

THE HUMANITARIAN.

VOL. I.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1892.

No. 5.

OFFICE OF PUBLICATION, 20 VESEY STREET.

Published simultaneously in London.

EDITOR:

MRS. VICTORIA WOODHULL MARTIN.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR:

MRS. ZULA MAUD WOODHULL.

All communications should be addressed to

The Editor, HUMANITARIAN,

142 West 70th Street,

New York, U. S. A.

or, 17 Hyde Park Gate,

London, England.

[Entered as Second Class matter at the Post Office in New York.]

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE.

It has been asked why did I originally interest myself in woman's suffrage?

Realizing the terrible degradation of a portion of women and the evils which resulted to society from such degradation, and knowing that effects cease when causes are removed, I commenced to study out the causes of disease, prostitution, poverty and crime, and to seek remedies. Laws are made to govern society; who makes the laws? I asked; and the answer came, why men of course. Public opinion is the arbiter of morals and woman's position; who shapes and educates public opinion? I asked; and still the same answer came—men. I saw the unequal representation between men and women in making laws to govern society, and I saw how unjust was that public opinion.

Women had great difficulty in obtaining proper employment, for, at that time, in 1870, there were not even the societies to protect either the well meaning or the unfortunate women, that exist to-day. Left without protection through ignorance of proper knowledge of her own person, and also ignorance of means of obtaining a living, she became a prey to men.

It was not that there were not some employments open to women, but even these were more or less hampered with conditions that very often led to the degradation of women. But when, through the very ignorance of vital laws of her own person, and the difficulties in the way of her earning an honest livelihood, she became a victim, there could be no redemption, she was an outcast. Outcast! The synonym of the ancient pariah. In ancient India par-

iahs were punished by loss of caste. In its final analysis, it meant a living death—the gradual annihilating of a human soul! Society to-day punishes in the same manner, and as a consequence, all large towns count their outcasts by the thousands. Outcast! She is to be socially ostracized, she is to be hounded, she is to receive no pity, no mercy, she has no soul worth saving. Has civilization invented a more fiendish plan of torturing the victims of its own creation? A properly educated public opinion should ostracize the producer and not the pitiful result. Its rage should be directed against the destroyer and not the destroyed. But this could never be, so long as public opinion was educated by men alone, and that same public opinion decreed that women ought not to have any power in the formulating of laws; they ought not to engage in any business which was remunerative because it was unwomanly. It was not, or is not, unwomanly to bear the idiots, the insane, the vicious, the inebriates, the criminals, into the world through her enforced dependence on man.

And society through its inhumanity to a portion of its women, drove them into prostitution. This very shortsightedness failed to discover why outcasts were women instead of men.

The highest purpose of the relations of the sexes will never be accomplished until women have social, financial, and political freedom. The curse put upon woman when she was driven out of Eden was: "Thy desire shall be unto thy husband and he shall rule over thee." The relations of the sexes will never be adjusted so as to insure the highest good to the community until women have a voice in making the laws which govern them.

I became satisfied that, under the Constitution, women had this right, and she was only deprived of it by habit and custom. Therefore I memorialized Congress to that effect. Sometime after, the question arose with me, how far could popular suffrage be safely extended under the conditions of ignorance which prevails among both sexes? Then I advocated that certain qualifications for voting should be insisted upon. I advocated the necessity that citizens should have some knowledge of the subjects on which they are expected to cast their votes. And if such a proviso were made, I had no doubt that extending the franchise to women would be in the direction of progress. I also said if intelligent

Copyrighted, 1892, by VICTORIA WOODHULL MARTIN.

women could be elected to office, they would eradicate the conditions which make it possible that human beings could be so ignorant and depraved as to vote for those who trade upon their ignorance. The defects of representative government, while the conditions of existence are such as to degrade individuals physically and mentally, are becoming apparent.

It can now be readily understood that woman's suffrage may be argued from two points of view; *first*, from conditions as they are—conditions which degrade and oppress women, and limit their perfect development; *second*, from social conditions as they ought to be—a social state which would surround women with the most favorable environment, in order to secure the highest ideal development of the race. Under conditions as they ought to be, the question of voting by either men or women would assume a different aspect.

Against woman's suffrage it may be argued that we have reason to condemn the ignorant majority vote of men to-day; many of whom are so degraded that they will sell their votes to those who profit by their misfortunes, forced by their necessitous condition to only consider immediate relief. Granting woman's suffrage, the ignorant majority vote would be simply doubled. Are there not as many poor women to sell their kind into slavery? Are not women also degraded by present conditions of poverty? The votes of women, however, would not be controlled by saloons. On the other hand it may be argued that the votes of women would be largely controlled by the Church, and this might extend so far as to bring about a renewed union of Church and State.

The instinct of self-sacrifice, so largely developed in women—self-sacrifice for their children, their husbands, or their God—is a potent factor influencing women, and leads them easily under the control of the Church, and it would be most disastrous to again bring free discussion under the censorship of the Church. But it must not be forgotten that women, by a better system of education, are becoming more enlightened on vital subjects, a knowledge of which is so essential to human progress, and it is only by the opportunity to exercise their energies that they will be enabled to throw off the shackles of ignorance which environ them now.

Undoubtedly, one of the strongest arguments advanced by those who oppose the participation of women in politics, is the physical disabilities of sex. They of course view the subject from social conditions as they are, not as they *ought* to be, forgetting the manifold evils resulting to women in the individ-

ualism and selfishness, which pervade society at the present time. The weakest women physically, who are left without protectors and who are obliged to make a struggle for the means of subsistence, are the ones who suffer the most, and they are only too often driven to trade upon their sex.

Superior physical strength is a power, and this counts for much in the terrible struggle for subsistence, where the weak must fall by the wayside. Physical weakness has rendered the majority of women unable to cope with men as bread-winners, so they have been obliged to eke out miserable existences by trading on their sex, both in legal and illegal marriages.

The female sex should have privileges by virtue of sex. There must always be division of labor, and it is simply a question which sex is best fitted for particular kinds of work. Physiologists have shown that the brain is more richly supplied with blood than any other part of the body. And that this is more marked the higher the animal is in intelligence. The blood is the nutritive fluid which repairs the waste, after functional activity, and the greater blood supply is favorable to the growth of an organ. A part is strengthened by use and deteriorates by disuse, owing to the increased or lessened blood supply. How long in each month does it require for the female brain to recover? How much must the brain suffer when the blood is drained to another part? But still one reads a paragraph like the following in the revised edition, 1888, of Darwin's *Descent of Man*: "The chief distinction in the intellectual powers of the two sexes is shown by man's attaining to a higher eminence, in whatever he takes up, than can woman—whether requiring deep thought, reason, or imagination, or merely the uses of the senses and hands. If two lists were made of the most eminent men and women in poetry, painting, sculpture, music (inclusive both of composition and performance), history, science and philosophy, with half a dozen names to each subject, the two lists would not bear comparison." No; physically woman has had to suffer in order that the man might have his physical wants ministered to. The woman has been the victim of her physical condition. It seems passing strange that so clever a philosopher as Darwin did not perceive one of the most cogent reasons why women and men cannot be placed in the same category. It is just those nutritive materials which are demanded of women and are wasted, except during the productive period, which serve as nutriment and develop the individual brain and muscle of the male. A woman is heavily handicapped in the struggle for

subsistence in all branches which require excessive brain work. But I have no hesitation in saying that in the future, if man continues the license he has at present, of subjugating woman to his demands through her financial subjection, while those women who are independent of this subjection continue to improve by perseverance and physical and mental culture, then these women will distance their brothers in intellectual powers.

Although the physical disabilities of sex may be very convincing against women taking an active part in politics, or against women becoming bread-winners, still continued reflection on this subject has convinced me that under present conditions of social life the enfranchisement of women would be beneficial to them as individuals, and to the race; especially when it is remembered how large a percentage of women in the past and at present are obliged to gain their living by trading upon their sex. Against those who oppose woman's suffrage for physiological reasons, I uphold woman's suffrage for physiological reasons. On attaining maturity the employment of the mind by occupations which are not too arduous are of the greatest benefit to women for physiological reasons. The attainment of maturity is a time of trial to both sexes, a transitional period,—new desires, passions, thoughts are awakened, emotions are kindled, which must have some outlet. The energies of a man accumulated at this time are diverted into numerous channels; his pent-up energy can be translated into thought and action. He must earn his living; he becomes identified with various undertakings; ambition is awakened. He is given an object in life. All the efforts of civilization are made to exercise his faculties in different directions, which at that time, above all others, needs diverting in our present artificial system. Byron has given the same idea poetical expression:

"Man's love is of man's life a thing apart,
'Tis woman's whole existence; man may range
The court, camp, church, the vessel, and the mart;
Sword, gown, gain, glory, offer in exchange
Pride, fame, ambition, to fill up his heart,
And few there are whom these cannot estrange;
Men have all these resources, we but one,
To love again, and be again undone."

Granting that this be true, the dangers which threaten society, as it is organized at present, are made apparent by studying the physiology of love. It is necessary that woman, as well as man, on attaining maturity should have her energies directed into various channels. She also needs healthy occupation for her mind. She also requires an aim

in life, and with this aim, to what altitude may she not attain? When her feet are free and her head high, then will she indeed lead man on to that higher life where degradation, misery, and crime will be banished, and a redeemed womanhood will inspire mankind anew with noble inspiration and exalted purpose. Think not this promised land shall not be! Say not that aught is impossible! Heaven on earth shall be when woman, unfettered, shall realize ideals, even of a paradise! Purify woman and mankind is purified! Uplift woman and mankind is uplifted! Deify woman, and God is made manifest in man.

"Thought consists in the establishment of relations."

"Great minds have *wills*; feeble ones have *wishes*."

"The true question to ask respecting any book is, Has it helped any human soul?"

"Every man is worth just as much as the things are worth about which he busies himself."

"Genius is common sense intensified—common sense is the gift of heaven; enough of it is genius."

"The feeble tremble before public opinion, the foolish defy it, the wise judge it, the skillful direct it."

"If day by day science did not augment its store it would be dead, it would no longer be living knowledge."

Superficial talkers have little learning and make much of it, deep thinkers have much learning and make little of it.

"Let us foster the faith that thanks God for the reason he has given us; let us spurn the faith that would make of God an instrument to subjugate reason."

"Think truly, and thy thoughts shall the world's famine feed; speak truly, and each word of thine shall be a faithful seed; live truly, and thy life shall be a great and noble creed."

"With all the beauties of Nature and Art, there is yet nothing higher than the harmonious interchange of thought by which obscure things gain expression and conscious existence."

LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE OF
NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY.

MRS. ANNA M. PARKER,

*President National Nominating
Convention of Women Suffragists.*

Dear Madam:—My nomination by the nominating convention as the candidate for President of the United States upon a Woman's Suffrage platform is before me. The form of the resolution passed commends itself to me especially, namely:

"Whereas, Under the Fourteenth Amendment no citizen is deprived of the franchise through law, but by custom and habit: therefore, be it

"Resolved: We, the representative women of America, ask the officers in charge of the election precincts through the United States in the coming campaign to give us the opportunity to cast our ballots on the first Tuesday in November, 1892, for our candidates."

This issue is one which was originally raised by myself and advocated by others as long ago as 1870, before Congress; and afterwards was maintained as the principal plank in the platform of the campaign of 1872, when my name was presented to the public as the first woman candidate for President of the United States. In this connection, I trust it will seem proper for me to revert to the following extract from my address in that candidacy of 1870. It was first published in the *New York Herald*, April 2d, 1870.

"I am well aware that in assuming this position I shall evoke more ridicule than enthusiasm at the outset. But this is an epoch of sudden changes and startling surprises. What may appear absurd to-day will assume a serious aspect to-morrow. I am content to wait until my claim for recognition as a candidate shall receive the calm consideration of the press and the public. The blacks were cattle in 1860; a negro now sits in Jeff Davis's seat in the United States Senate. The sentiment of the country was, even in 1863, against negro suffrage; now the negro's right to vote is acknowledged by the Constitution of the United States. Let those, therefore, who ridiculed the negro's claim to exercise the right to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,' and who lived to see him vote and hold high public office, ridicule the aspirations of the women of the country for complete political equality as much as they please. They cannot roll back the rising tide of reform. The world moves. * * * *

The present position of political parties is anomalous. They are not inspired by any great principles of policy or economy; there is no live issue up for discussion.

A great national question is wanted to prevent a descent into pure sectionalism. That question exists in the issue, whether woman shall remain sunk below the right granted to the negro, or be elevated to all the political rights enjoyed by man. The simple issue whether woman should not have this complete political equality with the negro is the only one to be tried, and none more important is likely to arise before the Presidential election. But besides the question of equality others of great magnitude are necessarily included. The platform that is to succeed in the coming election must enunciate the *general* principles of enlightened justice and economy.

A complete reform in our system of prison discipline, having specially in view the welfare of the families of criminals, whose labor should not be lost to them; the re-arrangement of the system and control of internal improvements; the adoption of some better means for caring for the helplessness and indigent; the establishment of strictly neutral and reciprocal relations with all foreign Powers, who will unite to better the condition of the productive class, and the adoption of such principles as shall recognize this class as the true wealth of the country, and give it a just position beside capital, thus introducing a practical plan for universal government upon the most enlightened basis, for the actual, not the imaginary benefit of mankind.

These important changes can only be expected to follow a complete departure from the beaten tracks of political parties and their machinery, and I believe the direct way to accomplish general reform to be through woman suffrage."

A great duty depends upon the exercise by women of this right to vote for it is to women that we look for the salvation, not alone of the American people, but of mankind. In support of this right of suffrage I will recall public attention to only one passage from the Minority Report of the Judiciary Committee, before whom my memorial to Congress was heard in 1871: it was conjointly signed by so eminent authorities as the Hon. Benjamin F. Butler and Judge Loughridge.

"The XIVth and XVth Articles of Amendment to the Constitution clearly recognize the right to vote, as one of the rights of a citizen of the United States. This is the language:—

Here is stated, first the existence of a *right*. Second, its nature. Whose right is it? The right of citizens of the United States. What is the right? The right to vote. And this right of citizens of the United States, states are forbidden to abridge. Can there be a more direct recognition of a right? Can that be *abridged* which does not *exist*? The denial of the power to abridge the right, recognizes the existence of the right. It is said that this right exists by virtue of State citizenship, and State laws and Constitutions? Mark the language: 'The right of citizens of the *United States* to vote;' not citizens of *States*. The right is recognized as existing independent of State citizenship. And the States in voting to accept those Amendments admitted this right."

As you have so happily expressed it in your resolution:—

"Resolved, That by the united efforts of the women voters of this nation we will drive anarchy, crime, insanity, and drunkenness from our midst by our humanitarian efforts backed by the ballot."

It is only by united effort that any reform can be accomplished. Your resolution coincides with my own belief that no change for the better, either in church, state, or society, can be effected until the women of America, in a solid body, move forward to the objects that they have determined to attain.

The chief question presenting itself in this important crisis of our nation's history is the method by which the evils afflicting society can be corrected. In the struggle between the politicians, and the conflict between international, federal and inter-

state law, the nation has sunk to an apathy regarding its social condition and deterioration that is appalling to the reflective mind. To such a pass has the political deadlock arrived that it has become a question not what reforms, what noble aspirations, can be accomplished, but simply what obstructions are there to be overcome to accomplish any reform?

So environed has the social structure become with this network of technical obstructions, that I see no salvation for society excepting through an entire revision of the basic laws of government. The Constitution of the United States itself, one of the modern governmental charters of the world, is a relic of old institutions. When we consider the great advance during the past century, nay, during the past decade, the aggregation of great wealth, the inventions, the progress in arts and sciences, we realize the incompetency of old constitutions to deal with these new conditions. Labor saving machinery, and the invasion by women upon men's occupations have revolutionized society, just as the great systems of transportation and intercourse have developed vast corporations and trusts revolutionizing commercial and business methods.

The advance of science has shown that, in its present condition of physical unfitness, humanity itself is incompetent to grapple with these new developments, and it has now become just as necessary to consider the important subject of intelligent breeding and physical culture in the human race, as it is in the inferior animals.

In order to accomplish such results and to overcome the conditions of crime, insanity and drunkenness referred to in your resolution new regulations must be proposed for society. Nay more, society must go further, and by investigating the physical degeneracy which breeds criminals, must surround motherhood with the protections suitable to an enlightened age. It is to woman therefore, at the base, that I look for the regeneration of mankind.

I wish especially to emphasize that I am not an advocate of woman's rights in the sense to unsex women. I would give women the ballot that they may defend their rights. I would give them the right to that representation which men have declared to be, in their case, inseparable from taxation. If men think that one of the results of granting to women their rights would be to take away men's work and men's positions and give them to women at less pay, they are mistaken. This is one of the results that arise from the present system. Women are now placed in competition with men for salaried work to the disaster of all,

while women's votes should be to give men their due rights in order that respectable homes could be maintained; for it is women chiefly who recognize the injustice to the majority of men, that the average wages for work in all grades of life are too small to meet the demands of families. When we contemplate the extremes of wealth and poverty that exist even in this most favored nation of the earth, we are appalled at the consideration that, in an age of reason, selfishness and greed should predominate over co-operation and sympathy.

I do not ask these questions to be settled in a presidential canvas, for the woman's party, in putting forward an actual ticket, is doing so as an educational movement. It is woman's voice crying to the prodigal and unwise! It is that in each legislature the warning voice may be heard! I have closely watched the progress of women since I was myself ground down with persecutions, because I then dared to raise my voice and to attempt reforms which have paved the way for much of the liberty enjoyed by women to-day.

It is a great satisfaction to know that, in New York State, where my most strenuous efforts in the cause were directed, a woman's suffrage bill was introduced and nearly passed at the last session of the legislature.

Woman's vote is one of the great weapons of reform. Woman's vote, with the enlightened and honest man's vote, will sweep the country of its degradations and redeem the world! For woman's vote would certainly be directed to reform in all social questions and to raise the standard of morality. Self respecting candidates would not have to go to the saloons, the real voting booths of the present parties, to canvas for the woman's vote. The woman's vote also will settle the liquor question itself, which the saloon vote under present conditions will never permit. With the woman in politics and the saloon out of politics, what may we not hope for?

I present a list of some of the chief heads of proposed reforms under consideration in a Humanitarian platform, which alone offers the ideals tending to the constant and continuous elevation of mankind.

It proposes:

Aristocracy of Blood.

Bureaus of anthropology connected with every police station.

Tribunals of Health.

Laboratories for analysis of impure foods and liquors.

Improved Dwellings for the poor.

Physicians to examine children in schools.

Labor Tribunals for Arbitration.

*Revenue and Tariff Reforms.**Financial Reform.**Scientific re-organization of the Criminal Code.**Free Courts of Justice for the poor.**National encouragement of Arts and Sciences.**Women's Suffrage.*

I will not dwell upon these questions, which are rapidly, of their own importance, asserting themselves for solution. In accepting this nomination, I cannot too strongly convey to you my deep sense of the compliment you have paid me as a worker in the cause which has always been so dear to my heart.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL MARTIN.

142 West 70th Street,
New York City,
26th October, 1892.

Beyond all questions of legal or constitutional or natural rights of women to vote, certainly, in comparison of the sexes, how great is the difference between the intelligence upon public affairs of a woman keenly alive to the necessities of not only her immediate family interests, but those of the public, and that of a man who habitually frequents the liquor saloons, where, as is well known, a large part of the lower classes receive their instructions to vote? The votes of women would be given in favor of public morality, and would do much to counteract the effects of the reign of a one-sided power. The two sexes complement each other. Humanitarian sentiments are essentially female. It is necessary that a woman shall have absolute control over her own person in order to insure the higher development of the race.

THE LATE LORD TENNYSON.

In connection with the much-lamented decease of Lord Tennyson, it is pleasant to recall an incident which happened to myself in connection with him many years ago.

When returning from Kings's College School to my father's house at Carshalton, a gentleman, in the course of conversation, advised me to "daily read at least one verse of the Bible, and one verse from Shakespeare, for, said he, the Bible will teach you how to speak to God, while Shakespeare will teach you how to address your fellows."

I afterwards ascertained that I was indebted to the late Lord Tennyson for this good advice.

From the London Times.

PHILOSOPHICAL NOTES AND COMMENTS.

He hurts the good who spares the bad.

* *

The corruption of the best man is the most complete.

* *

The world must be often tried and thoroughly known before we can pretend to judge of the motives of those around us.—*Cooper.*

* *

Man ought never to be idle. Inactivity frustrates the very design of his creation; whereas an active life is the best guardian of virtue, and the greatest preservative of health.

* *

A little learning is a dangerous thing,
Drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring,
There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
And drinking largely sobers us again.

Pope.

* *

Pittacus, one of the seven wise men of Greece, after being wronged by a Cretan and having the power of punishing him, let him go saying, "Forgiveness is better than revenge: for, forgiveness is the sign of a gentle nature, but revenge the sign of a savage nature."

* *

Of satires, I think as Epictetus did: "If evil be said of thee, and if it be true, correct thyself; if it be a lie, laugh at it;" By dint of time and experience I have learned to be a good post-horse; I go through my appointed daily stage, and I care not for the curs who bark at me along the road.—

Frederick the Great.

* *

"The governments most distinguished for sustained vigor and ability have generally been aristocracies."

The original signification of aristocracy was government by the best power, (*aristos*, best, and *krateia*, power.). But when aristocracy became hereditary, it lost its original significance.

* *

The Glory of Enthusiasm.—Indifference never wrote great works, nor thought out striking inventions, nor reared the solemn architecture that awed the soul, nor breathed sublime music, nor painted glorious pictures, nor undertook heroic philanthropies. All these grandeurs are born if enthusiasms are done heartily.

REFORM AND THE CONSTITUTION.

The most pressing of judicial reforms is to effect that uniformity of laws which will accomplish the just enforcement of the intent of the laws. To this end the co-operation of all the States is essential, in some uniform code of statutes which shall be just, prudent and operative between States. It is the most serious criticism upon the value of Republican institutions that, instead of co-operating to insure the protection of the majority from the persecution of the unscrupulous few, the various States constituting the Republic seem to resort almost intentionally to perverse methods of conflicting statutes, with wider differences still in the court decisions and precedents, sometimes providing diametrically opposite constructions upon the very same law in different States.

The necessity for a uniform marriage law is but one demonstration of the need of a more perfect and uniform system in all social regulations throughout the States and the world. But a danger to be carefully avoided is over-legislation. The universal code of reformed laws cannot permit of so much law as to operate obstructively.

In the marriage question the supposed punishment of bigamous relations has not prevented the extraordinary situation of the marriage laws becoming a mockery upon such a system of jurisprudence. There must be the direct responsibility of the man to second or bigamous wives, and to his illegitimate children.

So, also, as in the uniformity necessary in the marriage laws, the same principle of universal jurisdiction here presents itself. The mere change of residence is become a temptation to throw off the responsibility incurred at the expense of fellow-men or women, and to begin an unfettered career under new conditions, with perhaps illy accumulated spoils in wrongful possession, leaving behind the injured and honorable merchant, the distressed wife and the suffering and defamed children, or other wrongs. Whether by extradition or by sympathetic justice wrong-doers should be reached in whatever refuge, by the same justice which would reach them where they perpetrated the wrongful deeds.

To comprehend the real benefits which an intelligent and non-obstructive system of laws would bestow, it is necessary to understand the present actual condition now of the laws in their non-operation. In the first place, there is no standard of honesty or morality because of the difficulty of enforcing any law, and because of the difficulty of one's keeping free from litigation. The theory that every

one is entitled to secrecy in their business management is greatly the cause of present poverty and immorality. The smart class trading upon the credulity of others through pretenses of respectability and credit, but secretly being worthless, fleece the public, until now everyone is regarded as a knave until proved to be honest. This is not the meaning nor the operation of law. So the ownership of public improvements in the hands of a few monopolists is not only an unfair bestowal of public rights upon them, but it is an incentive to all kinds of public bribery and far-spreading political mis-doing.

In the era which has produced such inventions as the cotton gin, the planing machine, the grass mower and reaper, the rotary printing press, navigation by steam, the hot-air engine, the sewing machine, the India rubber industry, the machine manufacture of horseshoes, the sand blast for carving, the gauge lathe, the grain elevator, artificial ice making on a large scale, the electric magnet and its practical application, and the telephone, not to mention medical and other scientific discoveries, it is certainly time that we invented sensible laws, or that we ceased, in the name of law, to permit any part of our citizens to persecute, degrade or destroy whole masses of citizens and families.

Laws which would discriminate in favor of one State and against another, would not meet the acceptance of the differing localities, but individual responsibility can be so defined as to be applicable to every community; and national and international reforms will alone reach the correction of these wide spread evils.

But the questions of centralization and of constitutionality are involved. Shall the Government resign its revenue from tariff and internal revenue and demand from each State tribute, or shall the Government levy general taxes, thus centralizing revenue receipts? Will the Constitution of the United States be stretched, or, upon the other hand, can there be any reform in the United States without stretching the Constitution? But no matter what may be the merits or demerits of the Constitution *per se*, no one for a moment supposes that the Constitution can enforce itself any more than the State statutes or other laws can enforce themselves.

The great point, then, is to so draft the clauses that every one of every class will have a personal or selfish interest to induce them to strive for justice and so enforce the laws. It is just this point that I desire to emphasize in my recommendations. I think such reforms as making it the interest of every one to record honestly their incomes and

possessions, by invalidating them if they neglect it, and taxing all wealth proportionately; and also making it the interest of every one to watch every one else by rewards for the discovery of any fraudulent record; and, moreover, making it the interest of everybody to watch officials by rewards for the discovery of breaches of public trusts—I think such reforms as these are necessary to secure an operative constitution and laws. This is the principle operating in all commercial methods to-day—a system of espionage! If such reforms are impossible under the Constitution of the United States, then the Constitution must be changed, by amendment or otherwise.

When, for example, we find that the Constitution of the United States prohibits Congress from legislating upon marriage and divorce laws, and we find that the States have each power to enact diverse marriage and divorce laws, then we must admit one of two things: either the Constitution must give power to Congress to enact uniform laws, or give the Supreme Court power to enforce the principle of national laws, which proposes that laws valid in one State are valid everywhere; and thus, by nullifying conflicting State statutes compel them all to enact harmonious laws. We may find, in the marriage question, that States generally recognize marriages as valid, but divorces not, and we find a man married to two women in the same State through divorce in another State, and in violation of the laws of the original State. In short, so many anomalies, injuries, delays of justice, and conflicting laws exist between States that there is but one remedy for a solution of all social questions, and that is a new or reformed Constitution. Now, a new Constitution should be based upon the new history of the world, which embraces many features our fathers made no provisions to meet. There were no Goulds, Vanderbilts, or younger Napoleons of finance in the original scheme of the Constitution—no stock transactions shaking the United States Government; no telegraphic corners in wheat, pork and cotton markets, and no monopolies, and no trusts.

“In God is our trust” has been put upon our circulating medium; but this is irony. They left God out of the Constitution of the United States. And this is why we now see men and women slaving for simply the right to exist; and why we see men working for wages too small to supply their families with the barest necessities of life; and why we see women and children doing men’s work; and why we see monopoly stock companies wringing work from starving men and women with one hand and bleeding the pockets of the rest of the public with the other. But the prejudice against what now

seem radical reforms makes it difficult to discover the gradation of reform, to arrive at a solution of the great questions of government.

But the actual march of practical reforms agitating the minds of men and women of every position in life, points to a state of things which will render possible an actual social millennium, of which the countless thousands of all nations may mutually partake; and under perfectly operative statutes, humanly prescribing the rights and privileges of all and devised to prevent the control of the masses by small, selfish, and corrupt political rings and parties.

And I doubt not, that with the proper presentation of a new scheme of government, fair, just, and simply operative, a way will be found, in its popularity, to carry it into effect.

CHARLES STUART WELLES, M. D.

THE CONTINUITY OF HISTORY.

At the meeting of the International Oriental Congress, Prof. Max Müller, in his opening address, made some very interesting remarks regarding the influences in the past which have helped to raise humanity to a higher level. He states: “The ancient history of the world may be said to have assumed, under the hands of Oriental scholars, the character of a magnificent dramatic trilogy. The first drama tells us of the fates of the Aryan and Semitic races, as compact confederacies before their separation into various languages and historical nationalities. The second drama is formed by the wars and conquests of the great Eastern empires in Egypt, Babylon and Syria, but it shows us that, besides these wars and conquests, there was a constant progress of Eastern culture towards the West, towards the shores and islands of the Mediterranean, and lastly towards Greece. The third drama represents the triumphant progress of Alexander, the Greek far more than the Macedonian, from Europe through Persia, Palestine, Phœnicia, Egypt, Babylon, Hyrcania, and Bactria to India—in fact, through all the great empires of the ancient East. Here we see the first attempt at re-establishing the union between the East and the West. It is said that among the papers of Alexander a plan was found how to unite all these conquered nations into one Greek empire by a mixture of families and manners, and by colonies, and thus to raise humanity to a higher level. Common religious services and commercial unions were meant to teach Europeans and Asiatics to look upon each other as fellow-citizens. Though this plan, worthy of the pupil of Aristotle,

was never realized, his wars and victories have certainly drawn the most distant nations closely together, and enabled them to pour the stores of their ancient wisdom into one common treasury. The rays from the Pharos of Alexandria may be said to have pierced across Egypt, Persia, Babylonia and Bactria into the dark shades of Indian forests, while the name of the dwellers in these Indian forests, the Samanas or Semnoi, the Venerable, as they were called by the Greeks, might be heard in the halls of the Alexandrian Library. The very name of Buddha (*Boïtta*) was not unknown to the later philosophers of Alexandria, for we see that the mind of Clement of Alexandria, in the second century A. D., was occupied with the question whether Buddha really deserved to be worshipped as a god, though we know that this was the very last thing that the real Buddha would ever have desired. Clement knew also that the Buddhists built some kind of temple or Kaityas, in which they preserved the bones and other relics of Buddha and his disciples—the earliest specimens of stone architecture in India, some of them preserved to the present day. After the seeds which Alexander had transplanted from Greece to Egypt and the different parts of the East had begun to grow and abound, Alexandria became more and more the centre of gravitation of the ancient world, the point to which all the streams of ancient thought converged. Here in Alexandria the highest aspirations of Semitic thought, embodied in the sacred Scriptures of the Jews, became blended with the sublime speculations of Aryan thought, as taught in the Platonist and Neo-Platonist schools of philosophy, so that Alexandria may truly be called, after Jerusalem, the second birthplace of that religion of universal love, which, more than any other religion, was meant to reunite all the members of the human race, scattered in the East and in the West, into one universal brotherhood. In this way the whole history of the world becomes, indeed, a *preparatio evangelica*, if only we have eyes to see in Christianity not a mere *refacimento* of an ancient Semitic faith, but a quickening of that religion by the highest philosophical inspirations of the Aryan, and more particularly of the Greek mind.”

A mother, indignant to find her little daughter low in her class at school, exclaimed wrathfully: “I’m out of all patience with you, Mollie. I should just like to know why Sally Jones is always at the head of her class and you are always at the foot!”

Molly hesitated for a moment, and then, looking her mother squarely in the face, said demurely: “You seem to forget, mamma, that Sally Jones had very clever parents!”

HEREDITARY GENIUS.

On the question of the transmission of genius I wish to say something. The reason that genius is so rarely inherited may be found in sexual selection. Given a man of genius, and in order that he may beget a genius it is necessary that in his wife there shall be nothing to detract from the powers he transmits to his child. All the power does not come from the father or from the mother. Each parent gives half. In order to produce a genius it would be necessary for each parent either to be a genius or to bestow upon the child the necessary combination of powers to produce genius. Now it is well known that genius seldom weds genius. The case of Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett is an unusual one, and there, unhappily, the conditions were such that it throws no light on the subject of the transmission of genius. The fact is that sexual attraction generally leads a man of genius to wed a woman more or less inferior in mental capacity, and thus the offspring suffers. Perhaps, however, while this is bad from the point of view of a desire to propagate a race of geniuses, it is better for the race as a whole. One strain of good blood is not separated from the rest and allowed to improve alone, thus growing away from the rest of the race. By the power of sexual attraction genius is kept from propagating itself apart, and is made to intermingle with and raise the standard of the whole human race.

(*Charleston III.*)

W. C. COPE.

[It is easier to prove the transmission of peculiar attributes in animals than in human beings. Several generations can be observed among animals and results compared; whereas, with human beings, to arrive at any exact conclusions peculiarities of structure or function must be tested by scientific methods and carefully recorded, so that results might be compared in succeeding generations. In making the statement that all the power does not come from either parent, but each gives half, Mr. Cope overlooks the fact of prepotency in transmitting characters to offspring, and on the other hand the difficulty of retaining an acquired advantage to the race, if this prepotency does not exist. This acquired advantage would not go to raise the standard of the race as Mr. Cope assumed, but would probably be lost by the powerful influence counteracting it of race heredity. Hence we have one of the strongest arguments why similar individuals who have an acquired attribute should marry in order to retain and fix such attribute to the advantage of the race. Knowing how easily any quality gained is lost, breeders resort to in-breeding or to careful selection of similar animals when they desire to retain any qualities of superior animals. Although the union of similar germs have generally intensified the peculiarity of the child, instances are known where they neutralize each other, by their too powerful action. For instance, Darwin quotes an example in the eighth chapter in his book on Animals and Plants under Domestication: “There are two top-knotted canaries, and it is a singular fact that, if two top-knotted birds are matched, the young, instead of having very fine top-knots are generally bald, or even have a wound on their heads.” We know several instances where highly intellectual men have married women of superior mental attainments, and the offspring of these marriages have very inferior mental capacity; there may have been a plurality of causes producing these effects of which we are ignorant to-day.]

ECONOMIC INCONSISTENCIES.

Monsieur Émile Levasseur, the eminent French statistician, contributes to the Journal of the Statistical Society of Paris, an article on the population of France. We extract the following translation:

"On questions of population, as in many social studies, it is essential that the mind should emancipate itself from all prejudices arising out of the subject in hand, for men are apt to pronounce contradictory judgments, or to act in opposition to their opinions when they do not take up a position elevated enough to form a completely comprehensive view, or when they are not firm enough to harmonize their acts with their belief.

"Dwellers in towns deplore the depopulation of the rural districts, but they engage their nurses from the villages.

"We must not allow France to be invaded by foreigners," says a merchant, who, during the preceding month has engaged a Swiss clerk in preference to a Frenchman, because the former was acquainted with the German language.

"There are no more children born in France; it is the decline of the Roman Empire over again, is the sententious remark in society of those who have but a single heir.

"In a club, where each man is whispering scandal about the mistress of his neighbor, there is loud lamentation over the growth of immorality and the increase of illegitimacy.

"There are other contradictions. In France a military law has been passed which subjects all young men to military service. It was necessary to pass it, but an obstacle is thus imposed to early marriages, and a certain number of young men are thereby, possibly for ever, alienated from settling themselves in life, and from living in the country. The education of women is extending—its work of civilization and justice,—but the young woman, who is educated and without fortune, is not as easily resigned as she used to be, to become the wife of an artisan, and very often she prefers to live single by her own exertions. It is said that at Constantinople the instruction that is now given to girls in the primary schools renders the seclusion to which as married women they are doomed by the Mussulman religion excessively irksome. Although the condition of European women is quite different, the observation is worth noting. Railways are built, and facilities are given for change of abode by reductions in the fares, but in so doing the desertion of the country and the growth of large towns is

encouraged, although a rural population is more fertile than the population of the towns. The advance of wealth and of easy circumstances is a matter of congratulation, and legislation labors to encourage it, nevertheless it is no secret that the wealthy classes in general are not prolific.

"There are many who, while approving these measures and others which entail the same consequences, complain of the slow growth of the French population without noticing the contradiction involved. Just so it is illogical to make this complaint, and at the same time to weaken the doctrine of the Church, which calls on mankind to live in the married state, without limiting the number of its posterity, or to press for restrictive duties which place an impediment in the way of free import of raw materials and of food stuffs."

In London, one policeman is required for every 312 of the population; in the English boroughs one for every 697, and in the rural districts one for every 1,150.

Dr. Pinel, of Paris, has found that hypnotic patients obey the phonograph as readily as a living speaker. He therefore wholly discards the theory of animal magnetism, and is casting about for a plausible cause for the hypnotic phenomena.

The London *Times* of May 4, 1872, reported the death, in Edinburgh, of an aged man, of eighty-two years, who had been convicted for drunkenness and other offences, 350 times. It was calculated that he had spent upwards of forty years in prison. His usual cognomen, "Silly Kelly," implied that he was more or less imbecile. This is probably the case with many of the constantly recommitted petty offenders. They are "poor weak things, unable to take care of themselves."

The best minds of to-day have accepted the fact that if superior people are desired, they must be bred; and if imbeciles, criminals, paupers, and otherwise unfit are undesirable citizens they must not be bred.

The first principle of the breeder's art is to weed out the inferior animals to avoid conditions which give a tendency to reversion, and then to bring together superior animals under the most favorable conditions. We can produce numerous modifications of structure by careful selection of different animals, and there is no reason why, if society were differently organized, that we should not be able to modify and improve the human species to the same extent.

THE LAST MOMENTS OF BEETHOVEN.

He had but one happy moment in his life, and *that moment killed him.*

He had lived in poverty, driven into solitude by the contempt of the world, and by the natural bent of a disposition rendered harsh, almost savage, by the injustice of his contemporaries. But he wrote the sublimest music that ever man or angel dreamed. He spoke to mankind in his divine language, but they disdained to listen to him. He spoke to them as Nature speaks in the celestial harmony of the winds, the waves, and the singing of the birds amid the woods. Beethoven was a prophet, and his utterance was from heaven.

And yet was his talent so disregarded, that he was destined more than once to suffer the bitterest agony of the poet, the artist, the musician. He doubted his own genius.

Hadyn himself could find for him no better praise than in saying, "He is a clever pianist."

Thus was it said of Géricault, "He blends his colors well;" and thus Goethe, "He has a tolerable style and commits no faults in orthography."

Beethoven had but one friend, and that friend was Hummel. But poverty and injustice had irritated him, and he was sometimes unjust himself. He quarreled with Hummel, and for a long time they ceased to meet. To crown his misfortunes, he became completely deaf.

Then Beethoven retired to Baden, where he lived, isolated and sad, in a small house that scarcely sufficed for his necessities. There his only pleasure was in wandering amid the green alleys of a beautiful forest in the neighborhood of the town. Alone with the birds and the wild flowers, he would then suffer himself to give scope to his genius, to compose his marvelous symphonies, to approach the gates of heaven with melodious accents, and to speak aloud to angels that language which was too beautiful for human ears, and which human ears had failed to comprehend.

But in the midst of his solitary dreaming, a letter arrived which brought him back, despite himself, to the affairs of the world where new griefs awaited him.

A nephew whom he had brought up and to whom he was attached by the good offices which he himself had performed for the youth, wrote to implore his uncle's presence at Vienna. He had become implicated in some disastrous business, from which his elder relative alone could release him.

Beethoven set off upon his journey, and, compelled by the necessity of economy, accomplished

part of the distance on foot. One evening he stopped before the gate of a small, mean-looking house, and solicited shelter. He had already several leagues to traverse before reaching Vienna, and his strength would not enable him to continue any longer on the road.

They received him with hospitality; he partook of their supper, and then was installed in the master's chair by the fireside.

When the table was cleared, the father of the family arose and opened an old clavecin. The three sons took each a violin, and the mother and daughter occupied themselves in some domestic work.

The father gave the key-note, and all four began playing with that unity and precision, that innate genius, which is peculiar only to the people of Germany. It seemed that they were deeply interested in what they played, for their whole souls were in the instruments. The two women desisted from their occupation to listen, and their gentle countenances expressed the emotions of their hearts.

To observe this was the only share that Beethoven could take in what was passing, for he did not hear a single note. He could only judge of their performance from the movements of the executants, and the fire that animated their features.

When they had finished they shook each other's hands warmly, as if to congratulate themselves on a community of happiness, and the young girl threw herself weeping into her mother's arms. Then they appeared to consult together; they resumed their instruments; they commenced again. This time their enthusiasm reached its height; their eyes filled with tears, and the color mounted to their cheeks.

"My friends," said Beethoven, "I am very unhappy that I can take no part in the delight which you experience, for I also love music; but, as you see, I am so deaf that I cannot hear any sound. Let me read this music which produces in you such sweet and lively emotions."

He then took the paper in his hand, his eyes grew dim, his breath came short and fast; then he dropped the music and burst into tears.

These peasants had been playing the allegretto of Beethoven's symphony in A.

The whole family surrounded him, with signs of curiosity and surprise.

For some moments his convulsive sobs impeded his utterance; then he raised his head and said, "I am Beethoven."

And they uncovered their heads, and bent before him in respectful silence. Beethoven extended his

hands to them, and they pressed them, kissed, and wept over them; for they knew they had amongst them a man who was greater than a king.

Beethoven held out his arms and embraced them all—the father, the mother, the young girl, and her three brothers.

All at once he rose up, and sitting down to the clavichord, signed to the young men to take up their violins, and himself performed the piano part of his *chef-d'œuvre*. The performers were alike inspired; never was music more divine or better executed. Half the night passed away thus, and the peasants listened. Those were the last accents of the swan.

The father compelled him to accept his own bed; but during the night Beethoven was restless and fevered. He arose; he needed air; he went forth with naked feet into the country. All nature was exhaling a majestic harmony: the winds sighed through the branches of the trees, and moaned along the avenues and glades of the wood. He remained some hours wandering thus amid the cool dews of the morning; but when he returned to the house he was seized with an icy chill. They sent to Vienna for a physician; dropsy on the chest was found to have declared itself, and in two days, despite every care and skill, the doctor said that Beethoven must die.

And, in truth, life was every instant ebbing fast from him.

As he lay upon his bed, pale and suffering, a man entered. It was Hummel—Hummel, his old and only friend. He had heard of the illness of Beethoven, and he came to him with succor and money. But it was too late; Beethoven was speechless; and a grateful smile was all that he had to bestow upon his friend.

Hummel bent towards him, and by the aid of an acoustic instrument, enabled Beethoven to hear a few words of his compassion and regret.

Beethoven seemed re-animated, his eyes shone, he struggled for utterance, and gasped: "*Is it not true, Hummel, that I have some talent after all?*"

These were his last words. His eyes grew fixed; his hands clasped each other, and his spirit passed away.

Mortality in Childbirth.—Some remarkable evidence respecting midwives and mortality was given before a House of Commons committee which was dealing with the midwives Registration Bill. Dr. Rentoul gave it as his opinion that the education of a midwife should be as complete as that of a medical practitioner, and that she should have more power to act. His reason for entertaining this view, was that one in every fifteen first confinements resulted in the death of the woman, and that one in every fifteen first children was still-born. During 1890, 4,500 mothers died in childbirth, and during the same period 50,208 children were prematurely born.

CONSTITUTIONAL EQUALITY.

"In the Senate:

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

"In the House:

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

"No objection was made, and it was ordered accordingly."

[*The Congressional Globe*, Dec. 22d, 1870].

LECTURE ON CONSTITUTIONAL EQUALITY,

BY VICTORIA C. WOODHULL,

at Lincoln Hall, Washington, D. C., 16th February, 1871.

It was an honest zeal which first influenced me to appear before the public as a champion of a cause which receives alike the jeers of the common multitude and the railery of the select few. It is an honest zeal in the same that inspires me with confidence to continue before it as its advocate, when but too conscious that I am of that portion of the people who are denied the privileges of freedom; who are not permitted the rights of citizens; and who are without voice, in the pursuit of justice, as one of that sovereignty to whom this government owes its existence, and to whom it will be held accountable, as it holds all accountable who set themselves against Human Rights.

I have no doubt it seems strange to many of you that a woman should appear before the people in this public manner for political purposes, and it is due both to you and myself that I should give my reasons for so doing.

On the 19th of December, 1870, I memorialized Congress, setting forth what I believed to be the truth and right regarding Equal Suffrage for all citizens. This memorial was referred to the Judiciary Committee of Congress. On the 12th of January I appeared before the House Judiciary Committee and submitted to them the Constitution and Legal points upon which I predicated such equality. January 20th, Mr. Bingham, on behalf of the majority of said Committee, submitted his report to the House, in which, while he admitted all my

basic propositions, Congress was recommended to take no action. February 1st, Messrs. Loughridge and Butler of said Committee submitted a report in their own behalf, which fully sustained the positions I assumed, and recommended that Congress *should* pass a Declaratory Act, for ever settling the mooted question of suffrage.

Thus it is seen that equally able men differ upon a simple point of Constitutional Law, and it is fair to presume that Congress will also differ *when* these reports come up for action. That a proposition involving such momentous results as this should receive a one-third vote upon first coming before Congress has raised it to an importance which spreads alarm on all sides among the opposition. So long as it was not made to appear that women were denied Constitutional rights, no opposition was aroused; but now that new light is shed, by which it is seen that such is the case, all the Conservative weapons of bitterness, hatred and malice are marshalled in the hope to extinguish it, before it can enlighten the masses of the people, who are always true to freedom and justice.

Public opinion is against equality, but it is simply from prejudice, which but requires to be informed to pass away. No greater prejudice exists against equality than there did against the proposition that the world was a globe. This passed away under the influence of better information, so also will present prejudice pass, when better informed upon the question of equality.

I trust you will pardon me the expression when I say that I do not comprehend how there can exist an honest and perfect appreciation of the fundamental propositions, upon which the superstructure of our Government is based, and, at the same time, an honest hostility to the legitimate deductions of them; therefore I appear before you to expound, as best I may, the law involved by these propositions, and to point out the inconsistencies of those who evince hostility to such deductions.

I come before you to declare that my sex are entitled to the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The first two I cannot be deprived of, except for cause, and by due process of law; but upon the last, a right is usurped to place restrictions so general as to include the whole of my sex, and for which no reasons of public good can be assigned. I ask the right to pursue happiness by having a voice in the Government to which I am accountable. I have not forfeited that right, still I am denied. Was assumed arbitrary authority ever more arbitrarily exercised? In practice, then, our laws are false to the principles which we profess. I have the right to life, to liberty, unless I forfeit it by an infringement upon other's rights, in which case the State becomes the arbiter and deprives me of them for the public good. I also have the right to pursue happiness, unless I forfeit it in the same way, and am denied it accordingly.

It cannot be said with any justice, that my pursuit of happiness in voting for any man for office would be an infringement of one of his rights as a citizen or as an individual. I hold, then, that in denying me this right without my having forfeited it, that departure is made from the principles of the Constitution, and also from the true principles of government, for I am denied a right born with me, and which is inalienable. Nor can it be objected that women had no part in organizing this government. They were not denied. To-day we seek a voice in government and *are* denied. There are *thousands* of male citizens in the country who seldom or never vote. They are not denied; they pursue happiness by not voting. Could it be assumed, because this body of citizens do not choose to exercise the right to vote, that they could be *permanently* denied the exercise thereof. If not, *neither* should it be assumed to deny women who wish to vote, the right to do so.

And were it true that a majority of women do not wish to vote, it would be *no* reason why those who do should be denied. If a right exist, and only *one* in a *million* desires to exercise it, *no* Government should deny its enjoyment to that one. If the thousands of men who do not choose to vote should send their petitions to Congress asking them to prevent others who do vote from so doing, would they listen to them? I went before Congress to ask for myself and others of my sex who wish to pursue our happiness by participating in Government protection in such pursuit, and I was told that Congress had not the necessary power.

If there are women who do not desire to have a voice in the laws to which they are accountable, and which they must contribute to support, let them speak for themselves; but they should not assume to speak for me, or for those whom I represent.

So much for fundamental propositions upon which government is organized. Women did not join in the act of constructing the Constitution. So far as I know, none expressed a desire so to do, and consequently were not denied. But *what* is Government, and *what* a Republican form of government? Government is national existence organized. Government of some form exists everywhere, but none would assume to say that the government of *China* is similar to that of *England*, or that of *Germany* to that of the *United States*. When government is fashioned *for* the people it is not a republican form, but when fashioned *by* the people it is a republican government. *Our* form of government is supposed to emanate from the people, and whatever control it possesses *over* the people, is supposed to be exercised by and with their consent; and even more than this, *by their direct will and wish*. If, at any time, there are powers exercised by a Government which emanates from, and is dependent upon, the will of the people, which the majority of the people do not desire to be continued, they have it in their power, and it is their duty, to compel their suspension. If, at any time,

the majority of the people from whom has emanated, and who support, a republican form of government, desire that it should assume *new* functions, exercise more extended control, or provide for *new* circumstances, *not* existent at its primary organization, they have the power and it is their duty to *compel* their Government to take such action as is necessary to secure the form that shall be acceptable.

The people are virtually the government, and *it* is simply the concentration and expression of their will and wisdom through which they assume form as a body politic or as a nation. The government is an embodiment of the people, and as *they* change so also must *it* change. In this significant fact lie all the true beauty and wisdom of our form of polity. It can be changed without actual revolution, and consequently possesses the inherent qualities of permanency. It is capable of adaptation to all contingencies and circumstances, and provides how changes shall be made. It nowhere positively declares that its citizens, or the people, if you please, shall *not* have the right to vote under its provisions; and *mark you* it nowhere provides that any portion of the people shall vote.

Before government was organized there were no citizens, but there were *people*, and these people had *human right* to organize a government under which they could become citizens. In the absence of organized government, individual government alone exists, every individual having the human right to control himself or herself.

Now, if a people—an aggregate of individuals—not having a government, undertake to construct one, wherein, but *one-half* should engage, the *other* half taking no part therein, and its functions should be exercised over the *whole*, it is *plain* that, so far as the non-engaged part would be concerned, it would be an *usurped* authority that dispossessed them of the inherent right which all people have in organized government. But so long as the unconsulted part quietly acquiesce in such a government, there could be none to question its right to control. At the moment, however when the unconsulted portion should demur from such government they would begin to assert the right to self-government, possessed equally by all. The fact that such right had not been made known by expression could in no wise invalidate it. It would remain an inherent possession, and whenever expressed it could be maintained and enjoyed.

The condition of the people of this country to-day is this:—

I and others of my sex find ourselves controlled by a form of government in the inauguration of which we had no voice, and in whose administration we are denied the right to participate, though we are a large part of the people of this country. Was George III's rule, which he endeavored to exercise over our fathers, less clearly an assumed rule than is this to which we are sub-

jected? He exercised it over them without their consent and against their wish and will, and naturally they rebelled. Do men of the United States assume and exercise any less arbitrary rule over us than *that* was? No, not one whit the less. To be sure, his cabinet were *few*, while they are *many*; but the principle is the same; in both cases the inherent elemental right to self-government is equally over-ridden by the assumption of power. But the authority King George's Parliament exercised was even more consistent than *this* is which they assume and exercise; his Government made no pretension to emanation from the people.

When our fathers launched "Taxation without representation is tyranny" against King George, were they consistent? Certainly. Were they justified? Yes, for out of it came our national independence. Revolutionary war, which gave our country independence, grew from this tyranny. Was that war justifiable? Most assuredly it was. We find that the same declarations of tyranny were raised by Congress in the lengthy discussions upon enfranchising the negro. Such sentiments as the following were often repeated, and with great effect: "A considerable part of the people of the United States embraced under the preamble to the Constitution, 'We the people,' are left without representation in the Government; but, nevertheless, held within the grasp of taxation of all kinds, direct and indirect, tariff and excise, State and national. This is tyranny, or else our fathers were wrong when they protested against a kindred injustice. This principle is fundamental. It cannot again be violated without again dishonoring the fathers," whose rights were so ably and eloquently asserted and defended by James Otis, who, in his "Rights of the Colonies," says: "The very act of taxing exercised over those who are not represented appears to me to be depriving them of one of their most essential rights as free-men, and if continued seems to be, in effect, an entire disfranchisement of civil right. For what one civil right is worth a rush, after a man's property is subject to be taken from him at pleasure without his consent? If a man is not his own assessor, in person or by deputy, his liberty is gone, or he is entirely at the mercy of others." Could *stronger words* than these be found in favor of universal suffrage? They applied with sufficient force *then* to rouse a few men, whose souls were fired with its injustice, to resist a powerful oppressor. It was one of the most forcible arguments by which the cause of the negro was advocated. *Is it* any less forcible in its application to women? Is the tyranny now exercised over women under, as some say, the authority of the Government—but we say without any authority—any less tyrannous than that over our fathers? Or than that of the negro, for whom so many plead so earnestly? Or is *nothing* tyranny for women? If civil right is "not worth a rush" to a *man* when he is taxed and not represented, how much is it worth to a woman? If a