

# THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.

---

VOL. I. CHICAGO, ILL., MAY, 1869. No. 12.

---

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE—THE GREAT QUESTION OF THE AGE! No. 3.

BY W. F. JAMIESON.

Mr. Hammond claimed for himself much of the interest of the morning session by his unintentionally-expressed opposition. He proceeded to state his objections to female suffrage.

The ballot is the symbol of honor, and to vote implies the right to hold office. It also implies the necessity of attending all caucuses, and all preliminary political meetings. Ladies must run from house to house electioneering.

He regards it as one of the great objections to woman suffrage, that the bible opposes it. The bible gives man the prerogative of ruling and assigns to woman a subordinate position. She is the subject and he the ruler. He so interprets the bible. To have the ballot is to have the power of ruling; but if woman rules, she does what the bible forbids her to do.

[A gentleman in the audience inquired what the speaker would do in the case where the father was dead; would not the woman then rule the children? The speaker declined to answer.]

He next deprecated the answers he should get from the ladies, for making the objections he was about to make. So fundamental a change as is proposed by giving women suffrage needs much discussion.

One great objection to the extension of suffrage to woman is that it will interfere with the rights of infants. Their rights involve the interests of the family, the state, and the whole human race. Anything that interferes with the rights of infants, interferes with some of the first principles of society. Infants have a



right to be born. [Sensation.] If the race is to be continued, women must bear children. This is according to God's law; men cannot do it, and nobody else can. [Prolonged laughter.] Anything that interferes with the birth of children, which presents still greater temptations to the prevention of the conception of children, or to destroy unborn infants, will be a great evil. Ten thousand women in this land now have the guilt of murder upon them for having destroyed their unborn infants. [Applause.]

Now, if women become candidates for office, can you not see that they will say, "I will not become a mother, since it will interfere with my ambitious aspirations"?

Infants have a right not only to be born, but to be born in the best condition. It is an admitted fact, that undue excitements affect the constitution of offspring. Infants have a right to their own mothers' breasts, and not to be turned off upon the hands of menials.

Can any one suppose that the violent excitements of political life will not tend toward the prevention of conception? Besides, no law is more thoroughly well-founded than that undue passions on the part of the mother affect the character of the child. The violent passions that are so prevalent in political campaigns must affect injuriously the child when born. There are examples where children have been destroyed by undue excitement of the mother. It is but reasonable that married women should be exempt from public duties and excitements. A woman who is married at 20 years of age has, ordinarily, 25 years in which to perform the peculiar duties of her station, and then there is a transitional period of several years, when woman's very life requires rest. Therefore from 20 to 30 years of every married woman's life must be devoted to her domestic duties. She cannot, at that period, attend to political duties without neglecting her home duties.

But women have not the power to rule. I speak of physical power. God has not given them power to rule. Suppose the women should vote one way and the men another. This majority would not give them power to compel obedience. As long as men are stronger than women the power remains with them. You will say brute force has gone by; but I tell you it has not gone by. It rules in all the countries of the world. To what did the south



submit in the late war? Brute force, nothing else. It was brute force that elected Grant and Colfax. The power was with those that elected them. What compels obedience to law in our own city? Brute force, nothing but brute force, nothing higher than a knowledge that there is a power back of the common council, and the judges of the courts, that can compel obedience. Woe to the woman whenever she be arrayed on one side and man on the other; woman must go down in such a contest. I do not refer to intellectual inferiority; but simply to inferiority in physical strength.

The right to vote imposes an obligation that women cannot remove, and she can in no way escape from the obligation. When she has once received the ballot, it can never be withdrawn, even if it should prove detrimental. No party would dare to propose its restriction again. We cannot try the experiment to see how we would like it, any more than we can try matrimony as an experiment. [Applause.] If the experiment is tried it must be for life.

The speaker repudiated the notion that the advocacy of female suffrage was a test of intelligence. His own wife would compare well in intelligence, with any other woman, and she was not in favor of it, and his sisters would require more than five minutes' conversation to convert them.

A large class of women feel that they do not desire to vote. They feel that to have the right would be to incur new obligations that it would be impossible for them to fulfill. Mr. Hammond was not certain that the influence of women would purify politics. They might degrade it. Sometimes women became sunk lower in vice than men. Where would be the purifying influence of women, if the 10,000 bad women of Chicago should vote at the polls? What would be the influence in New York if the 70,000 lewd women there should vote? Would not women vote from interest rather than principle, as men do?

In conclusion, Mr. Hammond announced that he might become converted if these difficulties were all removed. [Laughter.]

Rev. Robert Collyer next addressed the convention, in answer to what Mr. Hammond had just urged.

He reminded his audience that he had not taken part in any debating society for many years, and the last question he had debated was "whether has the negro or the Indian received most injustice



at the hands of Americans." He felt, in attempting to answer the gentleman who had preceded him, that he was standing on rather uncertain ground, and exactly how he should come out he did not know. He believed in the woman suffrage sincerely.

The confession of the brother at first struck him with amusement. He had acknowledged that about thirty years ago he had been a reformer; while now his address showed that he was an old foggy. Such a transformation was apt to be the case. He, himself, sometimes felt that he was becoming an old foggy. Luther became an old foggy in his later years, and Bunsen has told us that Luther once said if he had known how the reformation was going he could not have been dragged into it by any possibility. Mr. Collyer characterized the remarks of his predecessor in regard to the degradation of women by mixing in political life, as ludicrous. Man in political life was a savage; woman would civilize him there as she had in all other departments of life. A man is a poor, wretched, dirty thing without a woman to take care of him.

In regard to the bible argument of Mr. Hammond, he had some hesitancy in stating his opinion. Mr. Hammond believes the bible to be opposed to woman's rights. So in the anti-slavery discussion, many people honestly believed that the bible lent its sanction to slavery. But the world has got over those arguments, and so they will in the present case. Probably the question of the relation of the bible to the rights of woman has got yet to be discussed; but there is no doubt as to the result of such discussion. How true it is that every man gets out of the bible just what he wants to get. [Applause.] The old Scotchman used to say that when his minister was cross he was sure to select some sour text for a sermon. The bible is very much like a pasture. Into it you turn all kinds of animals that eat herbs. The horse eats certain kinds of grass and leaves something for the cow; the cow then eats what she wants, and leaves something for the sheep; the sheep is succeeded by the goat, and the goat leaves the thistles for the donkey. So the hopeful man reads the promises; the gloomy man reads the gloomy passages of the bible; the tender man the pathetic. The man who wants to get woman's rights from the bible will succeed; but as for the man who, like the donkey, ate only thistles, he did not envy him.



What Mr. Hammond said about the most sacred and wonderful thing that the American citizen can consider—the relation of father and mother to the little child, the speaker disagreed with in some most radical particulars.

I do not feel that I could say what he said, as he said it. I felt as if there was some indelicacy about it, and that he would not have said them if he had consulted his wife, before he came to the convention. [Mr. Hammond responded that he submitted his remarks to his wife.] May be he did; my wife would not have advised me to say them. [Applause.]

Mr. Collyer said he had known Mrs. Mott for many years, and that she had told him that she never neglected her children for public duties. So it would be with every true woman. It must have been a fearful want of faith in woman that could have prompted the gentleman to speak as he did about the delicate matters of children, home, and the relations of father and mother to them. A good woman will never neglect her children, and there can be no doubt as to what she will do, and she will do it as a mother and a woman. If woman is criminally disposed to reduce the rate of births, is it not true that man, as the accessory, is equally guilty? [Applause.]

As to the question whether the excitement of political life would tend to the deterioration of the race, by its effect upon the mother, I ask if the gentleman himself, being, as he is, a member of an orthodox church, is not in favor of periodical religious excitements fully as great as any pertaining to political life, and does he scrupulously exclude women from such excitement for reasons he has advocated in connection with female suffrage?

Mr. Collyer next referred to the argument that woman had not power enough to rule. In his own case, he certified that a certain woman living on Chicago avenue was to his mind the best ruler he had ever known. When questions had arisen between himself and this lady, nine times out of ten, when he went contrary to her advice, he had to rue it. [Laughter.] He believed from a long and pleasant domestic experience, that woman could rule, and she could rule well; and that a man had better let her rule every time he got a chance. In the history of England, the three rulers under whom that country had most flourished were women, and the



reigns of Elizabeth, Anne, and Victoria were unequaled by any English male ruler, except Cromwell. [Applause.] Do not let us stand in the way of woman's ruling, when we have such illustrious examples before us. After Andrew Johnson, let us try a woman as soon as Grant gets through. [Prolonged applause.]

In conclusion, Mr. Collyer said that, even if the fearful picture drawn by Mr. Hammond, of seventy thousand lewd women marching to the polls in New York, were realized, he could draw another picture—that of seventy-five thousand good and pure women marching to the polls to vote the others down. [Applause.]

In the same session in which the debate between Collyer and Hammond took place, Judge J. B. Bradwell moved the appointment of a committee consisting of six persons—three ladies and three gentlemen—whose duty it shall be to proceed to Springfield and lay before the Legislature the claims of the female sex to more clearly defined rights as to property, and as to the custody of children, and petition for such a change in the State laws as shall place women on an equal footing with men in these respects. In support of the motion he proceeded to show how powerless the mother was to control the custody of her children in case of a will made by her husband at his death. He might enumerate many laws which worked harshly against women and minor children, as he knew how injuriously those laws worked.

The right of suffrage can only be given by the constitutional convention which is to assemble next year. By the present law, if a wife die, the husband has a life estate in the real estate; whereas the wife, in case of her husband's death, has only an interest in one third of the real estate. The husband has the supreme right to dispose of the custody of his children and estate, and this privilege he enjoys can not be gainsayed by any court, unless the person so appointed is an improper one, or abuses the right.

Miss Susan B. Anthony next wished to reply to some remarks she had heard, and a question which was asked during the intermission, and spoke as follows:

Mrs. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I don't want to prevent one of these good gentlemen from speaking, because it is



now almost impossible to get the women on our side. We cannot get a ballot before they say we can go. One says to me; "If the women get the right to vote, the best, most cultivated women, those whose influence is much needed at the ballot-box, won't go there. It is only the lower order of women, from Five Points and Mercer street,—the lower order of ignorant women." I want to answer this objection by telling a little story. In our city of Rochester we have a very liberal Congregational minister, Mr. Bartlett. When I am in the town in which I live, I go and hear him preach, because he is seeking enlightenment. Last summer he preached a most excellent sermon, wherein he stated the grand principles of the Christian religion, which was to go into the highways and byways and pick up the fallen; and showed how little the church now-a-days does this kind of work—how little the church allowed a fallen woman to attend church and own a pew. Instead of woman making any effort to reform these women, they would leave the church unless the fallen woman was sent outside, and he spoke of the power and influence of woman. Next day, Monday, he called around to see me; to see what I would say to such a sermon. I told him it was a splendid sermon, and every word was grand and on the right side. He also made the objection that good women, Christian women, would not vote, but only the vicious women, who could be bought by the politician. I said, "Mr. Bartlett, suppose, after showing up the importance of this Christian work, you had said, 'On Tuesday next is election day of the city of Rochester. On Tuesday we shall vote upon whether we shall have grogshops, brothels, gambling saloons, and choose our board of education, that shall decide every question of morals and the welfare of this community.' Suppose you had said to these women, 'These questions are to be decided on Tuesday. I appeal to you my Christian church women, I appeal to you to be the first at the ballot-box, and cast your ballot on the side of virtue and sobriety and honesty;' how many of your church women would stay away?" He said probably not one.

There you have the whole. Just so soon as women shall be made to feel, and taught by those who are her teachers all over the country, that it is her right, and religious duty to exercise



came  
1919  
?  
that right, so soon you will see the best women going first to the ballot-box. All over Kansas we found the most cultivated and best women of the State with us. We had also the aid and countenance of the clergy in that canvass. [My opinion is that the clergy, as a class, will oppose Woman suffrage on the same ground that Mr. Hammond opposes it; although among the most liberal minded of them it now makes but little difference whether the Bible is in favor of, or against any measure. Except in the estimation of bigots the "say so" of the Bible does not decide any question.] The rising generation should be educated in all our schools and academies of learning; a human being is such everywhere, no matter what the color, and is entitled to all the rights of human beings. I have no anxiety about the issue, it is only a question of time. It is God's truth, and we will stand by it, and all will have to come to it. In regard to the assertion that women are not competent to attend to business matters, I instance the experience of Judge Graves of Herkimer county, N. Y., who up to that time, as Probate Judge for the previous seventeen years, had invariably insisted on widows assuming the administration of their deceased husband's estates, and during this whole period his observations confirmed him in his conviction. Women would invariably carry on the management of such property fully as profitably as men under similar circumstances. The judge never knew of a failure. She spoke severely against bestowing all education upon the boys of the family, and neglecting to give the girls such an education as would fit them for earning and working their own way through the world. All the avenues of employment are open to men, and scarcely any to women. Women are desirous to work and of having a larger number of openings, and eagerly seizes upon and fills them when they do occur. This want of opportunity to work is the greatest existing drawback to woman's usefulness. It should be made just as respectable for a woman to earn her own livelihood as it is for men at the present time to do so; and if we fail to do this we fail of accomplishing our great work.

Glory!



## THE NOBILITY OF LABOR.

BY THOMAS CLARKE.

## I.

Blow the bellows—swing the hammer,  
Till the roof roll back the clamor,  
Till the perspiration flow ;  
Till the engine and the boiler  
Rise to bless the gifted toiler ;  
Shape the reaper, plow and hoe ;  
Spread these blessings o'er the prairie,  
There to pile the yellow grain,  
Which the iron-horse shall scatter  
O'er the world like summer rain.

## II.

Who is he that winneth treasure ?  
Who the purest, noblest pleasure ?  
Not the man of slothful mind,  
Not the proudest king reclining  
On his throne with jewels shining,  
But the toiler for his kind.  
Shall the few aristocratic  
Sluggards, destitute of brains,  
Trample Nature's noblest workers,  
Binding them in clanking chains ?

## III.

Never, never ! for the Nation  
Ratifies that proclamation,  
Setting toiling millions free.  
Let us build fair Nature's temples  
High, with nitches many, ample,  
For each worthy votary.  
There, beside old Homer shining,  
Shall our Fulton find a place,  
Morse and Field and Stephenson,  
Noblest toilers of the race.

## IV.

There above earth's sordid scoffers,  
Who by fraud have filled their coffers,  
Shall the honest LABORER stand ;



In his purpose brave, unyielding,  
 Whether pen or trowel wielding,  
 Noble through his brain and hand;  
 And, while upward still ascending  
 Thus in triumph, shall he say;  
 "Follow, ye who thirst for glory,  
 Lo! 'tis LABOR leads the way."

*Moses Hull*

## THE BIRTH OF THE SPIRIT.\*

ADVANCE SHEETS.

Though very popular it is hardly just to say of any question, "this is important," as such language implies that there are questions of no importance, which is not the case. Every truth has its bearing on every other truth. Every truth received is a light by which we may be enabled to discern kindred truths. Every truth rejected is a light extinguished, and darkness is the result.

"Ye must be born again," is the language of Jesus to Nicodemus, and every one who believes his Bible endorses it, the only question being, what is meant by being born again? There is a difference, "wide as the world," between our views and those of our Christian neighbors, as to what constitutes the birth of the spirit.

Jesus in his conference with a member of the Jewish Sanhedrim said, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." This astonished Nicodemus, who could not see how it would be possible for him under the circumstances to get into the kingdom, for he was already an old man, and how could an old man be born again? Jesus answered, "Verily, verily, I

\* This article is a chapter of a book now in press, [Wm. White & Co., Boston,] entitled "THE QUESTION SETTLED," or a Comparison of Ancient Spiritualism in its Phenomena and Philosophy as revealed in the Bible, with Modern Manifestations. By Moses Hull. The book will be for sale at the ROSTRUM office as soon as published. Price \$1.50. Sent post paid on receipt of price.



say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again."—John iii: 5-7.

Sawyer renders this, "That which is born of the spirit is a Spirit." Here the matter is explained. It is the birth of the *Spirit* that Jesus is speaking of. As much as to say, "You got your fleshly existence—got into this fleshly kingdom by a birth of the flesh. Now in order to enter upon your spiritual existence, that is, your existence where there is no flesh and blood, you *must* be born of the spirit. Don't wonder that I told you, you must be born again." "The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: So is every one that is born of the Spirit."—Verse 8. When but a boy we once asked a minister for an explanation of this verse. He kindly consented to give us the needed light. "The birth of the Spirit," said he, "is nothing more or less than conversion. All who are converted are born again. The spirit is like the wind, it comes and goes and you cannot tell whence it comes or whither it goes. You cannot see the wind, you see its effects, and feel it, so you cannot see the spirit, but you do see and feel its operations on the heart."

This is substantially the theory of the orthodox world; it may do as a hypothesis, but it will not do as an explanation of this text. The text does not say, the spirit comes and goes like the wind, as this theory would have it; but "the wind bloweth where it listeth (*pleaseth*) and you cannot tell whence it cometh from nor where it goes; *so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*" Thus it is the individual born of the spirit who goes and comes, *and you cannot tell where he goes to, or comes from.* Is it so with church-men? Can they go and come without being detected, more than sinners who never belonged to a church? They cannot. Then we must decide that they have not experienced the birth spoken of in the text.

We do not deny that Christians may have experienced a change—no doubt they have; but we do deny that they have been born



again. Jesus gives another *test* by which to try those professing to be born of the spirit. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit," (is a spirit.)—*Sawyer*. Are not church-men flesh and blood in the same sense as sinners who do not belong to the church? But those born of the spirit *are no longer flesh*. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." We might ask why? Paul answers, "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."—1 Cor. xv: 50.

This whole chapter is an argument showing the necessity of a resurrection, in order to get into the kingdom of God. As Jesus shows the necessity of a spiritual birth in order to get into the kingdom. The verse above quoted tells why a resurrection is necessary. It is because "*flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom*." A resurrection then, delivers us from flesh and blood—the birth of the spirit does the same. For this and other reasons, we claim that the birth of the spirit is the resurrection from the dead.

Here, before arguing this point we must tell what we mean by the term *resurrection*. We do not by this term mean, as many do, the recollecting of the particles of matter and converting them once more into flesh, blood and bones, and making them live again. That cannot be done, as we will show. By the term *resurrection* we mean just what the Greeks meant by the term *anastasis*; an elevation. Sometimes they used the term *ex-anastasis*. This will be found in Phil. iii: 11, where Paul says "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." The Greek is, *ex-anastasia tou nekrou*, which literally signifies, *resurrection out of the dead*. How plain; the body dies and man is born out of it. *This is the resurrection*.

Before attempting to prove that the birth of the spirit and resurrection of the dead are the same, we will show that the body never will be raised to life. No one contends that there are any scientific arguments for the resurrection of the flesh. All science is confessedly against it. Yet some say, "the Bible says so, and though we cannot comprehend it we believe God has power to bring it about." Now, we emphatically deny that the Bible,



when rightly interpreted, teaches any such doctrine; on the other hand it is squarely against it.

The text above quoted is pointed and emphatic. If the kingdom of God is the state to be obtained at the resurrection, and "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom," then whatever inference may be drawn from Paul's argument in other places, he has here positively committed himself as an unbeliever in the resurrection of the flesh. This whole chapter is worthy of attention; it is all devoted to this resurrection question. Any one who will read this chapter with the idea that Paul is arguing with Epicureans, who did not believe in any future life for man, will discover that he was simply arguing an existence for man beyond this mundane life, and not urging any particular form of resurrection, or definition of the term *anastasis*.

Paul bases the whole argument on certain phenomena, which he, and about five hundred others, had witnessed. Christ, he argued, had been seen after his assassination, therefore, he was not dead. Christ lived after he was killed, therefore, others would live after the event called death. He urges that there is life for man, as evinced by Christ being seen alive after his death, unless the witnesses who testified to having seen him were false; but he was seen on so many occasions and by so many that it could not have been falsehood or deception. He urges, further, that the witnesses were honest, as was proved by their jeopardizing their lives for their testimony. In verse 32, he says, "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Thus he stakes his life on a resurrection, and at the same time informs his brethren that "flesh and blood" cannot be raised. When certain ones ask, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" he answers, "And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bear grain, it may chance of wheat, or some other *grain*: but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body."—Verse 37, 38.

Every seed sown has God's own body. He continues urging that all bodies are not *earthly*; that there are *celestial* as well as *terrestrial* bodies, and finally says, "It is sown a natural body, it is



raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body."—Verse 44. All agree that a better rendering would be, "It is sown an *animal* body, it is raised a *spiritual* body." Now we inhabit an *animal* body; when born of the spirit, we shall inhabit the *spiritual* body. Thus will we have dropped "this mortal flesh" and been born into the higher life, called in this text "the kingdom of God." Lest some should continue, notwithstanding the positive Scriptures we have quoted, to think that the flesh is to be raised from the dead, we will quote a few paragraphs from the "book of books," which are so emphatic that their meaning cannot be questioned. The wise woman of Tekoah who went to David to make a plea in behalf of his rebellious son, in the course of the argument said, "For we must needs die, and *are* as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God respect *any* person; yet doth he devise means, that his banished be not expelled from him."—2 Sam. xiv: 14.

At a proper place we shall examine this from the philosopher's point of view. Then we shall show that this is literally true. That which goes to the ground *cannot be gathered up again*. Job, when he thought himself on his death bed said, "*As* the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away; so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no *more*. He shall return no more to his house, neither shall his place know him any more."—Job vii: 9, 10. Stronger language could not be used. How persons can pretend to believe the Bible and yet argue a resurrection of the flesh, in the face of such positive declarations, we cannot conceive. Comments on such paragraphs would be like holding up a rush light by which to view the shining sun.

Again, this same poet has said, "But man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where *is* he? *As* the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: So man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens *be* no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep."—Job xiv: 10-12. Until the heavens be no more is the longest time he could fix. If this text is true, man can never come out of the grave, for the graves where men sleep are all in the earth; but when the heavens pass away, earth with all its graves pass too.



John says, "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea."—Rev. xxi: 1. Again, he says, "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away; and there was found no place for them."—Rev. xx: 11. Now, we submit that if heaven and earth, with all its cemeteries filled with dead bodies, is gone so that *it cannot be found*, and the dead are not raised out of the earth until after that time, as Job asserts, that the chance for the resurrection of dead bodies is so small that we do not wonder that Watts said:

"Great God! on what a slender thread  
Hang all eternal things!"

*dreams  
Joseph*

Jesus in his conversation with the Sadducees proves the doctrine of the resurrection by the fact that God was said to be the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, after they had been dead several hundred years. "But," said he, "God is not the God of the dead but of the living." So these patriarchs are alive. His words are, "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him."—Luke xx: 37, 38. Now, in all candor, permit us to ask our readers, Do you believe *that the dead ARE RAISED*, as Jesus asserted, and was proved to Moses by the angel in the bush? Or, do you look forward to a time in the distant future when the dead *shall* be raised? We assert without fear of successful contradiction, that the doctrine of a physical resurrection is *made for and not by the Bible*. As the positions of our opponents on this subject will come under the head of objections, we will proceed to an explanation of such Biblical expressions as are supposed to teach the resurrection of the body.

Perhaps nothing in the Bible is more relied on to prove the resurrection of the flesh than the following: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."—Rom. viii: 11. This



text says not one word about the *re-making* and *re-vivifying* of *dead* bodies. It only speaks of the *quickenings* of *mortal bodies*. There is a vast difference between a mortal body and a dead body. Our mortal body has been quickened a number of times, and that by a spirit power, but there never was a dead body raised to life. It would seem that the theory of a resurrection of the animal body must be hard pressed for evidence when it grasps at such "straws;" truly it reminds us of the proverb concerning "drown-men."

"You speak," said an opponent in debate with us, "against the resurrection of the flesh. Job says his flesh shall be raised from the dead, and I believe in taking the Bible as it reads." "Very well," said we, "let us take a paragraph literally. Jesus says, 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us *his* flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is the bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.'"—John vi: 51-58.

Shall we all turn cannibals because Jesus said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you?" It is, according to a strictly literal rendering of this passage, our only chance of salvation. If those who believe in a fleshly resurrection could find as positive a declaration that the flesh should come out of the grave as this, that Christians must eat the flesh and drink the blood of Jesus, with what eagerness would they grasp it. Do, Christians! in heaven's name, be consistent! Now, we deny that Job, or any other Bible writer, said



that his flesh should come out of the grave. On the other hand, we have shown that he said just the opposite.

Here is the text supposed to teach a physical *anastasis*: "Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know *that* my Redeemer liveth, and *that* he shall stand at the latter *day* upon the earth: And *though* after my skin *worms* destroy this *body*, yet in my flesh shall I see God."—Job xix: 23–26. If this text teaches a material resurrection Job squarely disputes it in what he said in Chapters vii, xiv and xvi. This we cannot accuse Job of doing. This text has no more reference to the future of this life than though there was no future for man. Let it be remembered that Job was greatly afflicted at this time. His friends had forsaken him, he was covered with sore boils from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot. See Job ii: 7. That his wife advised him to "curse God and die."—Job ii: 9. This disease was caused by an animalculæ preying upon his flesh, so that Job says, "My flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dust; my skin is broken and become loathsome."—Job vii: 5.

In this very speech he states that his friends, wife, servants and all had forsaken him—though he entreated his wife for his children's sake, yet she turned against him. His bone cleaved to his skin, and he escaped with the skin of his teeth. He then breaks out in the language just quoted, expressing his confidence that he will recover though worms were consuming his flesh. Job did recover and became a healthy old man. "Ah, but Job said, 'In my flesh I shall see God,' did he see God?" We answer most emphatically, He did. The ancients saw God in bodily health and its attendant blessings. God was anciently in every gentle breeze, in the warm sunshine, the genial shower, in fact, in every pleasant sensation. When God withdrew his face then the storm, the blight, the mildew and pestilence raged. Then it was that disease preyed upon its victims. By and by the face of God was again seen and happiness and prosperity was the result.

Reader, this is not imagination; we are not left to guess on this point. After Job's recovery God answers him in such a way that Job is convinced that he is holding converse with the Infinite.



Then Job says, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee: Wherefore I abhor *myself*, and repent in dust and ashes."—Job xlii : 5, 6. Thus every part of the text was fulfilled without a resurrection.

Now, having shown that the doctrine of a physical resurrection is not a Bible doctrine, we propose to take it from modern theologians by showing that it is an impossibility, and could not be true even if it were taught in the Bible.

It is now an almost universally conceded fact that the entire matter of the human frame changes as often as once in seven years. Not long since, however, it was our fortune to hold a public discussion with a minister who pretended to some knowledge of science, who denied this fact, and to prove himself correct in his denial, triumphantly stripped up his sleeve to show a scar on his arm that he had carried nearly forty years. "There," said this oracle of antiquated theology, "why did not that scar go when matter was passing off?" He might as well have asked why his eye or ear did not pass off with other matter. This reminds us that we once made the assertion that there is no *inertia*—every particle of steel in the razor blade revolves around its fellow particle with all the precision that planets move in their courses. "Why," said an astonished opponent, "That is self-evidently false; I put my razor away and always find it where I left it, which could not be the case if it were moving all the time." The poor man could not see the difference between particles revolving around each other and razors moving off in bulk. So with this minister and his scar. The truth is, the scar had passed off several times within the period named, but each particle had retained its place until crowded out by another just like it, so that the size and shape of the scar was not changed in the operation, more than a pyramid of apples would change, by a purchaser buying an apple from the pyramid and the grocer dropping another in its place.

For the benefit of Adventists and all others who cannot see anything of man but flesh and blood, we will review this position at length. Imagine the following dialogue between an Elder of the materialistic school, who can see no future for man other than



by a physical resurrection, and a philosopher whose researches prevent his acceptance of that theory:

ELD. "Man is to be raised out of the ground, and the sea shall give up the dead which are in it."

PHIL. "How can that be, since matter is continually changing and man does not any one year of his life possess the same body he had any previous year? Besides, is not the spirit or mind the real man? What need of a remolding and bringing to life of the flesh?"

ELD. "Ah, friend, you err in two points. 1st, Let me inform you that mind is not an entity as you suppose; it is only a function of the brain, brain grinds out thought. Mind is the result of the organization and proper combination with the atmosphere of the machinery called man, as the keeping of time is the result of the organization and setting in motion of the machine called the watch. 2d, That matter does not change as you suppose, I will prove by a scar that I have carried more than forty years."

PHIL. "As to your first position, it is either true or false. If true, your second argument is not needed. If false, your second argument will fall of its own weight. If the identity of man is not preserved, there can be no resurrection. Possibly there could be a new creation, God could make a man out of every stone in the 'Granite State,' but he cannot make Abraham or Moses out of those stones, from the fact that identity consists in part, at least, of the memory of past events, and those men made of stones could not recognize themselves as being the Abraham and Moses of old. Neither could the particles of matter which constituted the physical of Abraham and Moses at any one time be the same Abraham and Moses for the reason that the *mind* of these men was the result of their organization, and being dependent on the organism could not exist after the physical man was disorganized."

ELD. "Let me interrupt you. You are partly correct and partly incorrect. The mind ceases to exist when the brain, its fountain, ceases to act; but when the brain is *re-organised*, of course, the mind, which is a result, begins to act as before."

PHIL. "Not so fast. The old mind was the result of the old organism, and per consequence ceases to exist when the old brain



ceases its action. The *new mind* is the result not of the old *but of the new* organism—is ground out by the new brain, and being the effect or function of the *new brain* made, for aught I care, of the old material, cannot antedate its existence. *Memory* being a function of the mind cannot go back of the mind out of which it proceeds, but that mind was the result of the new organism, hence the man before death cannot possibly be connected with the man after the resurrection.”

ELD. “There are difficulties, but God has power, and these dry bones shall live. The identity is not preserved in the mind, as that ceases to exist, but in the particles of matter of which the body is composed.”

PHIL. “Then you have lost your identity even while you live, and at this moment are losing part of it, for you are trimming your finger nails. These nails are a part of the essential Elder with whom I am talking, and if the particles are all to be raised, must come up in the general resurrection and be joined on to your fingers, lest you should lose your identity. Your hair, which was once short enough, got too long, and you had it trimmed last week. Did you know that the hair taken off your head once went into your stomach as food, then went frolicking and frisking through your veins and from that time forward was a part of your essential identity, and as such claims a part in the resurrection body? Again, in your tedious spell of typhoid fever last winter you lost twenty-five pounds of flesh. Where did that flesh go? It, too, claims part of the resurrection body! Notwithstanding your friends supposed you would die, you recovered, that is, all except the twenty-five pounds of you which died and left you. As soon as you became convalescent your appetite began to return, you ate more heartily than before, and as a result found yourself increasing in weight at the rate of a pound a day until you weighed more than before your sickness. Where did this second twenty-five pounds of flesh come from? Where was it while you were wearing the flesh you lost during your sickness? Let me tell you. Part of it was in the apple orchard in the shape of unripe fruit, some of it was in the garden and potato patch, some swimming in the ocean in the shape of codfish and mackerel, some of it growing in the coffee and tea fields;



other portions were in the air, the water, &c. Now your present flesh is as much a part of you as that you lost, and *vice versa*. Which will you have raised from the dead, the first or the second? One has died, the other will die; will you have them both raised? Then why not have all the matter that ever formed a part of your body brought back to it? Abraham lived an hundred and seventy-five years; that was long enough to wear out *twenty-five* bodies. Which one of those bodies shall be brought up from the grave? Or shall all of them come up? If so, there will be 'giants in those days.' *Abraham will have a beard forty feet long, and cannot weigh less than two tons.*"

ELD. "You ask questions faster than I can answer them. Some questions cannot be answered. We receive certain statements because God made them. You ask which one of Abraham's bodies will come to life? We have an example furnished us in the resurrection of our Savior. The same body that died was the one raised. So it will be in the case of Abraham."

PHIL. "But Abraham's twenty-five bodies each died, one no more than another. Not a particle of matter passed from either body till the body had used up all the life it could appropriate and its very death sent it from the body to feed the life of vegetation; and as it was resurrected in vegetation, it was eaten by animals and men, and in turn took its place in other bodies, *ad infinitum*. If you present the case of Jesus as an *example* to prove that the last body that dies, or the one that dies all at once, is the one to be raised, you are unfortunate, for the case selected proves the contrary. If Jesus' body that was killed came up from the grave, that, instead of proving that others will have a similar experience, proves directly the contrary. Jesus' body was made of what he ate, drank and breathed, but the corn that he and his disciples plucked on the Sabbath day, as well as all other food that ever went into his stomach, had been fattened on the dead. It drew its life from the decomposition of animal and vegetable bodies. Thus all of Jesus' body was made by the death of other bodies, but his body, according to your theory, was brought up out of the tomb revived and taken to heaven.

"Now, think of the general resurrection when millions upon millions of bodies shall be called from their beds of dust. Among



them are the martyrs whose bodies were burned to ashes and the ashes scattered to the four winds by their persecutors to prevent their resurrection. Thus their ashes have fattened the soil of earth, as our southern battle fields were fattened by the flesh, blood and bones of poor soldiers. This soil has produced vegetation which has been eaten by the 'cattle upon a thousand hills.' The cattle, made fat upon that which was once flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, have in their turn been slain and eaten to supply other bodies with aliment. The fluids of these bodies whose solids have thus been scattered, have a thousand times arisen in the atmosphere, and a thousand times condensed and fallen in gentle dew and summer showers, only to be evaporated to again fall to water the earth, wash the shores of the Atlantic, or be drank by man and beast—thus these particles of matter, after having existed in ten thousand forms, and for aught we can know to the contrary, in a thousand bodies, at the moment of death must be raised from the dead, when, perhaps, Jesus had taken part of them and gone to heaven."

ELD. "I must go, good day."

PHIL. "Don't go yet. I find some figures made to my hand, which I wish you to hear me read.

"*Dust returning to dust.*—It is asserted by scientific writers that the number of persons who have existed on our globe since the beginning of time amounts to 36,627,843,273,075,256. These figures when divided by 3,095,000—the number of square leagues on the globe—leave 11,320,689,732 square miles of land; which being divided as before, give 1,314,622,076 persons to each square mile. If we reduce these miles to square rods, the number will be 1,853,174,600,000; which, divided in like manner, will give 1,283 inhabitants to each square rod, and these being reduced to feet, will give about five persons to each square foot of *terra firma*. It will thus be perceived that our earth is a vast cemetery. On each square rod of it 1,283 human beings lie buried, each rod being scarcely sufficient for ten graves, with each grave containing 128 persons. The whole surface of our globe, therefore, has been dug over 128 times to bury its dead!

"From this extract it will be seen that there is not dust enough



now, if all the soil were converted to dust, to *re-make* the bodies that have existed on earth."

ELD. "These difficulties are not for me to settle, I only receive the Bible. If you hope to find a theological system with no difficulties in its way, all I have to say is you are having a bootless search. Good day."

Yes, the Elder thinks *he* has the Bible, and like thousands of others who never had a liberal thought, it is all he asks. Those who have read this book thus far can, perhaps, decide whether it is the Bible or merely his *ipse dixit* that teaches his peculiar views of the resurrection.

[To be Continued.]

---

## RHYMES FOR WHOM THEY MAY CONCERN.

BY EMMA TUTTLE.

Dear ladies and dear gentlemen  
Who talk with such impressment  
About the follies of mankind  
And Decency's obsession,  
I beg your pardon, but I say  
Your tattling and haranguing  
Are more demoralizing, far,  
Than any public hanging!

You beg the public, far and near,  
To look at Handy Spandy,  
Expressing love to Mrs. Green,  
As warm as pepper candy!  
Ho! cry a dozen simple gents—  
"Is that the fashion raging?"  
What pleases Handy *might* please me,  
It must be quite engaging!"

When lo! these dozen gentlemen,  
All sweetness and attention,  
Are telling twelve soft Mrs. Greens,  
Trash which I will not mention.  
And so as Handy Spandy did,  
Are doing just twelve more sir,  
And for *one* tortured, jealous man,  
The world has *three times four* sir.



If David Dapper went to town,  
And stopped while staying there sir,  
Where blossoms from the demi-monde  
Garnished the bill of fare sir,  
In vain you tell it, and cry out  
Against the trap which caught him.  
A score of boobies want to learn  
The lesson which it taught him!

If Dan and Susie can't agree,  
And pilfer other lovers,  
Do let them caper, if they must,  
Beneath opaque, close covers.  
For if the reprobates are caught  
And prisoned in glass boxes,  
People will only call them green,  
And shout for slyer foxes!

Mark me! I am for curing sin,  
But do not like your physic.  
'Tis, taken for a moral cure,  
Like running for the phthisic!  
It only weakens and destroys  
That which you seek to strengthen.  
Dusk Error puts her feathers on,  
And all her shadows lengthen.

Oh, tell us of the beautiful,  
The noble and the truthful,  
Whose lives are poems, grand and great,  
Unmarred by actions ruthless;  
And let Disease and Evil hide  
In narrow, darksome places,  
While Hope, and Love, and Charity,  
Reveal their angel faces.

---

Mrs. H. F. M. Brown, our able and highly esteemed contributor, author of "Pen Sketches of Reformers," will leave our city, May 1st, for California, via the Pacific Railroad. We hope to receive "Sketches" from her prolific pen, which will be truly interesting to our many readers, as soon as she arrives in the great El Dorado of the world.



**LIFE PICTURES.**

A POEM IN THREE CANTOS, BY J. H. POWELL.

BY J. H. W. TOOHEY.

Over a quarter of a century ago, R. W. Emerson in sketching the mission and ministry of the Poet, generalized the limitations of the Muse thus: "We do not with sufficient plainness nor sufficient profoundness address ourselves to life, nor dare to chant our times and social circumstances."

To aid in removing this limitation and fill the omitted requirements of poetry, Mr. Powell in common with Burns, Gerald Massey, Eliza Cook, and others less known to the American reader, invites our attention to "Life Pictures." The limitation complained of, however, did not, does not exclusively belong to the Poets, nor has poetry less "profoundness" than the other departments of the Republic of Letters. As an instrument for mental intercourse and spiritual communion, it has ever been abreast with the best experiences of life—the glass of fashion and the mold of utterance.

The emotional and imaginative characteristics of the poet, however, reflect the culture of his time and clime; conforming in this, like all of human kind, to the general law of development and progress; for Humanity has its apprenticeship, "living always and learning ever." Thus the genius and inspiration of the poet belongs to the individual to sublime the subject matter and verify the claims of the beautiful, for "a touch of nature makes the world a kin." Thus Milton reflects the earnestness and directness of the Puritans, reproducing the literalities of the Hebrews. Thus Pope is nothing-arian and "Whatever is, is Right"-ish according to the skepticism and prevailing metaphysics of the times: and last, but not least, by way of illustration, Tennyson is mystical and transcendental, faith and philosophy being alike in transition.

Precedents thus color the convictions of the mind, and become emphatically the educators of the poet-artist. He—she, may be the lover of nature by virtue of organization; a truth-teller from conviction—seeking the finest and clinging to the loveliest things;



but ever and always, poetry like all of *human* kind, reports, if it does not conform to the *actualities* of time, place and circumstance.

Poetry has thus a many-phased ministry of uses; and the poets supplement and compliment each other in the drama of the beautiful. They tint and tone the ever changing pictures of life, making the theater of its activity sweeter and healthier by their presence. Light and darkness may mix and mingle in this endless unfolding of thought and feeling, while dressing the naked loveliness of nature with the spiritual delicacies of a refining sense; but in joy or sorrow, in smiles or tears, the heart-shine of affection or the gloom of despair, poetry is the servant and interpreter of life, the echo of all that is beautiful in "The Good," and good in the beautiful.

The complaint of Emerson, however, returns for verification; since the classics, in common with kings, courts and customs, have often made the poet imitative rather than original. The pictured life of the many, "the people," have by these means been made subservient to the conceits of the few; while a dogmatic and an exacting theology have denounced the free use of the poetical and called in question the need and office of the imagination.

But nature lives and time endures to correct the conceits of ignorance and the pretensions of caste; to justify the *value* of imaginative and the need of its presence in art, literature and science. Confessions abound and acknowledgements are being multiplied of eminent thinkers by way of intensifying the spiritual and scientific importance of the imagination. Thus, Professor John Tyndall says, "It is thought by some that natural science has a deadening influence upon the imagination; and a doubt might fairly be raised as to the value of any study which would necessarily have this effect. This, in fact, is the faculty which enables us to transcend the boundaries of sense, and connect the phenomena of our visible world with those of an invisible one. The outward facts of nature are insufficient to satisfy the mind." Science is thus made tributary to poetry and the culture of the ideal.

Our debt is proportionate, therefore, to those students of the beautiful, be they cultured or to "the manor born," who reset



the pictures of life, and temper the imagination to finer issues. We sing their praises, because they help the mind to realize (in the conception of Mr. Powell,) that

“Life is a poem of epic mold  
In which forces of Action manifold,  
Out-epic all the epics of old!”

And the affectionate and household familiarity with which the names of Burns, Massey, and many others are mentioned, illustrate the magic power and real supremacy of the poetic nature. Their inspired utterances have sublimed the common experiences of daily life, making each phase minister to rich and compensating uses. While the pictured hardships of toil and the servitude of slavery are made more inhuman by representative minds, who could suffer such “outrageous fortune” and yet

“Learn to love, and loving, live—  
Trusting the Future what it shall give;  
Turning the intellect into a sieve

To channel the dirt and all that hinders  
The growth of the spirit, away as cinders  
And draw to earth angelic attenders.”

This, “so aptly put, so fitly spoken,” is the text and context of Mr. Powell’s epic; the incentive to his culture and the moral of his struggle. The son of an honest toiler, he was early made acquainted with the exactions of physical labor. His school hours few and full of trouble, passed amid the conflicts of privation and taxation, measuring by sad experiences the difference and distance between the ideal and the actual. As boy and man, in mill and factory, as craftsman and worker, he was made to feel the tyranny and injustice of competitive jealousies. Conventional usages and selfish interests authorized and enforced the cruelties of law; such as only the factory operative, in common with the plantation slave, knows fully how to appreciate; but the ethics of history took root and begot trust and confidence in a happier fortune. Later in life he analysed and classified these experiences, and they are thus generalized in the present poem.

“When Nature hath need of a poet, or logician,  
A sculptor, or linguist, or mathematician,



A Newton or Kepler, a Harvey or Bacon,  
 She moldeth him with clay full often forsaken  
 By the favored of fortune.

Despised to-day,  
 Cuffed and kicked by mankind, as nothing but clay,  
 A man, to-morrow, may sit on Fame's throne  
 The envied of Kings, and the worshiped alone."

But the past is the past; he is now an educated mechanic; an inventor, and a self-reliant thinker. He aspires to teach others what he has learned at so great a cost. He writes poems, delivers lectures and publishes volumes. He struggles and wrestles with his social circumstances and personal wants—but concludes to marry early, and be true to his affectional integrity. Step by step he mounts the ladder of intellectual success. He would do *greater* things and needs a newspaper; a paper, devoted to the Philosophy of Reform and the Interests of Humanity. In the very heart of London he champions Spiritual freedom; the issues being heightened and fundamental, knowing no compromise. It is spiritual in inception and conception, and says at its head "*The Spiritual Times*," embracing the totality of human and heavenly interests. For three years this herald of free thought and rational progress was kept before the people. But the editor gave place to the author, that his biography and other poems might appear, all of which attest the industry of the worker, the easy naturalness of the thinker and the humanitarianism of the reformer.

The flower and fruit of this rich experience appears and culminates in this new volume. It abounds in nicely outlined and elaborately drawn pictures of individuals, collective and domestic life. From childhood to old age, the action of the poem is continuous, elaborating the emotional, maternal, radical and heroic aspects of human endeavor. The happy ecstasy of a loving mother forms an attractive *lullaby*, to be set to music. It sings itself in reading.

"Gentle, laughing, loving treasure!

Mother's darling! precious boy!

Filling all her being's measure

With a rich excess of joy.

Mother's beauty! laughing mild,

Charming cherub, undefiled!



Laugh aloud, dear dimple mouth !  
Sweeter than the luscious South.  
Laugh and stretch, and laugh again,  
Laugh for mother, laughing Ben !  
Laugh and kick and show his toes,  
Baby-king ! unknown to woes."

This is happy in conception and versification, and will be a life long picture to all who appreciate the innocence of childhood and the delights of a mother's love. Occasionally, however, the measure of the verse is not so happy, some of the lines being rather long for easy reading. The conception and sense will generally compensate for this, rewarding the attentive reader.

The make up and finish of the book is attractive and substantial, the paper is good, the type clean and the binding neat. It looks sentiment, reads sense and suggests wisdom—the following being samples :

" One rosebud in heaven half closed in a night  
On the earth, unfolding with petals all white.  
One angel ' up hither ' with never a stain.  
Free from sickness and sorrow and earthly pain.  
One lamb of a whole fold redeemed from the block.  
One green ear of corn borne away from the shock.  
One dove on white pinions just flown from the nest,  
Right proud of its liberty, strengthened and blest.

" Who shall say our dear ones, like lilies of spring  
That are nipped in the bud by Death's blighting sting,  
Forever removed from their kindred and kind  
Can always be happy from friends left behind ?  
Away with all thoughts that the dead one is DEAD ;  
That the mother no more may pillow its head  
On her breast expanding with satisfied love,  
And nestle it there like a heavenly dove."

Chicago, April 20, 1869.

---

REMOVED.—Our neighbor, the Publisher of the *Lyceum Banner*, has come to our *very door*. Her office is removed to Room 84, Rear Building, Pope's Block, 137½ Madison street. It is very pleasant to be surrounded by good neighbors.



## EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

---

MOSES HULL & W. F. JAMIESON, EDITORS.

OFFICE, 90 WASHINGTON STREET, POST OFFICE DRAWER 5966, CHICAGO.

---

### CLOSE OF THE VOLUME.

This number closes volume one, and in compliance with our promise, we will enlarge the *ROSTRUM* at the commencement of volume two, to forty-four or forty-eight pages. This will necessarily incur additional expense, and we must look to our subscribers to aid us in the effort. We will furnish it at the same price, \$2.00 per year. Number one of the new volume will be dated July instead of June, in order to commence at the middle of the year, and perhaps will not reach you till the 20th or 25th of June. Friends, please send in your names as soon as possible to enable us to meet our liabilities.

---

### "TIME OUT."

Many of our subscribers will find on the cover of this number the words "Time Out," which signifies that the time for which they subscribed has expired, and we, according to our promise, shall send no more till you renew your subscriptions. But we hope all will renew forthwith. Will not one or more in each place immediately see all the old subscribers and get their names, with as many new ones as possible, and forward them to us? By no means permit the list of subscribers to diminish in any place, but rather make it a point to increase them in every place. Every sectarian is a mortal enemy of this Magazine, and would rejoice to see it fail. If you would see a perfectly Independent Journal succeed you must come to our aid. See our club rates for new subscribers.



## CLUB RATES.

As an inducement to those who would like to do something to help build up the circulation of the *ROSTRUM*, we offer the following rates for clubs:

Single copy one year.....	\$ 2.00
Five copies and one free to getter up of the club .....	10.00
Ten copies and one free to getter up of the club.....	18.00
Fifteen copies and one free to getter up of the club .....	26.25
Twenty copies and one free to getter up of the club .....	32.00
Fifty copies and one free to getter up of the club.....	75.00

Names can be sent from different offices, if more convenient.

---

TO OUR CORRESPONDENTS.—We are in receipt of so much manuscript that we cannot possibly publish all as it comes. Be patient, friends, we will give you all a hearing in due time.

Dr. R. Greer (see advertisement,) has removed his office to 79 South Jefferson street, second door south of Madison street, where he is now located and ready to receive patients. The doctor has had very good success in healing the sick, and those wishing medical aid would do well to give him a call.

---

NEW BOOKS, PERIODICALS, ETC.

**THREE VOICES.** BY WARREN SUMNER BARLOW. Boston: Wm. White & Co., 158 Washington Street. New York: Warren Chase, 544 Broadway. Chicago: J. C. Gill, 137½ Madison Street. Pp. 184. Price, \$1.25, postage, 16 cents.

Mechanically this is one of the neatest and most tasty books for the price, that has appeared before the public for years, being printed on extra heavy paper and bound in good style. But its greatest beauty consists in its literary construction. In this respect we consider it a perfect gem, glittering and sparkling in whatever light you may choose to view it.

The first is the "*Voice of Superstition*," in which the author gives a true rendering of the Bible from Adam to Christ, showing conclusively that in the great contest between God and the Devil that the Devil always came off victor. We make the following



quotation from page 107, to give our readers a faint idea of the style of the work :

“Thus God’s great plan hath wholly failed,  
Which clearly is revealed ;  
While Satan ever has prevailed  
In each contested field.

Thus Satan, with unnumbered throng,  
Embracing tribes and nations,  
God’s former hope, His joy and song,  
Of many generations,

Are now within the Devil’s clasp,  
Obedient to his will,  
Who holds them all within his grasp,  
His purpose to fulfill.

And yet it seems a peaceful reign  
Would be the Devil’s choice ;  
If undisturbed he could remain,  
And none oppose his voice ;

For who can read that he hath waged  
A war on any nation ?  
Or any people hath outraged,  
In any generation ?”

Second is the “*Voice of Nature*,” in which occurs some of the most sublime strains of poetry that ever fell from human tongue, or graced the pages of any book. And third is the “*Voice of a Pebble*,” which tells the tale of all past ages, and beautifully portrays the life and individuality of everything in Nature, teaching the great truth that infinite wisdom controls all things and will eventually bring harmony out of seeming discord.

Taking it as a whole we consider it the master-piece of composition on the subject of which it treats. It must be read to be appreciated. Among its other good features is the fact that every word has a meaning—is the representative of an idea—no useless words being thrown in to fill up the poetic measure. We challenge any man or woman of literary taste to take up the book and read a few pages, without feeling an irrepressible desire to finish it.