this world to pay the debt, the account will be kept open, and *settlement must be had on the other side.* Therefore, be not deceived. The gallows is a poor starting point for heaven! No matter for the endless babble of priestly hirelings upon such occasions. Nothing they can say or do can affect body or soul in the least.

Let each individual understand, that true religion demands even and exact justice for all, murdered and murderer, "according to the deeds done in the body."

## Directly to the Point.

"Warrington," commenting on the late message of Gov. Washburn, of Massachusetts, relative to that portion concerning Woman Suffrage, says:

The Wyoming law and the condition of affairs under it, illustrate the absurdity and danger of allowing this question of the franchise to be subject to statute. It must be settled, if it be not now settled, by the constitution. It seems to me that there is good reason to believe that the courts may by-and-by hold that women have the right to vote under the United States constitution. And, Oliver Johnson and Mr. Garrison to the contrary, I can see no trick or dishonesty in seeking for this result. If Lucy Stone has her pocket picked, and afterward finds in the street the money she lost, I do not think she is bound to seek out the thief and ask him if he intended to drop it where she could find it again. So, the right to share in the government being, as she believes (and as Mr. Johnson and Mr. Garrison believe) as good for her as for any man, if by intention, or even by blunder, the male monopolists have made or left the constitution so that she can take her right, why should she not do so? It seems to me, the argument on the 14th and 15th amendments is a strong one, and I hope Gen. Butler will press his declaratory act, and that it will pass, or that, by the decision of some competent court, the case will be rightfully settled. Until it is there is no security, and any apparent gain may turn out a loss. The Wyoming law may be repealed any time. Under Dave Carter's imbecile decision, the law will always be left at loose ends. And under any scheme like that which Gov. Washburn recommends, the matter would be left in a worse than uncertain state. This matter of suffrage is fundamental. It is the doctrine of the *Atlantic Monthly* and the *New York Nation* that it is only a matter of detail, and so of experiment. People who believe that government, national, city and town, ought to be carried on by "science," as they call it, and that the legislation of the State should be managed as you would manage a gas company or a water company, hold the opposite view; but the American, and the modern, and the democratic, and the true idea is, that *rights* are fundamental and matters of *principle*, and not of administration. First of rights is the right of suffrage, and this must not be subject to empiricism, but be settled on knowledge, and on the principle of equality.

## Not Correct.

We find in the *Religio-Philosophical Journal* of January 27th, the following:

"THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST.—The above-named journal has removed from Cleveland to New York city, and makes the announcement that it will hereafter be published weekly. This paper seems to be devoutly committed to the Woodhull and Claflin "New Departure" party . . ."

We beg to correct the *Journal* in the above paragraphs. Instead of our paper having removed from Cleveland to New York city, we have changed the publication office, keeping an office still in Cleveland, and issuing a Cleveland edition of our paper, a Louisville edition, and a New York edition, with central office at New York, and other offices established at Chicago, Louisville, Washington, Boston, and San Francisco.

These were our published declarations which the editor of the *Journal* must have noticed in the very issue from which the above partial, incorrect notice was made up. Why not state the facts? Does not our enterprise and determination to extend the circulation of our paper, find favor with the *Journal*?

What authority has the *Journal* for saying that "this paper seems committed to the Woodhull and Claflin party," or any other party? What is the "Woodhull and Claflin New Departure Party," that the *Journal* "seems" so deeply exercised about? Although it declares we "seem devoutly committed," we affirm that we do not know what the "New Departure Party" is, to which the *Journal* says we "seem committed!" Can the *Journal* tell?

If the editor of the *Journal* will take the trouble to read an editorial in THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST, of January 27th, headed "The Policy of this Journal," he will find the mistake of his "seeming," (perchance he was only dreaming,) and will also find that our paper is not "committed" to any man, woman, sect, clique, or party, and perhaps it will not be expecting too much of the *Journal* to make such correction of the wrong impression it has sent abroad, as the fact and fairness demand.

A. A. W.

## A Theological Straw.

The professors in the Bangor Theological Seminary have issued an earnest appeal to the pastors and churches of the State in reference to the gradual but constant diminution of the young men preparing for the ministry. Only two from Maine have entered any theological seminary out of the State during the past year, and only two from the State have entered the Bangor Seminary.—*Boston Journal*.

We are glad to know this, if true, but question its correctness. However, it has a hopeful look and gives us reasonable assurance that the young and thinking men of Maine have something better to engage their thought and spend their time than vainly trying to extract any practical satisfaction out of such a muddled system of theology as is propounded from the professor's chair of this hitherto popular seminary, belonging to the straitest of sects.

Thanks to the liberalizing tendency of the times the people are fast turning their back to the dogmas of an Evangelical pulpit, finding therein neither the sense to meet their intellectual requirements nor the sustenance to satisfy their spiritual demands.

## Manhood and Moeay.

In his recent lecture on this subject, Henry Ward Beecher is reported as saying:

It is divine to learn to make a little go a great ways, and to work out with little a great and abundant joy out of your manhood. Man wants enough to satisfy his affections, that his wife and children may be able to take hold of the ordinary pleasures that surround them. When a man has that he has enough. But it is by no means to be borne in mind that happiness depends on wealth. It is foolish to say that a vulgar man spends his passions—does not enjoy them. We gain nothing in saying that a wicked man does not enjoy himself. Do you suppose animals don't enjoy themselves because they don't write? But I affirm that no pleasure below the senses are comparable to those above the senses; but no men are so miserable as those who have given themselves joy through their animal passions.



**A Response and Appeal.**

A CONCERT OF BENEFIT LECTURES—A PROPOSITION BY A. J. DAVIS.—*To all Spiritualist Lecturers and Congregations:* The ever-recurring appeals in our various journals for charitable contributions, to meet the daily necessities of those sufferers, Austin Kent and Joseph Baker, must eventually dry up many generous fountains because of the incessant demands upon them without prospect of doing any permanent good, only relieving sufferings and supplying wants from week to week. Cannot you each and all, with one heart, agree to give one discourse for the benefit of these two unfortunates, or take up a special collection in their behalf, on some particular Sunday, so that there may be a beautiful community of feeling and a happy, wide-spread concert of action in all parts of the country, in a noble work of benevolence? Let me now name a Sunday, 11th February proximo, as the silver-white day devoted to raising a sum that will make further newspaper appeals unnecessary for at least a year to come. And let me suggest further that each lecturer or congregation forward the amount raised on that white Sunday to William White & Co., to be by them paid in regular monthly installments to the suffering brothers and their worthy families. Text: "Write me as one who loves his fellow men." A. J. D.

*To all Spiritualists:*

The suggestion of Bro. A. J. Davis, in the *Banner of Light*, that we all act in concert on a specified day, 11th February prox., for the benefit of Austin Kent and Joseph Baker, finds a response in my soul, and I intend to put it in practice. I write this with a view to aid the good work by stimulating others to join heartily in the practical response. In all such labors we are quite too apt to wait for each other and do nothing. We can work with much better heart when we feel the sympathy of others joining in the good cause. Let us all devote a portion at least of one day's labor to the relief of these two brothers. We have done much work to inaugurate the spiritual dispensation, and we feel blessed in the realization of success, even though the majority who share the fruits treat us coldly for what we have done. These brothers, as I understand it, were among the earliest workers, giving their lives to the cause and are now suffering for what rightly belongs to them from the public they have served. Let us divide with them, and we shall think better of ourselves for the deed. Lecturers are not rich, and I am probably as poor as any of you, but I can afford one lecture—half of a Sunday's earnings,—and then societies ought to make another. Let us all act simultaneously, and bless and be blessed. LYMAN C. HOWE.

SPIRITUALISTS, ONE AND ALL.—Need anything more be said than what has been presented above, to move every single Spiritualist in the land to do something in concert for once, in the cause of a worthy charity? Although pressed and oppressed with work, we shall get a hall somewhere and lift up our voice on that day in concert with others for these needy and deserving brothers. Remember, the 11th of February is to be our "Silver-white" Sunday, and may each Spiritualist so act, that the memory of their action on that day may forever remain as "apples of gold and pictures of silver" for the deserving charity they bestow. A. A. W.

**Our Sick.**

MR. A. A. WHEELOCK:—Last week A. J. Davis made a splendid appeal through the *Banner of Light* in behalf of Austin Kent and Father Baker, two good and deserving men. They are growing old and helpless. They need money and the loving pity of friends. The hope is that Mr. Davis' call will be heard and heeded. It has been suggested that the *Banner of Light* be the recipients of all good gifts for their worthy brothers. That is well, only be sure that the money gets into the *Banner* office. And now I want to thank you for your mention of Miss Rebecca H. Lyon, of Washington. All you

said of her is true. She is helpless and destitute. I had the pleasure of seeing her in the sunless upper chamber of which you speak. Her sweet faith in humanity, her divine love of all beautiful things charmed and rebuked me. I wish people, who are given to growling, would go and sit at the feet of this brave woman and learn to suffer and be silent. That is not all. I wish every one of your readers would put into your hands a sum, be it ever so small, for Miss Lyon. She needs a pleasant room and a good, genial woman to take care of her. For three years she could not brush a fly from her face, and she has very often been left to the tender mercies of flies and mosquitoes. If those whose duty it is and whose pleasure it should be, do not provide comfortably for Miss Lyon, let the Spiritualists see to it that her remaining years are not clouded by discomforts. We have among us some wealth and a host of good hearts. The angels whisper, "Feed my lambs." Who does not hear? Thine,

H. F. M. BROWN.

**Thomas Gales Forster in New York.**

The arrival of this talented and eloquent trance speaker in our city, as a permanent lecturer on the spiritual philosophy, will afford many persons an opportunity to investigate this great and growing subject. Mr. Forster has been engaged in the investigation of spirit-intercourse about eighteen years, and has made ancient and modern Spiritualism his theme. He has consequently become very familiar with all the various phases incident thereto. His course of lectures in Boston, during the month of January, were attended by over three thousand persons each time. All persons interested in the present and the life beyond the grave will now have an opportunity to learn something of deep import to themselves. Mr. Forster is considered by many without a rival. The managers have engaged Apollo Hall, corner of Broadway and 28th street, where Mr. Forster will speak every Sunday morning, at 10½ o'clock, and evening, at 7½ o'clock.

**Victoria C. Woodhull.**

Men professing independence are not independent if they are afraid to tell the truth when a proper time exists for its expression. Concerning the prominent woman whose name stands at the head of this article, we propose to speak the truth—to reiterate a few facts of history. Victoria C. Woodhull, in her personal appearance and address, is a gentle lady. She charms all who come within the influences of her presence, and attaches such to her as friends. She is an eminent truth-teller. Touching the faults and blemishes in the record of her life, she tells the truth herself. Anything beyond what she tells resolves itself into the form of unwarranted and malignant strictures, the offspring alike of jealousy or depravity, and from which the names of but few women are free in this wicked world. Well-judging men—those who know anything of the world—are not apt to eagerly credit irresponsible reports affecting a lady's character. They also know enough to know that a woman with a face like Mrs. Woodhull's, one radiant even with an angelic expression, is not and cannot easily be a bad woman. "Impossible!" echo those who know her. Another fact: she is generous to the poor. The great precept of the Divine Master in this regard has in her a fervent and conscientious disciple. Her hands are white with charity. She herself is not a slanderer. Her remembered words and printed speeches will be recalled in vain for one word of slander against a fellow mortal. She is a modest woman. It is her devotion to a cause in which her heart and tremendous energies are enlisted that inspires her. It is the advancement of the cause, her interests in humanity, and not personal pride nor ambition which impels her onward. She is a popular woman. This fact in this community needs no argument to sustain it. She is heroic and self-sacrificing, and would not hesitate at anything, not even to the laying down of her life for truth. She is a devout believer in immortality, and in the "communion of the saints," and in that sense a Spiritualist. All who are believers in immortality are Spiritualists. This dogma is infallible. From it there is no escape. We understand that Mrs. Woodhull will soon deliver a lecture in this city. She will have a large audience, beyond any question, if we may judge from the intense anxiety to hear her so plainly and continually exhibited at every session of the Woman Suffrage Convention held during the current week in this city. Constantly, upon opportunity presenting itself, loud cries were incessantly made uttering, "Woodhull—Woodhull," imperatively demanding her presence.—*Sunday Gazette, Washington, D. C.*

**Another Friend Departed.**

The sad news reaches us from Chagrin Falls, Ohio, in the form of an obituary notice, which will be found in another column, of the departure for spirit-life, of our highly-esteemed friend, William C. Waldron. We were not very much surprised to learn he had left his frail body, for we had noticed the slight hold he seemed to have upon the physical.

We do not know that we can add aught to the excellent, just and well-deserved notice, written of the dear departed, by a neighbor and intimate friend, who knew him well and could appreciate the many virtues which made the life of William Waldron a bright and shining light in the community where he lived. Eminently modest, quiet and unobtrusive in his manner and the presenting of his opinions, yet he was a man of decided convictions, clear perceptions, large sympathies, and though gentle as a woman, was very firm in his opinions when his mind was once satisfied of the truth. He was an outspoken and avowed Spiritualist, and although his convictions led him to espouse an unpopular cause, he never faltered in an earnest, manly support of the principles he loved.

To the bereaved family and friends we extend our sincere sympathy, asking to share with them the deep regret that must be ours because of his departure, yet reminding them that we mourn not like those without hope, nor for one afar off, sorrowing as we do; that angels hold the gates of death ajar, so that our loved ones may return to us at will, to counsel, and with their shining presence still to love and bless.

A. A. W.

JOHN B. FAYETTE, of Oswego, N. Y., is still producing those beautiful spirit likenesses. The life-like and correct one he sent us of our sweet spirit sister may be seen by any one desirous of examining it. We never tire of looking upon it, and shall never cease to be grateful to this medium, through whose powers art speaks so definitely, bringing the loved and gone back to view after an absence of years. There was no picture or painting of our sister in earth-life. A. A. W.

IT IS pleasant to be informed that five hundred men, women, and children, go every fine day into the streets of New-York City for the purpose of stealing whatever they can lay their hands on. We may readily believe that the aptitude of the thief is glossed over with the good dress and good manners of lady and gentlemanhood. But since this is so, and since the public is continually reminded of the fact, both by the daily papers and by its own sufferings from petit larcenies, it seems useless to waste much sympathy on individual cases.—*Ex.*

THE SPIRITUAL PILGRIM.—Mr. Peebles and his biographer remind us of James and John, two other beloved apostles of a new doctrine. Mr. Barrett loves his brother James with a fervor that is only born of the spirit; so let us call them soul brothers. John has not only been fellow worker, but he has been the servant of James—lovingly, faithfully doing the things that needed to be done. He has been over and about the Green Mountains, gathering items of interest that are linked with the early life of the young pilgrim. The vine-covered cottage, the old red school house, the woods and waterfalls in a Vermont hamlet, are, in some way, historians. John has heard what they had to say of James and translated their stories into plain prose. Mr. Barrett has done a good work, for which we give him thanks. The custom is to find fault with whatever does not bear our stamp; according to custom we want to pick a few flaws with Mr. Barrett's work. He has portrayed the victories of the Pilgrim. We see him now standing firm footed upon the green hills of life. How did he reach the upper land? Did he have no grand defeats? Did he ever stumble and fall? We, who are plodding along life's lowlands; we, who are out-reaching our hands through the mists and shadows, calling in vain for light and a guide; we who totter and tumble, wonder if the shining souls up there have ever known by bitter experience our trials and tears. If they have, why, then, may we not hope sometime to reach the holy hills and join the song of deliverance?—*Lycium Banner.*



PERSONAL AND LOCAL.

EMMA HARDINGE-BRITTEN lectures in Portland, this month.

LIZZIE DOTEN lectures in Springfield, Mass., during April.

CEPHAS B. LYNN's address, for the present, is Sturgis, Mich.

J. M. PEEBLES speaks in Troy, N. Y., during February and March.

LYMAN C. HOWE is lecturing for the Spiritualist Society in Chicago.

MISS R. AUGUSTA WHITING (sister of A. B. Whiting) is to enter the lecturing field.

ELIJAH WOODWORTH was to hold a discussion with E. Sprague, at Hillsdale, Mich., January 20th.

MRS. A. E. MOSSOP will speak for the Society of Spiritualists, in Cleveland, O., during February.

A PAINE without a pain—the Paine Ball at Nassau Hall, Boston, Monday evening, January 29.

DEBATABLE Land, by Robert Dale Owen, is having an extensive sale. See extracts from the book in this number.

REGULAR meetings are held at Sagess Hall, 220 East 34th street, N. Y. Lecture at 10½ A.M., and conference at 2½ P.M.

INTERESTING conference meetings are held every Sunday, at Apollo Hall, 2½ P.M., corner Broadway and 28th street.

LAURA DE FORCE GORDON will answer calls to lecture in the New England and Middle States during the winter.

CHARLES H. REED has been astonishing the good people of Du Quoin, Carbondale, and Marion, Ill., with his wonderful tests.

LYMAN C. HOWE, the eloquent inspirational lecturer, will speak at Union Hall, West Farmington, O., during the Sundays of February.

WILLIAM BRUNTON, the graceful speaker and able writer, whose poems often appear in our columns, speaks at Newburyport after January 28.

A SEARCH after God, in the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, continues, with as little prospect of coming to an end as of finding the object of the search!

HUDSON TUTTLE is to lecture before the German liberalists and Spiritualists of Cleveland the first two Sundays of February. The German Theatre has been secured for that purpose.

WE were favored the other day with a brief call from Dr. Allen, of Vineland, N. J. He is conductor of the interesting lyceum at that place, and speaks hopefully of the cause of spiritual progress there for the future.

AT the Calhoun county circle, held at Marshall, Mich., January 13th and 14th, the following officers were elected for the ensuing year: J. P. Averill, President; Mrs. A. Fisher, Vice-President; Mrs. M. E. Cornell, Secretary; and Mrs. Addie Bishop, Treasurer.

THE continued illness of Mrs. Tappan necessitated a change of climate, and accordingly arrangements have been made for her to spend the cold weather amid the orange groves and balmy breezes of the sunny South in Florida. Mrs. Tappan sailed last Saturday on the steamer Magnolia. We most heartily wish her a safe voyage and full recovery of her health and a safe return home again.

EMMA HARDINGE BRITTEN gave the closing discourses of her month's engagement in New York last Sunday at Apollo Hall to large and interested audiences. Her subjects were treated with that clearness of logic and conclusiveness of reason which always characterizes the lectures of this eloquent speaker. As we intend to publish both of these lectures soon, we defer comments for the present, on subjects or lectures.

SOUTHWARD bound is that earnest, active soul—Dean Clark—on a mission of Spiritualism to our southern brethren. He is an able writer and speaker, and we wish him abundant success in his new field of work. He will correspond and act as agent for THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST. Our readers may soon expect a favorable report from this tried and faithful brother. His address, for the present, is 1919 Walnut street, Philadelphia.

LYRIC HALL, last Sunday evening, was filled to its utmost capacity to hear Mrs. Laura Cuppy Smith, on the all-important and deeply interesting subject: "The social problem—fashionable morality exposed—the woman side of the Fisk tragedy." If the frequent applause which interrupted the speaker is any indication of the ability with which she treated her subject, as well as the interest the audience evidently had in it, she must have been satisfied with her effort. We shall publish the lecture in full.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL will make engagements to lecture upon either of the following subjects: "The Principles of Social Freedom;" "Impartial Suffrage Constitutional, vs. Impartial Suffrage Unconstitutional;" "Carpenter and Carter on Woman Suffrage Reviewed;" "The Material Relations of Humanity;" "The Principles of Finance;" "The Rights and Relations of Children;" "The International;" "The Religion of Humanity;" "The Impending Revolution." She may be addressed 44 Broad street, New York city.

The misfortune of the ex-minister of the church of the Messiah is that he chose the time for creating his own sensations when others were before him in the market. He preached his farewell when Stokes murdered Fisk, and he makes his debut when the Fisk letters crowd aside all other eager reading. The manner of the reverend gentleman's fresh presentation to the public suggests broadside posters, ornamented vans and sonorous metal. Dr. Clarke declares that he has not changed his theological convictions—only his theological associates. Unitarianism is unpopular in New York, and he felt lonely and left. Dr. Bartol thinks the new "gymnastic feat in theology" too unimportant to notice; if it were a profound thinker who had left the denomination, he should feel that it was time to revise his convictions. It is not when a meteor shoots its trail of borrowed light that men regulate their time-pieces, but when there are eccentric movements discoverable in the sun. Without at all invading the theological domain, but judging practically and as the world judges, it is unquestionable that the "new departure" of Mr. Hepworth is already a failure. Very few of his Sunday hearers could describe with any precision what it was he wanted. He left Unitarianism because it was too broad—he proposes, now he is out, to found a church broader than them all.—[*Ex.*]

THIS is an age of disillusion. We have reluctantly consented to consign William Tell, with his cross-bow and apple, and the dog Gellert to the limbo of Aryan myths; have had our faith shaken in Captain John Smith and Pocahontas; and have yet more lately seen the Venus of Milo straightened into her original position out of what has for half a century been accepted by the world as the line of beauty. But a greater shock to our settled ideas has been given by Mr. Story, in the statement that the famous Beatrice Cenci of Guido is not all that we and our fathers before us have supposed it. The Barberini palace is one of the most noble wrecks of Rome; and the most noble among the few art treasures which it still contains, remnants of a great collection, is the female head, beautiful as an angel and agonized beyond the expression of tears, which has stood as the portrait of the unhappy daughter of the Cenci. If we must give up the legend of Guido, watching with pencil in hand to catch the final expression as she went to her doom; if we must refuse to be moved by the raving of the poets and sentimental tourists; and if we must catalogue this portrait as only "Head of a lady;" what can we absolutely trust as genuine among all that we think we know?—*Boston Post.*

Departed.

Passed into the spirit world January 8, 1872, from Chagrin Falls, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, Mr. William C. Waldron, aged forty-eight years.

We have thus lost a useful and honored citizen; a friend from a large circle of sympathizing mourners, and his family a husband and a father, seldom equaled in the practice of all those virtues and affections that pertain to a well ordered, social and domestic life.

Mr. Waldron began life a poor boy, but succeeded by steady and persevering industry in accumulating ample means for the support and comfort of his deeply bereaved family. Prompted by the practical good sense which ever characterized the man, he made full disposition of all his pecuniary matters in a very satisfactory manner. Being possessed of ample discriminating powers, he became an investigator and an early believer in the phenomena and philosophy of modern Spiritualism, and as with him, to know the right was to do it, his life was an illustration and exemplification of the principles of the harmonial philosophy. Liberal in purse as in spirit, he always lent very efficient aid in the promulgation of science and rationalism, as opposed to and against superstitious bigotry and religious hypocrisy.

A very pious Methodist neighbor called on him a few days prior to his departure, and interrogated him concerning his opinions. "No," says he, "I have not changed my opinions at all, and have no desire to change them. They were good enough to live by, and I am willing to die by them." He enjoyed the fullest exercise of his senses and reason to the very last, and having passed without a murmur through a sickness of nearly five months, he expressed a willingness to go, feeling that the way was bright before him.

There is no truer maxim than that "an honest man is the noblest work of God," and as such, our friend occupied a truly high position, for being the oldest merchant in this place, having done business here for more than a quarter of a century, he possessed an enviable and universal reputation among all classes throughout the entire community for "honest dealing." He possessed, in an admirable degree, the ennobling qualities of honesty, industry and sobriety, than which, three greater accomplishments do not pertain to the embellishment of human character.

"No sectarian creed his soul enslaved,  
But fearlessly he trod  
The path of rectitude and right,  
And left the rest with God." V.

OUR well-known, universally esteemed brother, Thomas Gales Forster, was suddenly called upon last week to lay the dead form of his wife in the all-embracing arms of mother nature. Years ago, Mrs. Forster's mind became somewhat darkened. The development of time but increased the cloud which hung over her mental vision, and about two years since, with reluctant consent, she was placed in an appropriate asylum for the afflicted, an excellent institution of its kind, in the city of Washington. When last we heard of her, the only faculty she retained was her memory of music, which, providentially as it were, appeared to be spared her. Always distinguished as a brilliant performer on the piano, even when an occupant of the asylum and unable to recognize either husband or children, she would often while away the hours, seated at her favorite instrument, playing over and over again, with exquisite tenderness, though doubtless more or less mechanically, the familiar airs of her earlier years.

Lack of information, at this present writing, concerning her departure and the facts attending her funeral, prevent our speaking of the deceased as we otherwise would. This much, however, is certain, that Spiritualism, as a consolatory religion in all the so-termed afflictive changes of human life is worth more than all the other theological systems known to mankind.

Brother Forster, who has the fullest sympathy of all Spiritualists, was thus necessitated to disappoint the vast concourse at Music Hall, Boston, last Sunday, who had not heard of this not altogether unexpected event. Miss Lizzie Doten was fortunately obtained to supply Bro. Forster's place.

Another False Move in France.

The hopes that there can or will be any improvement in France and the condition of the French so long as M. Thiers is at the head of the government, are now quite vain. Every opportunity for some solid gain from a republican form of government is lost through either the willfulness or the blindness of this singular old man. There never was a better chance to liberalize education in France than within the last few weeks. On the appointment of the president of the Bureau of Instruction hung in great measure the future fortunes of the country. The assembly had promised great things—the renewal of the national life, the upbuilding of a new social fabric on the ruins of the old, the classifying and precisizing of all the now unavailable talent in the country. These were, to believe these illustrious gentlemen, near at hand. But meantime the President of the Assembly very coolly appoints Monseigneur Dupanloup, the Catholic Archbishop of France, the main authority in all the new educational movements. This is to make a mockery of the wishes of the intelligent portion of the French people. The same illiberal and narrow culture which the Catholic church has for centuries given to the children of its adherents has been plainly proven insufficient to give a nation its best development. Yet M. Thiers asks France to content herself with it, and combats even the moderately advanced minds which claim a liberal and secular school system, over which no cathedral altar shall throw its shadow.—*Boston Journal.*



(Continued from Fifth Page.)

have not time to notice them here. I wait however to hear him advocate them from his seat in the Senate, and to see his brethren of the Republican party say, Amen!

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

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

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

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

But Justice Cartter strikes a blow at the very existence of our theory of government, when he argues that the right to vote is not a natural right, existing regardless of constitutions and laws. He says: "The legal vindication of the natural right of citizens to vote would involve the destruction of civil government, hence the right does not exist." Civil government does exist, even with all the accumulation of male depravity. Justice Cartter in substance tells us if women participate they would destroy it, hence women do not have the right to participate. Complimentary, truly; isn't it?

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

But this is not all the discoveries in constitutional law made by this latter-day Columbus. It has been his fortune to find out that women have been rescued from one unpleasant condition by this Amendment. "It has done so much as to distinguish them from aliens," says this Solomon. "To be an alien," says Webster, "is not to belong to the same country or government;" "belonging to one who is not a citizen;" "estranged;" "foreign;" "not allied;" "adverse to;" "one not entitled to the privileges of a citizen." Now we are in-

formed that we are rescued from these conditions; that we now "belong to the same country and government;" that we are "citizens;" that we are not "estranged," or "foreign;" that we are "allied," and not "adverse to;" and that we are "entitled to the privileges of a citizen." All this may be consistency, and very precious jewels at that, but I am free to confess that my obtuseness will not permit me to appreciate the application of it, made by Justice Cartter.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



vote, it shall be the duty of every such person or officer to give to all citizens of the United States the same and equal opportunity to perform such pre-requisite and to become qualified to vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But we suppose Senator Carpenter would at this stage of the argument again remind us of that "fatal" second section of the Fourteenth Amendment. None of our opponents now attempt to say that women are not citizens. That is admitted by them all. Now if to be a citizen is to have the right of suffrage, or, if the elective franchise is included among the privileges of citizens, then women have the right to

vote. I will prove both propositions, and thus doubly establish our claim by two other methods.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But let us see more of this business.

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

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

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

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

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

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

"The privileges and immunities conceded by the Constitution of the United States to citizens in the several States," are to be confined to those which are in their nature fundamental, and belong of right to the citizens of all free governments. Such are the rights of protection of life and liberty, and to acquire and enjoy property, and to pay no higher impositions than other citizens, and to pass through or reside in



the State at pleasure, and to enjoy the elective franchise as regulated and established by the laws or constitution of the State in which it is to be exercised.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now shall we quietly submit to have five millions men domineer over and insult seven millions women and two millions men. If men think so I am sure they will be mistaken. There is one thing left to be done. If, under our present Constitution, we cannot obtain our rights, we will project one under which we shall be able to get them, and that too without depriving anybody else of theirs. These nine millions citizens are entitled to a Constitution to represent them, and they have got the power to inaugurate it. I do not propose they shall wait "sixty years" for justice. I want it here and now; and I intend, at least, to propose a way to get it; and not only to get this justice, but also a way by which justice shall be secured to all classes; and especially to those millions who toil all their lives only to see the results of their labor

poured through channels constructed by our wise legislators into the coffers of the already rich—a justice which shall set this tide in the opposite direction, until equality shall be restored, and until no man or woman shall be able to exist from the sweat and toil of another. We have spoken of revolution before, and what I shall now propose means revolution—means a complete transformation of the present condition of things—means the voice of the people heard as the government of this country, in the place of Congress and Legislatures, who have usurped our rights, and who presume to deal them out to us by the teaspoonful, and even this only when they see fit, or think it expedient.—[Here followed the presentation of the New Constitution.]

BRANCH OFFICE  
HUDSON  
RIVER WIRE WORKS,  
114 ONTARIO STREET,  
Cleveland, Ohio.

Patent White Wire Clothes Line.  
REASONS WHY EVERY FAMILY  
SHOULD HAVE ONE.

1st—It never need be taken down, for whatever the weather may be, it cannot affect it.

2d—In addition to the said great convenience, it is the cheapest Clothes Line in the world. Cannot be loaded with clothes so heavy as to break it, and will last a life time, while a rope line that will cost one-third or one-half as much, will last with good care only about one year. If it cost 25, instead of 3 cents per foot, it would be cheaper in the end than a rope line.

3d—It does not in any way discolor, wear, or injure clothes, and they never freeze to it. In the coldest weather the finest fabrics can be removed instantly without injury. This is a decided advantage over rope lines.

4—It will save its cost in saving clothes every six months it is used.

5—We give to every person who purchases from us, or our agents, the following guarantee from the manufacturers:

GUARANTEE.

.....187

This is to guarantee the Patent White Wire Clothes Line, this day sold to M..... against rusting, corroding, wearing the clothes or freezing to them. If not found to prove as represented, the money will be refunded.

HUDSON RIVER WIRE WORKS,  
R. T. BUSH & Co., Manufacturers.

FOR THE CHILDREN  
OF  
Spiritualists and Reformers.  
A BOOK FOR ALL.  
A  
NEAT LITTLE VOLUME  
OF  
DIALOGUES AND RECITATIONS,  
MOST HAPPILY ADAPTED  
To the use of

Progressive Lyceums,  
Published by the American Spiritualist  
Publishing Company,

NOW READY TO TAKE ORDERS

These Dialogues and Recitations are  
written by

MRS. LOUISA SHEPARD

Leader of

LIBERTY GROUP,

in

Geneva Lyceum Ohio

Aided by

SPIRIT INFLUENCE.

And will be found not only

INTERESTING & INSTRUCTIVE

But will help to supply a great want  
long felt in our Lyceums.  
First Edition

ONLY 2,000 COPIES.

PRICE.—Cloth, embossed and neatly bound,  
75 cents. Plain cloth, 50 Cents.

Send Orders At Once.

Liberal Discount made to Lyceums and  
persons sending for 2 doz. copies or more in  
one order: Address

AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST

29 Beekman street, New York City

SPIRIT  
PHOTOGRAPHS

BY

W. H. MUMLER.

Three wonderful pictures of Mrs. Fannie  
Conant, of the "Banner of Light."

1st—Of her spirit brother, Chas. H.  
Crowell.

2d—Of her little Indian girl, Vash-  
ah.

3d—Spirit hands holding in suspen-  
sion spirit flowers.

Card size. The three sent to any address  
on receipt of 50c. Every Spiritualist should  
have them. Address, W. H. MUMLER,

170 West Springfield St.,

19-2m

Boston, Mass

To Advertisers.—All persons who con-  
template making contracts with newspapers  
for the insertion of Advertisements should  
send to

GEO. P. ROWELL & CO.

for a Circular, or enclose 25 cents for their  
ONE HUNDRED PAGE PAMPHLET, con-  
taining lists of 3,000 Newspapers and esti-  
mates, showing the cost of advertising, also  
many useful hints to advertisers, and some  
account of the experiences of men who are  
known as SUCCESSFUL ADVERTISERS.  
This firm are proprietors of the American  
Newspaper Advertising Agency,

41 PARK ROW N. Y.,

and are possessed of unequalled facilities for  
securing the insertion of advertisements in all  
Newspapers and Periodicals at lowest rates.

BANKRUPT. --- From Auction,  
a large lot of  
Ladies' Solid Gold Hunting Case Watches,  
full jeweled, detached lever movements, \$28  
each, usual price \$45. More expensive Ladies'  
Hunting Watches and elegant Chains, from  
auction, at proportionate prices. Goods sent  
C. O. D., privilege to examine. F. J. NASH,  
removed to 712 Broadway, N. Y., May 1st.  
"Worthy the fullest confidence."—*Christian  
Advocate*, N. Y. "All that Mr. Nash says  
may be relied upon."—*Christian at Work*.  
"We have the utmost confidence in the above  
goods."—*Liberal Christian*. "Certainly cheap  
and the quality reliable."—*Christian Intelli-  
gencer*. "Just what he represents them."—  
*Christian Union*. "Reliable."—*Moore's Rural  
New Yorker*. 11

COAL! COAL!

I AM RECEIVING DAILY the following  
Coals, and will sell at the

LOWEST MARKET RATES.

The Franklin Hard Coal is superior to any  
in this market. The Cannel Coal burns more  
like wood and is a very superior coal; will  
last much longer than any other of the soft  
coals in market.

MASSILLON, HOCKING VALLEY,  
BRIER HILL, CANNEL AND  
SALINEVILLE COAL.

Hard Coal, Lehigh, Franklin  
& Pittston.

Sewer Pipe and Drain Tile.

Office 64 South Water Street, and at  
Euclid Avenue Station.

E. N. HAMMOND.

21

Cleveland, O.

DR. C. BUTTS

WISHES to inform his patrons and the  
public that he has resumed the manufac-  
ture of his

EXCELSIOR MEDICINES AND  
NEVER FAILING  
PILLS,

And in a few days they will be ready for sale  
—having been burned out by the Chicago  
Fire. 24



**THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST**

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY BY  
The American Spiritualist Publishing Company,  
Only \$2.50 per year in advance.  
Address—  
**A. A. Wheelock,**  
29 Beekman Street, New York City

The Managing Editor will answer calls for Lectures, officiate at Marriage Ceremonies and attend Funerals.

**RATES OF ADVERTISING.**

Inches	1 issue, 1 time	2 issues, 1 month	4 issues, 2 months	6 issues, 3 months	8 issues, 4 months	10 issues, 5 months	13 issues, 6 months	19 issues, 9 months	26 issues, 1 year
1	1.00	1.50	2.68	3.80	4.92	6.04	7.72	11.08	15.00
2	1.75	2.56	4.19	5.81	7.44	9.07	11.51	16.39	22.08
3	2.50	3.56	5.70	7.82	9.96	12.10	15.30	21.70	29.16
4	3.25	4.56	7.21	9.83	12.48	15.13	19.09	27.01	36.24
5	4.00	5.56	8.72	11.85	15.00	18.16	22.88	32.32	43.32
6	4.75	6.56	10.23	13.86	17.52	21.19	26.67	37.63	50.40
7	5.50	7.56	11.74	15.87	20.04	24.22	30.46	42.94	57.48
8	6.25	8.56	13.25	17.89	22.56	27.25	34.25	48.52	64.56
9	7.00	9.56	14.76	19.89	25.08	30.28	38.04	53.56	71.64
10	7.75	10.57	16.27	21.90	27.61	33.31	41.83	58.87	78.72
11	8.50	11.58	17.78	23.91	30.13	36.34	45.62	64.18	85.80
12	9.25	12.59	19.29	25.92	32.65	39.37	49.41	69.49	92.88
13	10.00	13.60	20.80	28.00	35.20	42.40	53.20	74.80	100.00

**SUBSCRIBERS.**

Subscribers will please understand that when they see our "office stamp" upon the margin of their paper, in blue ink, it is the only notice we give that the time of their subscription has expired! It is also a special invitation from the Managing Editor, to have each one renew promptly.

**Are You Going to New York?**

If so, and you wish to stop where you will

**FEEL AT HOME,**

and get

Good Food Healthfully Prepared.

AND

**PLENTY OF IT,**

go to the

**HYGIENIC INSTITUTE,**

Nos. 13 & 15 Laight St.

Horse Cars pass near the door to all parts of the city, making it a very

**CONVENIENT STOPPING PLACE**

for persons visiting New York, either upon business or pleasure Open at all hours, day and night.

BOARD BY THE DAY OR WEEK, AT REASONABLE RATES.

Rooms can be secured in advance by writing. Address

WOOD & HOLBROOK, Proprietors,

Nos. 13 & 15 Laight street, New York.

**BUSINESS CARDS.**

**T. C. EVANS, ADVERTISING AGENT,**  
106 Washington street, Boston.

**BROWN & LOWN,**  
Attorneys and Counselors at Law,  
Office corner Bank and Superior streets, opposite Weddell House.

**Mrs. SCHNEIDER,**  
MILLINER AND DRESSMAKER,  
186 Ohio St., Cleveland, O.

Skirt supporting Corsets for sale. 23

**E. DECKER,**  
PHOTOGRAPHER

243 SUPERIOR STREET,  
CLEVELAND, O.

**THE SHERMAN FAMILY.**

JOHN SHERMAN and his two sons,  
MOSES and HENRY,

Remarkable Test Mediums,  
will answer calls to hold Seances for the manifestation of the

WONDERFUL PHENOMENA  
produced through their mediumship.

Address,  
JOHN SHERMAN,  
Cardington, Ohio.

**ROSE & BROTHER,**  
PACKERS AND HAM-CURERS

138 Ontario Street, Cleveland, O.  
HAMS, Shoulders and Breakfast Bacon, best in market, prime Leaf-Lard, rendered, in tierces, barrels and kegs No 1 Mess and Light Mess Long and Short, Clear Pork.

All articles warranted to give satisfaction; all at lowest market price. No charge for package or cartage.

**APOLLO HALL MEETINGS.**

(Cor. Broadway and 28th street.)

**Thos. Gales Forster,**

THE  
ELOQUENT TRANCE SPEAKER,

ENGAGED FOR A YEAR,

Will Lecture EVERY SUNDAY  
Morning at 10, and Ev'g at 7.30.

ALL ARE INVITED.

**ONE PRICE**  
**Boot and Shoe Store.**

**T. G. SHOLES & Co.,**  
234 Superior St., Cleveland, Ohio.

(T. G. SHOLES, WILLIAM MCFARLAND,  
A. H. WOLF.)

Largest assortment in the city. 7-1y

**New Millinery Establishment.**

JUST OPENED a large and splendid assortment of

**Millinery Goods!**

BY  
**Mrs. M. C. Stewart, Painesville, O.,**

who will give her whole attention to the Millinery department.

A call solicited. 23

**Whitney's Neats Foot**  
**HARNESS SOAP.**

(Steam Refined.)

It Oils, Blacks, Polishes, and Soaps at the same time. For sale by Harness Makers, Grocers, and Druggists everywhere. Manufactured by  
**G. F. WHITNEY & CO.,**  
17-6t Lexington, Mass.

**\$375** A MONTH—Horse and outfit furnished. Address, NOVELTY Co., Saco, Me. 23-13t

**A GREAT CHANCE FOR AGENTS.**

Do you want an agency, local or traveling, with a chance to make \$5 to \$20 per day selling our new 7 strand WHITE WIRE CLOTHES LINES? They last forever; samples free, so there is no risk.

Call on, or address, C. M. NYE, 114 Ontario St., Cleveland, O.

**DR. H. SLADE,**

CLAIRVOYANT,

AND

**J. SIMMONS.**

DR. SLADE will, on receiving a lock of hair, with the full name and age, make a clairvoyant examination, and return a written diagnosis of the case, with cost of treatment. A fee of two dollars must accompany the hair, which will be applied on medicine where treatment is ordered. All letters should be directed to  
SLADE & SIMMONS,  
210 West 43d Street, N. Y.

P. S.—Please write your address plain:

**THEY NEVER FAIL!**

The following extracts from letters to Prof. Spence, show the vast range and irresistible power of the POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE POWDERS:

"The Positive and Negative Powders are creating a great excitement here. It can truly be said, in my own person, that the DEAF HEAR, the BLIND SEE, the LAME WALK, and the LEPER IS CLEANSSED. I had the Leprosy in my legs, arms, head, and nearly all over my body, for thirty years. After taking your Positive Powders about four days, I shoved up my sleeve to see how my arm looked and, to my utter astonishment, the scabs would cleave off easily, and leave all smooth; and now my head and body are clean. The Catarrh in my head is arrested. They cured my lungs that were tied up with Phlegm and Cough. The Rheumatism in my muscles commenced many years ago, and by degrees extended all over me, so that I could not raise my right arm to my head, or put it in my vest. I can now hold it in any position. My legs I could only with difficulty get off, any way. I now travel quite easily. By overdoing, last Fall, I brought on a pain about the heart, and it would beat a few beats, and stop, and start again. I could not lie on it at all. The Powders have set it all right. Several years ago, from overstraining one eye, and a blow on the other, I became Blind, so that I could not know a person in the same room; now I can read the large words in your circular. Yet, I took only two boxes of Negatives. Please send me six dozen boxes. A. H. MILLS, Jefferson Mills, N. H."

"The Positive and Negative Powders do all they are recommended to do. They cured me of DYSPEPSIA, and there has not been any return of it for over a year. They cured one member of the family of the AGUE in three days. I have used them in my family for over two years. No amount of money could tempt me to be without them.

"Mrs. BENJAMIN KINYON, Bristol, Ind."

"I was Blind, and nearly helpless with Rheumatism, and the Positive and Negative Powders perfectly restored my sight and health."

S. S. BAKER, JR., Blacks & Whites, Va."

"I have been introducing your Positive and Negative Powders in this neighborhood with astonishing effect. One old man had HEART DISEASE very bad, and was not expected to live. In one week after taking the Positive Powders he was better than he had been for twenty years, and now he is as well as he ever was. All who have tried the Powders are doing well. Send me three dozen boxes, C. O. D. P. N. MORRELL, Pilot Grove, Iowa."

"My daughter, in Boston, had the CHOLERA MORBUS, and was confined to her bed two weeks before telegraphing to me. I went to her and commenced giving her the Positive Powders, and in two days she was up and dressed. Her three children had first the SCARLET FEVER, and then the CHICKEN POX. I used the Positive and Negative Powders, and nothing else, and in two weeks they were going to school.

"Mrs. LOUISA SNOWMAN, Castine, Me."

"I have derived great benefit from your Positive and Negative Powders in past years, by being cured of RHEUMATISM and ERY-SIPELAS. I have used two or three boxes

of those last received, for NEURALGIA in my head, and they had the desired effect, as I am now quite free from that painful disease.

"H. GORTON, Marion, Ohio."

"I have a little girl four years old, who had the CROUP so bad that she could scarcely breathe. I gave her the Positive Powders, and in an hour she dropped to sleep quietly, and that was the last of the Croup.

"MARY STOODLEY, North Hamden, N. Y."

"One lady has had a CANCER of fourteen years' standing, cured by one box of the Positive Powders. Send me six dozen boxes.

"J. W. WHITELY, Bonaparte, Iowa."

**AGENTS WANTED.**

We want Agents everywhere, male or female, local and traveling, to whom the MOST LIBERAL TERMS WILL BE GIVEN. Agents are doing splendidly. The writers of the following letters each began his agency with only one dozen boxes of the Positive and Negative Powders. The writer of the first is a well known healing medium.

"Prof. Spence.—You will please find enclosed a draft for \$350.00, for which you will express one gross of your Positive and Negative Powders to Matilda B. George, Lincoln City, Neb., and the balance in Powders to myself. ELLIS B. GEORGE, Yates City, Ill."

"Prof. Spence.—Dear Sir: I herewith send you a draft on New York for \$200.00. Be kind enough to forward me the worth of it in your most excellent Positive and Negative Powders. A. HUGGINS, Branchville, Ark."

"Prof. Payton Spence, M. D.—Sir: Please forward by express—marked C. O. D.—twelve dozen boxes of Positive and Negative Powders.

"Dr. W. J. VESCELIUS, Woodruff House, Watertown, N. Y."

Buy the Positive and Negative Powders of Druggists, or of Agents, or else send to Prof. Spence for them.

**One Box 1\$. Six Boxes \$5. Twelve Boxes 9\$.**

OFFICE 37 1/2 ST. MARK'S PLACE.

Address PROF. PAYTON SPENCE, M. D. Box 5817, New York City.

For sale also at the office of The American Spiritualist, 114 Ontario street, Cleveland, O., and 29 Beekman street, New York City.



HEADQUARTERS FOR

**EMBLEMATIC SIGNS,**

For every trade and profession, including:

- Watches, Mortars, Hats, Boots,
- Guns, Gloves, Spectacles, Gilt
- Eagles, Block Letters,
- Developing Clubs, &c.

PARTICULAR ATTENTION PAID TO SPECIAL DESIGNS, SIGN AND BANNER WORK, FANCY AND ORNAMENTAL GLASS SIGN WRITING. COPPER WEATHER VANES IN EVERY VARIETY

And at Prices to Suit.

Illustrated Catalogues sent free.

**W. L. WASHBURNE,**

No. 4 Courtlandt street, New York.



## THE HILLS BEYOND THE BAY.

BY EBEN E. REXFORD.

Gray shadows fall and hide the day,  
And lands beyond the sombre bay—  
The land whose hills have all day long  
Been touched with sun and cheered with song.

So falls about some lives the night,  
And hides the sunshine from the sight—  
The sun kissed peaks of youth away  
Beyond the darkness of the bay.

O years, between the now and then!  
Your tide sets out and in again,  
And widens, while the hill-tops seem  
To fade as in some lingering dream.

Oh, dim and dimmer, on our sight,  
The far peaks fade into the night;  
The morning seems so far away  
At twilight of a vanished day!—

A day of sunshine, like a prayer  
Sent up by earth, and sea, and air,  
Not fairer has the long day been  
Than youth, which cannot come again.

The sun-touched hills of youth must be  
Henceforth a tender memory—  
A day that died—a land away  
Beyond the ever-widening bay.

## A Solution Extraordinary.

Some years ago there lived in Missouri a preacher of the Campbellite persuasion, who was noted for eccentricities, which brought large audiences to hear him. On one occasion, when at the zenith of his glory, he discoursed on the deliverance of the children of Israel from the bondage of Egypt. "Brethren," said he, "there are many difficult passages in the Bible, and you may be led into error unless you understand them. Now you have all read the chapter which says Moses stretched out his hand over the Red Sea and the waters became a wall, and the children of Israel went over dry shod, while their pursuers were overwhelmed by the returning waters and drowned. As this reads, it is hard to understand and difficult to explain. But we know that any event that does happen may be explained and understood if it is only put rightly. There is no doubt this event happened, for the Bible says so, but the fault of the difficulty is with the translators. It don't mean what it says in English. I have read it in the original Greek, and tell you that it will be properly rendered in the translation our church is now making. It will then read: "when they arrived at the Red Sea they camped all night, the weather became cold, and a strong east wind caused the sea to freeze over, and the children of Israel walked over to the other side. When the Egyptians, with their immense army and heavy chariots of war, attempted to follow, they broke through the ice which providence had made only strong enough to bear the host of Israel, and thus were engulfed and lost." A brother in the audience said: "will the brother allow me to ask a question? My geography locates that sea nearly on the equator, where there is never any ice, and I would like to know where the ice came from?" The elder became somewhat embarrassed, but recovered courage and replied: "If the enquiring brother was as learned as he would have us believe, he would know that this happened thousands of years ago, before there was any geography or equator. I think this a complete answer." It is but just to the intelligence of the audience that the congregation appeared entirely satisfied with the explanation, whether the enquiring brother was or not.

A GENTLEMAN who conversed with Mrs. Lincoln, in Chicago, a few days since, says she is in excellent health, but overwhelmed with grief at the loss of her son Thaddeus. He had grown to be a tall and handsome boy, speaking French and German fluently, and had never had a day's sickness while abroad, but the moment he reached New-York he was so affected by the heat that he never recovered from the change. She says he was one of the most affectionate children she ever knew, hardly ever leaving her side, except when at school, and then coming in every evening to dine with her at Frankfort. He was a great American, and loved to talk of his country. Wherever he went he was a favorite. A few days before his death he told his mother he had just seen his father, and that he knew he was waiting for him. No wonder the poor lady feels this new blow and is inconsolable under her double grief.

## BRIEFS.

A MAN may be ashamed of the fashion of his nose, although he follows it.

STRANGE to say, no matter how well paid a dentist is, he always looks down in the mouth.

i do n't kno ov enny det so hard to kollect az a minister's salary, after it once gits kold.—*Josh Billings.*

THE Worcester *Palladium*, last week, had a capital leader in favor of woman suffrage, argued from the broad democratic ground of all the governed having a share in government as a *right*.

GAZING on a grave-yard from a lawyer's den is something well calculated to give even an unimaginative person very vivid views concerning death and the devil.

Of the ninety-seven cities in the United States having a population of upward of ten thousand inhabitants, twenty-three are in the New England States, and of these fifteen are in Massachusetts.

THE experiment of keeping the Philadelphia Mercantile Library open on Sundays has proved so successful that the directors will not close the building hereafter until 9 o'clock, instead of at sunset, as hitherto.

Gone before

To, that unknown and silent shore—*Charles Lamb.*  
HE mourns the dead who lives as they desire.

—*Young.*

Who builds a church to God, and not to fame,  
Will never mark the marble with his name.—*Pope.*

'Tis the sunset of life gives me mystical lore,  
And coming events cast their shadows before.

—*Campbell.*

THE Lafayette (Ind.) *Journal* tells of a young man in that vicinity who gave a woman his note for \$500 as a balm for wounded honor, and afterward married her to get possession of the note. He then destroyed the document and left for parts unknown, and has not been heard of since.

EXTRAORDINARY conduct of an English girl.—Late English papers mention an extraordinary case, at Renfrew, of one Marie Campbell, who put on boys' clothes at thirteen, and wore them till twenty-two, before discovery. She worked in a ship-yard among men for years, married another woman, was a desperate flirt and famous for her adventures and intrigues with her own sex. This is declared one of the strangest cases on record, as Marie is in every respect a perfectly developed woman, but its authenticity is pronounced beyond question.

THE *Independent* administers a just rebuke to President Grant for saying in his message that providence has visited the nation "with more than the usual chastisements in the loss of life and property by storm and fire." A good father may see that it is best for a child to have severe trials to develop his endurance, courage and trust, without necessarily intending that they should be regarded as floggings for sin. We pity the people of Chicago and Peshtigo afresh, if, in addition to their bodily sufferings, they saw only a vision of God as an angry overseer, laying his lashes on their bleeding backs with a will.—*Christian Register.*

A PRIVATE letter from a Zurich lady has the following: "A young lady from Boston, Miss Susan Dimmock, has just been obliged to crown her course of study in medicine, surgery, etc., with a thesis in German, which both professors and students of the School of Medicine in Zurich were at liberty to discuss with her. She won the admiration even of those most opposed to the practice of medicine by women. Each of the professors set himself to praise her application, the dignity and firmness of her character, and the perfect propriety of her conduct toward her fellow-pupils of the other sex. It is said that no female student here has reached her line; and it is predicted of her that she will make herself a name in science."

1872. OUR MOTTO IS 1872.  
IMPROVEMENT!

THE

## AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST,

IS NOW PUBLISHED WEEKLY,

PRICE ONLY \$2.50 PER YEAR.

GREAT INDUCEMENTS

TO SUBSCRIBE!

WOODHULL &amp; CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY,

a sixteen-page paper,

GIVEN AWAY ONE YEAR,

To every NEW Subscriber to the AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST, before March 1st, 1872!

REMEMBER that the AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST is the only paper that clubs with "Woodhull &amp; Claflin's Weekly," on those terms!

ALSO,

To PRESENT Subscribers,

Who will RENEW their subscriptions for another year, BEFORE March 1st, 1872, we will send a copy of

WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY  
FREE for one year!

OUR FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE

will be a most interesting feature, as some of the  
Ablest Minds in Europe

have been engaged to correspond regularly for this journal.

WE ALSO PRESENT ASTONISHINGLY

LOW CLUB RATES

The American Spiritualist,  
Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly,  
and The Lyceum Banner.

ALL SENT ONE YEAR

FOR ONLY \$3.25!

The regular price of the three papers would be \$5.50! We have arranged this Club List to assist the *Lyceum Banner*, our Children's Paper, the office material, &c. of which was recently entirely DESTROYED in the great CHICAGO FIRE!

## THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST

will have for its contributors, OUR BEST WRITERS—with a distinguished Corps of Corresponding Editors soon to be announced. Besides being published WEEKLY, it will be issued the SAME DAY from Offices established in the following cities:

CLEVELAND, O., - - - Office—114 Ontario St.  
C. M. Nye, Agent.

WASHINGTON, D. C., - - - Office—  
Geo. White, Agent.

BOSTON, MASS., - - - Office—  
Geo. A. Bacon, Agent.

CHICAGO, ILL., - - - Office—225 West Randolph St.  
Mrs. Lou H. Kimball, Agent.

LOUISVILLE, KY., - - - Office—  
W. M. Connelly, Agent.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., - - - Office—  
Herman Snow, Agent.

CENTRAL OFFICE, - - - NEW YORK.  
A. A. WHEELLOCK, Managing Editor.

AGENTS WANTED IN EVERY STATE and TERRITORY to canvass for the AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST, to whom LIBERAL compensation will be given.

All matters of business and other communications should be addressed to

A. A. WHEELLOCK,

29 Beekman Street, New York City.