

WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY.

PROGRESS! FREE THOUGHT! UNTRAMMELED LIVES!

BREAKING THE WAY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

Vol. VI.—No. 20.—Whole No. 150.

NEW YORK, OCT. 18, 1873.

PRICE TEN CENTS.

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

CAPITAL..... \$500,00
Subject to increase to..... 1,000,000

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

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

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

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

JOHN J. CISCO & SON,
Bankers,
No. 59 Wall St., New York.

Gold and Currency received on deposit subject to
check at sight.

Interest allowed on Currency Accounts at the rate
of Four per Cent. per annum, credited at the end of
each month.

ALL CHECKS DRAWN ON US PASS THROUGH
THE CLEARING-HOUSE, AND ARE RECEIVED
ON DEPOSIT BY ALL THE CITY BANKS.

Certificates of Deposit issued, payable on demand,
bearing Four per Cent. interest.

Loans negotiated.

Orders promptly executed for the Purchase and
Sale of Governments, Gold, Stocks and Bonds on
commission.

Collections made on all parts of the United States
and Canadas.

HARVEY FISK. A. S. HATCH
OFFICE OF
FISK & HATCH,
BANKERS AND DEALERS IN
GOVERNMENT SECURITIES,
No. 5 Nassau st., N. Y.,
Opposite U. S. Sub-Treasury.

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

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

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

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

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

Communications and inquiries by mail or
telegraph, will receive careful attention

FISK & HATCH

TO INVESTORS.

To those who wish to REINVEST COUPONS OR
DIVIDENDS, and those who wish to INCREASE

THEIR INCOME from means already invested in less

profitable securities, we recommend the Seven-Thirty

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

The bonds are always convertible at Ten per cent.

premium (1.10) into the Company's Lands, at Market

Prices. The rate of interest (seven and three-tenths

per cent. gold) is equal now to about 5 1-4 currency

—yielding an income more than one-third greater than

U. S. 5-20s. Gold Checks for the semi-annual in-

terest on the Registered Bonds are mailed to the post-

office address of the owner. All marketable stocks

and bonds are received in exchange for Northern

Pacifics ON MOST FAVORABLE TERMS.

JAY COOKE & CO.

A FIRST-CLASS
New York Security
AT A LOW PRICE

The undersigned offer for sale the First Mortgage
Seven Per Cent. Gold Bonds of the Syracuse and Che-
nango Valley Railroad, at 95 and accrued interest.

This road runs from the City of Syracuse to Smith's
Valley, where it unites with the New York Midland
Railroad, thus connecting that city by a direct line of
road with the metropolis.

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

The road approaches completion. It traverses a
populous and fertile district of the State, which in-
sures it a paying business, and it is under the control
of gentlemen of high character and ability. Its bonds
possess all the requisites of an inviting investment.
They are amply secured by a mortgage for less than
one-third the value of the property. They pay seven
per cent. gold interest, and are offered five per cent.
below par. The undersigned confidently recommend
them to all class of investors.

GEORGE OPDYKE & CO.,
No. 25 Nassau Street.

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

Circular Notes and Letters of Credit for travelers;
also Commercial Credits issued available throughout
the world.

Bills of Exchange on the Imperial Bank of London,
National Bank of Scotland, Provincial Bank of Ire-
land and all their branches.

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

Deposit accounts received in either Currency or
Coin, subject to Check at sight, which pass through
the Clearing House as if drawn upon any city bank;
interest allowed on all daily balances; Certificates of
Deposit issued bearing interest at current rate; Notes
and Drafts collected.

State, City and Railroad Loans negotiated.
CLEWS, HABICHT & CO.,
11 Old Broad St., London.

BANKING & FINANCIAL.

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

FIRST MORTGAGE BONDS

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

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

Price 97½ an accrued interest, in currency, from
February 15, 1872.

Maps, Circulars, Documents and information fur-
nished.

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

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

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

AUGUST BELMONT & CO.,
Bankers,

91 and 21 NASSAU STREET,

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

MESSRS. DE ROTHSCHILD AND THEIR
CORRESPONDENTS.

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

RAILROAD IRON,
FOR SALE

BY S. W. HOPKINS & CO.,
71 BROADWAY

TOLEDO, PEORIA

AND

WARSAW RAILWAY,

SECOND MORTGAGE CON-

VERTIBLE 7 PER

CENT. CURRENCY BONDS.

INTEREST WARRANTS PAYABLE

OCTOBER AND APRIL,

PRINCIPAL 1886.

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

For terms apply to

CLARK, DODGE & CO.,

Corner Wall and William Streets.

H. J. Sheerance



The Books and Speeches of Victoria C. Woodhull and Tennie C. Claflin will hereafter be furnished, postage paid, at the following liberal prices:

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

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
TENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SPIRITUALISTS,
Held at Grow's Opera Hall, Chicago, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, Sept. 16, 17 and 18.

SECOND DAY—MORNING SESSION CONTINUED.

Capt. Winslow—This is a question that to me seems a little premature. Facts are stubborn things, and when a fact is presented we cannot get round it. We have just passed a proposition that order is nature's first law. I did not know it was the first, although it is a law in nature. There are other things that have come up in this discussion. It seems to me that it is premature; I will tell you why I do not understand it. They contend that social freedom is right, because they contend that it is the highest type of our spiritual nature. Well, I do not exactly see it. There are secondary faculties, certainly secondary to the spiritual nature. [Cheers.] Here I come to the second point. They tell me in advancing this doctrine—those who believe in this social freedom—that no one should have a child unless it was perfectly harmonized. What will be the result? It will introduce a new element into the action of our faith. You may point to my life's history and find acts which were perhaps not so good as they should have been, but that does not interfere with the principles involved. What would be the result of opening this animalism upon us? In twenty-five years it would have played havoc with us. Law is for our protection, and it is right to have law, but don't tell me that it is right to take my life. I want to know if right exists on my side. I wish that we might have high and pure organizations, and I feel sorry, deeply sorry, that my organization is not of that nature that I can with truth say that I am pure and holy, without spot or blemish. I cannot say this, nor is there a single individual breathing that can say it. The reason is that I am a finite being.

Miss Addie L. Ballou—It seems to me that there is a great mistake made by some people on this question. Social freedom does not, as I see, compel me to take up all kinds of animalism in the street. The gentleman in his explanations seemed to make an indirect thrust at womankind. Of all duties put upon mothers, there is none more sacred than that of maternity. The deepest, holiest thought of the woman is that the child shall come into the world better organized; and in order to do that, the mother knows that the first law is pure impregnation; and I say that the filthy, rotten men of this country are not fit to have children. If there is a pure and good man in the world, if I wanted to give the purest child to the world—and I will say right here that I do not wish to be misunderstood, for my life will stand your inspection—if I wished to become a mother again, if I wished to fill that holy office of maternity, I am sure that I should demand that the father of my child should be as pure as my own thought. I do not know where in this great community I could find such a man. I know what this question calls for. I know what it is for a mother, for a wife to be held in subjection to the will of her husband. Her body belongs to him, and his is the right to sell it to another man to pay a debt. There are persons in this hall, a woman among you whose body has been, by her own husband, offered to pay a debt. Now I claim on behalf of woman freedom of this question. If a man has the right to sell my body because the law has given him the privilege, then I say down with that law. Any other woman in this community, subject to this same law, feels equally its force, and for her I also speak, although the walls should tumble down and crush me. [Cheers.]

The Chairman—I hear Mr. Higgins's voice. It is impossible for me to recognize every one, but all shall have a chance.

Mr. Anthony Higgins—I said last night that when we scratched a Spiritualist we sometimes found a Christian underneath. There is a great deal of truth in that, because we cannot grow out of the prejudices which education and society have thrown over us. The argument brought forward against this proposition emanated in the seminary of Christianity. They have not the mark of spiritual philanthropy about them; they were born in the womb of Jesuits; they come from the Vatican; they belong to the dead past and we have nothing to do with them. Let us come to the question, "Whom are we seeking to reform?" Men and women? What

are men and women? Spiritual, ethereal beings, or are they not social beings? Are we not animal as well as angel? Have we not political as well as social rights, and social rights as well as political rights? The gentleman says that the spiritual underlies the material. One need not deny it. Every person here has physical phenomena, and organs and passions located at the base of the brain. If you seek a reorganization you must not omit these, and if you wish to erect a different kind of Spiritualism from that we have to-day, you must begin at the proper base and look after the animal wants of men and women before you can reach the full developed man and woman. Therefore, I think this proposition is in accordance with the object and aim of Spiritualists. You say we are but dreamers, wild speculators, seeking to reach out into immensity for some intangible something that is to remodel society. What we want is something solid—questions we can discuss. What we want is to bring back again people to the basis of truth. Can we get a better basis than to take care of the animal nature of man—the basic element of life? They say that we Spiritualists are a religious body and have nothing to do with the animal man, and yet Moses claimed not only the soul but the body. He said, "Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not bear false witness." The Church to-day has its grasp upon your minds and bodies; we Spiritualists are to have nothing to do with these things. We are attacking the most formidable power in the world—Christianity, yet we are not to take practical measures for making our assault. In the name of common sense, let's have some logic from the other side of the house. [Cheers.]

Mrs. Waisbrooker—There was a time when nature's laws in my being and my conscience were at conflict, but that time has passed. When I was in the church I certainly did much that my soul condemned. To-day I do not. I do not claim to be perfect; no woman can be. For years every act of my life has been moulded under the highest conception of my duty and right at that time.

Mr. Shaw, of Iowa, said:

Mr. President, this transcendentalism surfeits me; it recalls to my mind the anecdote of the Scotchman's reply to the inquiry whether he understood the meaning of metaphysics. "O yes," he said; "when ain man dinna ken what anither man says, and the man who says it dinna ken what he says himself, that is metaphysics." [Laughter.] I have listened to a good deal of metaphysics upon this little question, as it seems to me, whether we should organize in order to secure social freedom. That is the objectionable point. Now, the question comes up, what constitutes social freedom? I am in favor of the proposition viewing it from my standpoint, but I am not in favor of viewing it from the standpoint of another. Social freedom, as it has ordinarily been interpreted to mean promiscuity, I certainly cannot accept. Mark me here, there is not one who is socially a slave by reason of marital laws, and I put myself in that position. If the lady who has spoken here desires to select the man to be the father of her next child she is at perfect liberty to do it. Let her remember that the true law of marriage comes in after she has made her selection. The provisions of the marital law come altogether from a deeper quarter than that. It rests deeper than this superficial law. That it is a restraining and necessary evil I tell you. It has been found necessary in order to guard against certain evils—a barrier that they have put from another and altogether different cause. That cause is a disregard of the basic law of life, which says that the earth and the fullness thereof belong to mankind individually, without respect to communities or sects. I shall stand ready here, when I occupy the platform to-night, to trace every evil, general and special, under which mankind suffers, to that one grand violation of basic law. I will tell you another fact, that we are not without experience in reference to this point. In Rome, for 500 years, women were under restraint far more severe than that which holds them now—the power of divorce was with the man alone, and there was not a divorce for 500 years. But mark the result when the law was changed, which amounted to about the same thing that you are calling for here—social freedom. The cause for divorce was made very trivial, and both husband and wife could obtain it at will. What was the result? Why, Cicero says that a man no longer counted the years by the consuls but by the number of his wives—that some men had as many as twenty wives, and some women got a little ahead of the men and had 25 husbands [a laugh], and they found that it was necessary to reverse this social law, which is now for the second time to be imposed upon a community.

Mr. Higgins—I do not disagree with my friend on the main point; he has one idea of marriage and I have another—that is all. Now, the natural idea of marriage is what we are seeking out. The marriage of the hierarchy, of the Catholic and of the Jesuit is one thing, and that which costs \$5 for a piece of parchment is another.

Mrs. Severance—Is a question in order? I ask him what women have to do with making laws?

Mr. Shaw—I grant you that woman have very little to do with making laws, but it would be with perfect willingness on my part that they should.

Mrs. Severance—Why did you not say so?

Mr. Shaw—I have not spoken to that point yet.

Mr. Hull—The time has arrived for adjournment, and I move that this matter be laid over until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was temporarily withdrawn.

Mrs. Witchener, of St. Louis, said—I have but one fact to offer. I have practiced medicine for seventeen years, making especial point of the diseases of women when I first gave my name out. The first seven days I had six applications to procure abortions, five of them were married women, and three of them were methodists. Far better would it be that we should have our children born on the plan of social freedom than have them murdered in the churches.

Mrs. Mary Thomas Clark, of Indiana:

What I have to say will not be valuable, but so many have talked of what they do not know that my soul is alive, and I do want to say one word. A gentleman said that there was no slavery under the marriage law. I believe the gentleman has never been a slave in all his life, or he would know better. I do not stand here to speak of myself, but on behalf of those women who are scared to go home after they have become slightly indisposed, for fear they might be ill used. First let me speak of the labor we have under the marriage system. I have seen my mother, who bore seventeen children to her husband—I have seen that woman quite wild, before I knew what was the matter, awaiting the arrival of another life. To obey her husband was that woman's religion. Baal was her God, and she worshiped him in her own soul. Let me pass from her to my oldest sister, who bore thirteen children. We lived in England. When we crossed to America she had eight children and a little babe to take care of, and she asked and begged her husband that she might make the journey free. I am not ashamed, for I know the truth of what I am saying. The consequence of my sister's request was quarrels in the family. She was spat upon. I ask whether a law which compels a woman to submit—whether a law which binds them as slaves is a good law? Are you for adopting it throughout the whole country? I ask you, which is worse—a slavery endured by a woman under such laws, or that of the Caucasian, who sells her body because she loves? I say that we are not free, and we must be free in this if we will be anything else than slaves in the next generation. [Cheers.]

The Convention then adjourned until 2 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention reassembled at 2 o'clock P. M.

The Chairman—Although the hour for opening the Convention has not arrived, yet I will call the Convention to order, so that a little business may be transacted before we begin the consideration of the resolutions. The Secretary will proceed to call the roll of those who have paid their fees and become regular members of this Convention.

Mr. Jamieson, the Secretary, then read the list of delegates, already published.

Mr. Cotton said:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—I do not propose to occupy your time but a very few minutes. I believe we are limited to five minutes, but if we were allowed a longer time I could not occupy it, because I am in ill health. I rise to say that there is a portion of this Convention who believe—perhaps it may be without foundation—that when this proposition is passed, they are committed to the extreme views of these individuals on this social question. You all know that an individual, who has proclaimed himself as a believer in, and a practitioner of, what to me is promiscuity, has said that he can have one true love and then love forty women in forty days. I grant that he may be right when he says that he traveled by and through and into the holy of holies to find this condition, and then assumes that I must travel through the same path in order to get that holy, glorious experience by and through which he has become more intellectual, more angel-like, and so forth, on to the end of the chapter. I say, for me, I do not want to pass through that way. There is a class here who feel that they are committing themselves to what they do not approve. Some one says that there is no such thing as seduction; that there is no such thing as prostitution; and that class of individuals to-day is substituting the word "love" for "sexual embrace." Now, if you should love so and so to-night, and so and so to-morrow night, and some one else the next night, that would strengthen the bonds binding together me and mine. Now, this is to me an absurdity, and what I want to be understood as meaning is this: That I want this Convention to have this proposition recommitted, and let those who have had this matter under consideration give us to understand what is meant, that all may act intelligently touching this subject. As I do not propose to make any extended remarks, I will just repeat my motion. "That this proposition be recommitted, with instructions to give an explanation of social reform and freedom, particularly as to the breaking up of the family relationship." Now, I do not suppose that there is a single individual but will go nearly up to the end of the chapter with regard to social freedom. But there is something abhorrent to my soul when you ask me to let myself down, and not allow the intellectual to govern the animal. To my idea, it may be all right for the persons who are doing it. I do not judge for them, but for myself. But when they say to me that I can never have this glorious experience, I demur. I am very well aware that a great many among us are peculiar in their organization, and individuals have declared to me, were it not for the gratification of what they call love, they would no longer want to live an earthly life, and the highest ambition that many have in the future—though I charge it to no one—is a gratification of that feeling on the other shore, and their hope that in that land, directly and by proxy, they may communicate and have this embrace, that there, through intellectual and spiritual conflict, they should develop into angel life. I believe if the time ever comes when humanity shall be a law unto itself, then we can lay down all the bars of restriction, and let every one press in.

Miss Anna E. Hinman read a list of delegates from whom she had received the dollar necessary to constitute membership of the Convention to properly qualified delegates.

The Chairman—The question before us is on the motion of Mr. Cotton to recommit this proposition for explanation. Perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions will read the original, so that it may be understood.

Col. Blood then read the proposition and said:

The committee discussed this question, and they thought it was ample to cover the case. Mr. Cotton evidently misunderstands it. It says nothing about compulsion; it is very plain in its statement, and if you like I will read it again, so

that it may be thoroughly understood. We do not propose to compel anybody to do anything. I cannot conceive that there could be anything plainer than the terms of this proposition. It leaves everybody to do as they please in social as in religious matters.

Mr. Cotton—Is a word of explanation in order? I would just say that there are many of us who understand this proposition to commit them to the extreme views to which I have referred. Now, can it not be differently worded, so that we can harmonize together, and work on this platform for what to us is the truth?

The amendment was lost, and the original motion adopted.

On the clause referring to the Young Men's Christian Association—

Judge Holbrook said—I rise to ask what is meant by the words, "the infamous attempt."

Col. Blood—By putting God into the Constitution.

A Delegate—I would move that Tennie C. Claflin be allowed to explain. [Cheers.]

Col. Blood—Miss Claflin declines to explain now, but thinks that she will have an opportunity to discuss the question this evening.

There were cries for Dr. Jamieson and Colonel Blood.

Mr. Jamieson said:

I am very busy with my duties as secretary, but I will just say in a few words as I can what I think is meant. The Young Men's Christian Assassination Association means the entire subversion of our American public. It means to begin at the very base of our social and political institutions, and means to overthrow them entirely. That is the object of the so-called Christian Association. This Association proposes to undo the work of the grand old revolutionary heroes. It proposes to pass upon this question in the shape of Christianity against infidelity; and in that form, when the question comes before the American people, it will be carried by an overwhelming majority, and God, or the Jewish Jehovah, and his son Jesus and the Bible, are to be recognized in our Constitution. That is what they propose to do; and when they obtain the recognition of their God and their Jesus and their Bible, then will come a time that will try men's souls, and will inaugurate the coming religious war. These men are in earnest. They are to assemble in one shape on the 2d day of October. \$180,000 have been subscribed for the purpose of advertising that single meeting of the Evangelical Alliance. That is the grand Christian Association. These men are engaged in no mere fanatical scheme; they are only carrying out the logic of Christianity, and this government of ours not being based on Christianity, these men propose that the so-called Christian nation should be consistent, and recognizing God first in the national Constitution, shall then recognize him in the State Constitution and then in all the different institutions of the country. Their object is to overthrow religious liberty—to prevent the very freedom of expression you have listened to from this platform. [Cheers.]

Judge Holbrook—I do not consider the wording of the resolution quite exact. The article "the" is definite, and points to one object, one thing that the Young Men's Christian Association have assuredly done. I would suggest that it read "all infamous attempts." I will make an amendment to that effect.

The amendment was adopted.

On motion for the adoption of the resolution as amended, Mr. Cotton said:

I would just like to say that I, with Dr. Treat, attended a convention of this class at Cooper Institute, last winter. I was surprised to see the amount of talent engaged in this direction. People say that there is no danger—that this cannot be forced down the throats of the people. But I saw enough there, and know enough of the combination made by the Catholics and Protestants in this connection. They are a power in the land; and unless we inform the people on this subject we shall soon be in the grasp of a hidden foe. I believe, beyond a doubt—and I do not speak without some knowledge—that the Young Men's Christian Association is a Jesuitical instrument to do this work. The men who are at the head of this movement say that they intend to carry it out if it takes ten or twenty years. Stephen H. Tyng, of New York, who has the confidence of millions of Protestants—who rules his people like a pope—is one of its leaders. The culmination of the idea of these persons will be, not only to continue the disfranchisement of women, but to disfranchise every liberal from one end of this country to another. Here is the danger; and I hope we shall not sleep upon our oars. [Cheers.]

Dr. Maxwell—I move that we incorporate in the proposition the words "The evangelical alliance."

Col. Blood—The Committee on Resolutions will accept the amendment.

The proposition as amended was then carried.

On the next proposition referring to children's lyceums,

Dr. Merton said:

It is hardly possible, Mr. President, to say in five minutes time why I do not think that that proposition expresses the whole sense of this meeting. In my address this evening I intend to show particularly why the Children's Progressive Lyceum has not been that success which its originators hoped it would be. The Children's Progressive Lyceum ought to make a definite provision for the cultivation of the whole nature. But it does not. Why does it not? Because, for example, it has twelve groups of members for every complete lyceum. Why are they required? The founder of the lyceum has never given us a single reason for their existence. I believe that there is an intellectual system of education possible, which could be fully adapted to most natures, and definitely provide for each of the twelve groups. I oppose this proposition, because I believe that something better than the children's lyceum can be adopted.

The proposition was carried. The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh propositions of Chap. III.

were also passed without dissent. The eighth was reached, whereupon Mrs. Severance moved its adoption, and it was declared carried. At this moment Judge Holbrook rose to his feet.

Judge Holbrook:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—Five minutes is a very short time to make a speech on this question; but as I stand in the presence of Col. Blood, I wish to reveal what a transformation has been made in these propositions. I want to complain that good faith has not been kept. When in the conference-room, Col. Blood insisted that these propositions read just the same and meant just the same after the reconstruction as they did before. Why don't you pass the reconstruction?

Mrs. Severance—Because we thought it superfluous.

Judge Holbrook—This whole doctrine of free love from beginning to end is based on language that reads both ways. Misunderstood you! Why, you cannot be understood when you are using language that can be just as well read one way as the other. Here is the terrible social freedom of the past. It is stealing the livery of heaven to serve the devil in, that is what you are doing all the time. You bring in a proposition stating that hypocrisy is the greatest crime of the age, and this is hypocrisy from beginning to end—the use of language that cannot be understood; using the term social freedom to mean one thing when others regard it as meaning another. I do not want any of your social freedom. I am only in favor of my own. [A hiss.]

Mr. Cotton—Let us have freedom.

The Chairman—Let us have order; be as quiet as possible.

Judge Holbrook—Well, now then, if this is to be as you insist that it is, that government has just as much right to direct the matter of marriage as it has your physical liberty, what is your social freedom good for? Are you insisting that the government has no right to stand in the way of any physical liberty? You must admit it or deny it. I drive along the street; have I not a right to the whole street? You drive along that street, and you have a right to the whole street, and yet the law says that I shall go to the right and that you shall go to the left. The government is there standing in the way of my physical liberty. It is directing me what I shall do in that particular business. Well, these revolutionists here are so almighty independent that they say government cannot control them in the least. I would like to know what you mean. In this way you have no government at all, for your moral liberty is the result of the physical; and the physical is the result of the moral. According to your own construction, government has the right to interfere in the case of marriages. Now, I own a piece of land and the government wants it, or a railroad wants it. I, however, wish to live upon it, but the government will come and take it from me for public use, thus interfering with my personal liberty.

Miss Claflin—They pay you for it though.

Col. Blood—But the fact that they do so, shows evidently that the right of the community is superior to that of the individual, since it is paid for. Still it is taken without consent. This, however, instead of being an argument in favor of Judge Holbrook's position, is the very reverse, since it demonstrates that there can be no such thing as absolute, individual ownership, in natural wealth. That belongs of right to the people collectively. Land, like the air and water, is natural wealth to which individual title can never be acquired rightfully, because no person originally created it.

Judge Holbrook—I grant you that; but they interfere with my personal liberty. And no government has a right to interfere, according to your doctrine; and if you don't stand on that doctrine you don't stand anywhere. If you wish to preserve your personal liberty you must retire from the streets, because government says that such and such things may not be done at certain times; and if government has the right to do this, then it has the right to interfere with these marriages. If you think that, being married one day, you can dismiss the wife next day, and five months afterward, if government considers that to be wrong, it can restrict your physical liberty in that respect and also your moral liberty; and if it cannot do that—

Mrs. Middlebrook—Will Judge Holbrook allow me to ask him a question?

Judge Holbrook—Yes, sir. [A laugh.]

Mrs. Middlebrook—If Judge Holbrook is willing to put before this audience his idea of social freedom, and not have a law based upon Col. Blood's idea of social freedom, I will ask him if one person's idea ought not to be protected by government just as much as any other person's idea?

Judge Holbrook—I do not understand the question.

Mrs. Middlebrook—Judge Holbrook stated that he believes in social freedom, but not in Col. Blood's idea of social freedom; and I would like to know if it would not be despotism? Would it not be protecting one citizen as against another, if the government should pass a law based upon his idea of social freedom, be opposed to another person's idea of it?

Judge Holbrook—I see no better place to commence at in the answer to this question than my belief in social freedom—I mean by this social freedom, that I believe in social liberty as it is restricted by proper laws. We have no other liberty but that. Liberty has its restrictions. You talk about your absolute liberty, and there is no such thing. This doctrine of social freedom in the first place depends upon absolutely inalienable rights. There are no such rights, my friend, when you look into the matter. If you have but one individual in the world you may talk of absolute rights.

A voice—"Are not the rights, to see, to smell, to taste, to feel, absolute rights of the individual, and of two individu-

als? May they not breathe the same air, see, smell, taste or feel the same things? Will any one dare to say that the right of two individuals to love is any less absolute or inalienable than these?"

But the moment you have two individuals in the world you must talk of relative rights, because your right has some relation to another person's rights, and when you come into government every person's rights are limited by those of others. That is my idea. [Cheers. A Voice—"So are the wrongs, and it is from them that people need the protection of laws and not to restrict rights." Now follow me and see. The whole community comes together for the purpose of protecting the individual, and in entering upon the government every right of every individual has its relation to everybody's rights. Now, that is the meaning of government; that is the force of government; all the rest of the people are against one every time. What shall he do; how far shall he carry it? What shall the individual do that is fighting the great public? The trouble is that the revolutionists carry your idea of personal freedom too far; they mean well enough, I suppose. I have much respect for their character, but I cannot say so much for their judgment.

Col. Blood—May I ask a question? Here are several of us upon the platform. Suppose that we agree among ourselves to organize a government, based upon the proposition of personal freedom and inalienable individual rights. The administration of this government would consist in protecting this freedom and these rights in every individual. We should thus secure to each other every inalienable right, and at the same time, by such security generally, every one would be protected individually. Would not that protect you equally with every one else? If every one is secure how can anyone stand in danger? What is required in sexual matters is not restraints upon intercourse, but punishment for rape.

Judge Holbrook—That is an absurdity. Talk of inalienable rights—What are they? Is it an inalienable right to do just what you please? You cannot do it, you cannot go into government that way. You have conceded too much. Take the case of the land. Here I have a certain piece of land; it is an inalienable right of mine to own it. [A voice—"That is your assumption." But the people of the United States, 40,000,000 of them, come to me and say we want it. We do not care about your inalienable rights, and they drive me away, no matter whether they pay me for it or not, yet I have a right to own the land. This is the foundation principle of all these matters. Whether they are right or not, the right of the great mass to reconstruct the individual must be granted. Government I hold is omnipotent. The great mass of the people is God, so far as government is concerned. When Jonah was in the boat and was thrown overboard, I say that is the government of God, and if I or you were in the boat, and it would only carry nine in a storm, and there were ten of us in the boat, I say it would be right for one of us to be cast overboard. This is the province of government to restrict, and we must have some restrictions upon individual rights in the matter of matrimony as in everything else.

Mr. Higgins—If we are to be governed all the time by existing forms of government, where did the men who declared their independence of the government of England obtain their rights here, but in Convention of the people, who declared their right for higher freedom? Don't you see that you limit us in our right of revolution, which every nation has the right to declare?

Judge Holbrook—The right of revolution is a right inherent necessarily in every people, because there is no right to dispute it. [A Voice—"There you yield the whole claim." There is no power to control governments, they obtain their power by the consent of the governed; but at another point of time the people may want to overturn the government because it has been too hard upon them, and they determine to assert their rights by revolution. In this case, you say you can carry on your personal government—we say that you cannot. I say it is revolutionary, and must uproot the government before it can be successful.

Mrs. Severance—It is strange to me that anybody can see such a great bugbear in this religious, political and social freedom. Can you not see that the very same laws that relate to religious freedom apply with equal force to social freedom? That is to say, every person now has a right over his conscience and his religious acts, with which nobody has the right to interfere except they interfere with the exercise of the same rights on the part of another. Why should it not be so with social laws? Why should not the dictates of one's own conscience govern one's action in matters of social affairs as in religious affairs, so long as you do not infringe upon the rights of others? [Cheers.] Is it forgotten that the women will have the same, even a greater right, to deny these ministers of carnal appetites when they reject in social freedom as they do now. [Cheers, and cries of "Question!"]

The Chairman—Let us hear everybody; they are all entitled to a hearing.

Mr. M. E. Bean, of Massachusetts:

This idea of the government against the individual I want to say a word about. Some 200 years ago the officials of Massachusetts took it in their heads that certain women, to the number of twenty in all, should be murdered. The women were right and the officials were wrong. You can go back some 1,800 years, and some officials of Judea took it into their heads to go and do the same thing. They were wrong and the individuals were right. [Cheers.]

Mr. Shaw—I do recognize a difference between religious restraint and political and moral and social restraint. There is a vast difference. One refers to the relationship of man with his maker, and the other his relations with his fellows. Where this latter relation is established, there must come in laws. The basic conditions of society require it, and we shall find that no one can rise superior to them, whether as individuals or as a nationality. The disregard by the nations generally of the basic law of life, which speaks in favor of the equal distribution of the earth and its fulness, has caused the

distress we see around us. These social propositions do not seem strange at all in view of the fact that 23 1/2 inches of brain is unable to conceive properly what this social problem really means. Perhaps I can make my position clearer by repetition. We find that there is competition, or a law of competition, governing in the world; each man and each woman essays to claim the greater prominence, the higher position, to place, if you please, a greater distance between himself and the great demon of want or the dread of it, and this involves competition, which has within itself the elements of selfishness, and comes in to corrupt every relation of life, even the marital relation itself. When you look into your own experience, if you have had difficulty there, or look into the experience of your neighbors, you will find that the great corroding cause of this marital relationship flows right out of its basic conditions, the disregard by the nation of the basic laws of life, which says that the earth and the fulness thereof are all mankind's equally, without respect to individuals or sects. Without overthrowing these conditions, without making them in harmony, will you inform me how you will be able to proceed without some reconstructive laws? How will you be able to do it? Will you take away the restraining laws? We have an example before us, of 500 years' duration, where the masses have been under your law of social freedom as interpreted by you. I am in favor of social freedom, but I want it free from those conditions that lie at the base of all the corruptions of society, including that of the marital relation. This is my definition of the social question.

Mr. Crocker—I want to say one word in explanation with regard to the latitude which the speakers are taking over this question. During the process of revolution, the idea of the sovereignty of the individual comes first; after this come in nature, science and universal law. Universal law is the modifying influence. The individual is always in advance of the multitude. We vote to put ourselves under the law from the demands of emergency, not because we would yield to the government of the multitude, or rather to an inferior than to the superior force. Politics come in; and, if I understand the question, we do not want to infringe upon the right of the individual. Again, you cannot legislate on social freedom. It asserts itself. It is like the muscular system in the human organization—it is self-asserting. You make all the laws you choose—it will still retain its life. Condemn it if you can. I do not care one straw with regard to all the laws that may be made; let me alone. I have a law in my own organization, and I cannot work it out; and if I have to go to hell to learn the way to heaven, I shall have to submit under the circumstances: it is inevitable. If you want to modify things, for God's sake bring circumstances to the front that will uplift the individual!

Mr. Pope—I have just a word to say on this great question. ["Louder!"] I can make you all hear me if the angels help me. If there is a double pivot upon which this just, grand and glorious question revolves, it is the question of the rights of society and the rights of the suffering individual, and the native total depravity of all gross races. These are the pivots upon which this question revolves, and my heart desires that I should speak plainly and intelligently, as does the spirit that I have invoked. The question asked by the great Dart, in New York, and to-day asked by the great, large-hearted lawyer (Judge Holbrook) is: Are there any rights, inalienable, belonging to society? We, sir, as reformers—I, sir, as an inspired delegate to this Convention, ask, in the sovereignty of my individuality, What rights has society which the suffering individual is bound to respect, at the sacrifice of his own? This question must be settled intelligently before the subject can be disposed of legitimately. I claim—from the knowledge received by me at this hour from my mother inspirator—that all men and women have a glorious claim of that manhood—that they have an inalienable right to the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness. I ask no government but a government of my own native constitution. I ask liberty which shall give me the dictation of that inspiration within me, and I will have it, too, if I have to spill every drop of blood that flows in my veins. This is the point, and in the future I hope to say more upon it. [Cheers.]

Mrs. Stearns, of Corry, Pa., said:

My Friends—Three parts of my experience bear upon this question, and I wish to tell it while the Convention is on this debate. It is a personal experience, and because there are thousands of such, this question is before you. I married by and through the influence of friends. One month after my marriage, I conceived. My husband told me that I had no right to become a mother. He physicked me, but the child was born. This was one of his marital rights, he claims it as such, that I should be a mother by and through his offices. Time passed and I separated from the man; after that separation I was deprived of the privilege of associating with my child; and in the bill brought before the court, the allegation was made that I was practicing Spiritualism around the country, and that was considered good and sufficient reason why I should not associate with my child. This bill was presented by the father of my child, who had been side by side with me for four years in the investigations of Spiritualism, during which time I took care of the children. He said, if there was a good wife I had been one; but the law gave him the right to the child, and restricted me in my associations with it; for five years, during which for three years I never saw the child. Once I went to see it but was prevented, and the law sustained the father all the time. Now, why are we advocates of social reform? I do not mean license! We want the divine rights of motherhood respected, and we intend to have them respected. [Cheers.]

Mrs. Laura C. Owens, of Indianapolis, said:

If I had more than five minutes to speak upon this subject, I could tell you volumes. Ladies and gentlemen here assembled—the sister gave you a little of her experience, and talked about reforming the law. I am in favor of it. She had her child taken from her, and the law sanctioned it; but when my husband and I parted; I defied the law to take my

child. But the law did not—it died. My husband tried to steal her, the law tried to come in, but, the child was ready, and I would have killed her rather than have given her up. But I was divorced, and a month after I married the same man again. [Laughter.] And I am the mother of another child. My first child was born after my husband and I had parted, and my earnest prayer was that we both might die. I thought that I was disgraced forever. I thought the name "grass widow" was enough, without bringing a child into the world without a father. [Laughter.] I will tell you of the crimes that I tried to do: I went to a physician and offered him \$500 to cause an abortion; he professed his willingness, but my father heard of it, and said that if he did it, he would prosecute him to the full rigor of the law. The physician did nothing, and the child was born; but it died, and God knows that I am the occasion of its being in spirit land, for with tears of bitterness I prayed that she might be born dead. She lived two years—a beautiful flower. My husband and I got divorced again; six months after we were married the second time. [Laughter.] I know what has brought me and my husband to our present position; but I am going to try and cultivate a sweet, healthy disposition, the best I can. [Great laughter.] My other child is just as healthy as it can be, although I have been afraid of it once or twice. But my mother regretted almost that I was a coming, and I am a divorced widow to-day. [Laughter.] If I ever marry again, it will not be to please my friends, but it will be for love, even it be a nigger. [Great laughter and cheers.]

The Chairman—Those in favor of the adoption of the proposition, will say aye.

The proposition was adopted without a dissenting voice.

On proposition 1, of Chapt. V., respecting Christians—

Mr. Dean—I move that the word "professed" be placed before the word Christians.

The amendment was lost and the original proposition carried. The other propositions of this chapter were adopted, as were also those of Chapter VI. This disposed of the last of the clauses contained in the majority report.

The Chairman—The question now comes upon the adoption of the majority report as a whole.

Col. Blood moved, and the motion to adopt as a whole, having been seconded, it was carried.

The Chairman—Under the rule, the minority reports are now before the Convention; what will you do with them?

Mr. Hull—I move to lay them on the table.

Mrs. Severance—I second the motion.

Judge Holbrook—I call for the reading of the report.

The report was read.

Judge Holbrook—And now I call for the yeas and nays,

While the vote was being taken,

Mr. George Gear, of Connecticut—I wish it to be distinctly understood that I think the motion to lay on the table a very ungentlemanly one.

Mr. Shaw—I did not know that it was necessary to pay in a dollar before I could vote.

The Chairman—I have announced the fact several times.

Mr. Shaw—I will pay in my money. Can I have a few minutes to explain my vote?

The Chairman—Not a bit of it.

Mr. Shaw—I did not expect to get it.

On Mr. Lynn's vote in the negative being called, apparently at the far end of the hall, the Chairman said: That seems strangely hypocritical.

Mr. Lynn—The Chairman charges me with being a hypocrite because I vote "No." I am no hypocrite. Cephas B. Lynn never was.

The Chairman—The Chair did not accuse you of hypocrisy; it thought somebody else was taking your name; it had not seen you.

The vote was read as follows: Yeas, 113; nays, 28.

The Chairman—There is still another part of the minority report.

Judge Holbrook—The question will again come up on the other part of the report.

Dr. Maxwell presented his proposition as part of the minority report.

Mr. Randolph—I move that the propositions be taken up by sections. Carried.

The first section was adopted unanimously.

A motion to table the second clause was made.

Judge Holbrook—I call for the "ayes" and "noes."

The Chairman—Will you vote by "ayes" and "noes?"

Those in favor will say "aye" and those opposed "no."

The motion was lost.

A division was then taken by the members rising. About twenty persons rose in the negative. The proposition was consequently tabled.

Mr. Hull—I move that we now adjourn. Lost.

Mr. Randolph—I move that the regular order of business be taken up.

The Chairman—Mr. Cotton caught my eye first, and has the right to the floor.

Mr. Cotton—I hold in my hands a proposition which I wish to read, with a few words of comment. We hope that the better judgment of the Convention will decide to say something on what to me is a very important subject. It may not signify to any one else, but it may at this stage of the proceedings. It is an important proposition. I will read it, and then spend two or three moments in speaking about it.

Resolved—That we represent the condition represented by those who argue and practice promiscuity in sexual intercourse outside of one true love as a condition to be commiserated and not censured or condemned.

Mr. M. A. Root—Has this proposition been presented in the usual way by the Committee on Resolutions?

The Chairman—No.

Mr. Root—Is it in order?

The Chairman—There is no law on this subject passed by this Convention, but the custom of the Association has been sometimes to allow them to be presented on the platform. This has never been denied; at other times they have been presented to the Committee on Resolutions, and through them they have come to the Convention. I decide that according to the usages of the Convention that the proposition is in order.

Mr. Barnes—I wished to introduce one but could not get it in. If you allow one you must allow another.

Mr. Cotton—I will read my proposition over again. [Proposition read.] I simply want to say, and then I will leave it to the discussion of others, that I hope this point will no longer be shunned. I am aware that it is shunned, but if I stand alone I am willing to place myself square upon it. I say as an individual, the doctrine that I may have one true love, and then go outside for pleasure and call it love, and love that may produce offspring, with high, heavenly and holy aspirations, is something that I cannot comprehend. I am fully aware that those who love in this way state, as one of their number did, that they experience their highest joys and enter the holy of holies in this way, and tell me that I must travel the same way. I have no desire to do it.

The motion was laid on the table.

Mr. J. O. Barrett—I move that the regular order of business be taken up.

Mr. Barnes—I wish to introduce a proposition.

The Chairman—You are too late. The committee will meet in the ante-rooms. The Convention is adjourned until seven o'clock this evening.

The Convention then adjourned.

EVENING SESSION.

The Convention was called to order at 7 o'clock.

The Chairman said—The hour for opening has arrived, and we can have some short speeches. While others are collecting their thoughts I will say a few words. Ten years in this country has been considered a decade—and a decade ago the first National Spiritual Association convened in this city, in the month of August. That Convention lasted eight days, and delegates from all parts of the country were present. It will be recollected that in 1864, the first date of the publication of these proceedings, we were in the war of the rebellion. At that time, Mr. Henry C. Wright, who had almost throughout all his life advocated self-abnegation—that if we were stricken on one cheek, we should turn the other—unexpectedly threw a bombshell into the Convention in the shape of a series of resolutions sustaining the principles of war, and in favor of putting down rebellion. We had a troublesome time then. Some delegates thought we had a lively time this afternoon, but it was a quiet family circle compared with a boisterous political meeting, of which the first Convention was a fair sample. [A laugh.] The result was, a separation into two organizations, one of conservative the other of active workers, like the majority here to-day. We have a much smaller party here to-day, dissenting with the mass of Spiritualists on the question of the duties of the situation, than were present in the first Convention. The proclamation had gone forth from the Chief Executive of the nation—from Abraham Lincoln—that the slaves, these people belonging to the African race, must be freed, and slavery forever cease in the United States. And it has been accomplished. [Cheers.] And now another bombshell is thrown into the American Association of Spiritualists. It comes in the shape of resolutions declaring the right of freedom of nearly twenty millions of human beings. [Cheers.]

A male Delegate—Why don't you take us all in?

The Chairman—As a lady said on this platform, there are a great many of the men who need this; and in the freeing of those whom we have been in the habit of calling our better halves, many of us will, no doubt, obtain greater freedom than we have ever before. It is an important fact that this declaration comes upon us from what I might term, although it is disputed, yet, from what I will term the head of the revolution, looking to the enfranchisement of women, as was the proclamation from Mr. Lincoln, from the head of the movement looking to the abolition of slavery. [Cheers.] It is signalized in the commencement by almost the same circumstances. (When anybody wants the platform let them come right up.) I have watched the movements of this association since its foundation. I know that its first President, S. S. Jones, of the *R. P. Journal*, ignores it now, but from the revelations that have been made to-day of the manner of his life, it is no wonder—the nature of the parent being transmitted to the child—that this association should have culminated in Woodhullism. [Cheers and laughter.] I make another most startling revelation. I have taken particular pains to investigate in the localities where our past Presidents have lived, and where they are best known, and you will be perfectly astonished when I tell you that there has not been reported one single individual, male or female, with one exception, that has not stood on the same line of social freedom. [Cheers.] And that one exception I have not been able to look after yet. If the Spiritualists, two-thirds of whom come out of the churches, are ably represented in the concentrated forces of the American Association of Spiritualists, it comes with an ill grace for any of the Spiritualists to ignore Mrs. Woodhull. Everybody will understand from my manner of ruling in this Convention that I have no favorites. When I take this position of presiding officer, I have nothing but the duty that belongs to the office to perform. I have been taught in the spiritual school that one of the inalienable rights—although the existence of inalienable rights has been denied to-day—was free speech. It has been contended that when a man enters society he surrenders a part of his rights, which is the disputed point, and one which met our forefathers when launching the government of the United States. But they declared emphatically, and the people sustained them, that

we have inalienable rights among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. [Cheers.]

Mr. Pope—As the chairman has extended an invitation for addresses I will attempt to continue the grand thought which he has presented to you—to push still further the inquiry, whether the individual has any inalienable rights. We as sovereign individuals have outgrown that fanaticism; and we now ask in the majesty of our advanced condition, has society any rights which the sovereign individual is bound to respect at the sacrifice of principle. ["No."] Yes, the booming answer which comes forth from the soul of this Convention to-day is a grand and emphatic "No." Why? Because principle is superior even to society. What, we ask, is society but the creature, the server of the individual. This is her legitimate function, and she has none other. Her rights are found only in the prosperity and advancement of the individual, and when she refuses thus to fill her legitimate function; when she becomes the hindrance [as she is to-day] instead of the cause of the advancement of the sovereign individual, oppressing him in his upward ascension from the base of the brain to the glorious region; from the subjection of the animal by the intellectual by which she shall advance on from infinite to infinite unto the end, then is she entitled to no regard from us. When society thus hinders the progress of the infinite soul we insist that her function has ceased. We have a right to rebel, and in that rebellion we intend, through the inspiration of the spirit world, to rise to a superior citizenship of freedom socially, and into the plain of the universal family that shall give us the new heaven and the new earth.

As an individual, I have learned within the experience of thirty years what to me is an invaluable revelation—that I am a plant, and not a creature made out of nothing, and that, as a plant, I am subject to the conditions of growth. I am further convinced by my inspiration that whereas the devil, in the garden of Eden, declared if man, in his compound condition of Adam and Eve, would disobey the prohibition against eating of the tree which was adapted to his tastes and his conditions, he should become as God, knowing good from evil. That voice has gone on until, in the latter days, we hear it repeating "Ye are Gods;" and we have found that this God is not concentrated upon his throne as an almighty, powerful and avenging judge, but is disseminated. We are now seeking him in the face of our brother men. We know that this divinity is in humanity; that this God is manifest in the flesh; that this infinite intelligence and power, this love and benevolence and ingenuity, inhabits, not only the region where virtue dwells, but the base of the brain, and that it is as absolutely good as infinite wisdom and an absolute, pure God can make it. I have fought against the idea that laws and those conditions which proceed from the base of the brain are illegitimate; that they are the cause of the fall; that they are the product of man's depravity. I insist that they are not. I assert that they are as legitimate as the functions of the coronal region; that they are God's revelation to man; that man must commence with the inferior conditions and advance; and in this day we have the inspiration and ability to create a new heaven and a new earth. When we know that we are gods, and that we have the power, we shall advance to that position in which we shall become judges, not of our brothers and sisters, but of ourselves. I know what the functions of the base of the brain are. I know that to me, in my personal experience, they are unsatisfied; and that I am controlled, not by them, but by the rule of ideality, and spirituality, and reason, and by these I shall advance from the inferior to the superior. This is the gist of the question of social freedom. It is the freedom we ask to be allowed to advance from the inferior to the superior. What if there are those who, by their organization, are compelled to live in the base of their brain! It is God's infantile construction, and the child will remain a child until it has outgrown this limit. The aspiration of the soul for the highest good is my ideal of life, and I will follow it, and I ask you to follow me as I follow this inspiration. I have much of this kind to say to you. My soul is burdened with the fact that to-day is the day of the establishment of the fifth universal empire. It is the republic of science; it is the republic of ethics, by which we shall have religion connected with science. I claim to be a mediator between science and religion. I accept every condition in nature as legitimate, as of God's institution; it is all divine. This order of nature is divine, and I glory in the perfection which I see in every creature of God's creation. Our prospect is divine. We are to put down inferior institutions, and on their ruins erect systems that will be productive finally of the grandest souls. I leave these thoughts which my inspiration has forced me to speak. I do not desire to speak to your cold intellect, but to your souls, on these important questions.

Mrs. Dr. Barnes, of Chicago, said:

Our brother seems to fear, as too many of our friends do, that we radicals of the radical type have almost lost our wits, in fact, that coming here to-night, and gathering as we do in Convention, are a little out of order on this grand question. Now, I would like to give you a few ideas of my own upon the subject, although they may not perhaps be altogether to your satisfaction. It was my good fortune to inaugurate this grand social question in this hall. I gave in this hall last summer a series of discourses on this important question, and many faces that I see here to-night are familiar to me from the acquaintance I then formed. Although not alone in the field of this grand question, it has been dear to me for many years. How can it be otherwise, when I look around and see so much suffering, so many unhappy couples and so few married people in this broad city that can say they are happily married. Then do you say that this is not a question of the day. What other decision can we come to, when we have these facts staring us in the face, when, at every turn in the streets, we hear cries coming up from unhappy women—unhappy in their wedded state; and not alone from them, but from men and children also? The cry seems universal, and the day has come when something must be done to put a stop to it. [Cheers.] It is the question

of all; and I think that that noble woman, Victoria C. Woodhull, and the many noble men and women who are helping her in this work, have been raised up for this very purpose. [Cheers.] A short two years ago and she was a perfect stranger to me, but, in common with many others, I shared the idea that she was a very bold reformer, and that so radical a woman must necessarily, perhaps, be of a type with whom a great many ladies would not care to have much to do. I took the opportunity, while staying in New York, to see her. One glance at the woman told the whole story. To see a woman of her physique, of that frail, delicate form, that grand, kindling eye—not to listen even to her words of enthusiasm, her love for the whole race of humanity—gave the lie to all that her enemies had said against her. I came out of her office feeling that I myself was a grander—that I was a better woman, for having listened to the thrilling words of the little woman. [Cheers.] I think that I would like forever to live with her, and to the grand cause of social freedom devote my days. Since that I have been taken coldly by the hands, and have seen the averted gaze of many who knew me when I was in the church; but I do not care, for I shall do the best I can do here. [Cheers.]

We have all to work together, a few women and a few men. There is so much need of it, for the world labors in agony and trouble, the like of which has never been seen since the foundation of the world. Last winter, when I was lecturing in Boston, they said to me, "Go on in this work, never mind the rebuffs of the few, for you will at length succeed, and the many that are now groaning in slavery, in subjection to a false marriage system will be freed." These words cheered me; I felt that I had been paid for what little of personal displeasure I had met from those to whom I have referred, for what little of personal inconvenience I have suffered in this land. But not only in the direction of social form, but in the obtaining by women of every right that she must and will have, lies our duty. The two questions go right together. The woman is kept down by the marriage tie. The man and law keep her down. When a woman is left alone, what little chance she has of settling matters? In my own experience I know of this, for I well remember when if I had been a man, I should have been able to have got an extension of time which was refused to me because I was a woman. I ask why is this? Are women not as economical as men? Can they not manage business affairs as well as men? That is not the question. It is only this: that men wish to keep them down; they do not wish, in many instances, for them to have their rights. In this question I have fought against great dangers, but I shall go through all right, and many other noble women will do the same. It has been the work of ages to get down to it. We hardly knew that we had the right to rebel. When I was a little child, I lived in Boston, and father used to go on the Common to spend the 4th of July. And he always gave the boys twice the money to spend that he did the girls. And when they had spent their money, they used to come and borrow of us—and they have been keeping it up ever since. [Cheers.] I generally find that it is a woman and not a man who lends money.

But that is neither here nor there; I wish to come back to this question of Victoria, and again to say one word in her favor. How grandly she has worked, especially in regard to *exposes* in regard to the truths she has felt obliged to tell concerning the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. [Cheers.] Years ago—not many years ago, either—I lived in New York, and I used to attend Mr. Beecher's church. I know that he is a noble and good man, and grand and eloquent, and could tell many noble truths. I sat for years listening at his feet entranced—and it was Henry Ward Beecher that made a free lover of me. [Cheers.] I know him to be a free lover; I know that every word that Mrs. Woodhull has said is true, not only of him, but of others. She is a woman, who would not tell a lie; she has been cursed and abused by the Methodists; and not only by them but by the Spiritualists—some of them for the same thing. For what? For simply telling the truth about rascals—clerical rascals in high places. If a poor, weak, miserable man or woman offends, we can talk about them, but if Henry Ward Beecher does the same, oh no, we must not talk about him. Why is that? I say and I repeat it, I admire the man—his learning, his eloquence, his greatness, his piety, but I know that every word of this charge is true. I wish you would bear with me for a moment. When this question of her election comes up, and it is said, "why, she did this thing" or "she did that," well, it was for the best, and I thank God she was permitted to do it.

I hope that she will go on in her noble work, and wherever she sees a crime being committed in high places expose it to view. Why, in this city, I know enough of families living in high style on the West side to damn them if it was published. I do not say that I will make any revelations. I would feel badly if I hurt any one's feelings; but it may have to be done yet, if things do not progress better. If we, who are standing in the rank of reform, if we are not helped on, it will be our duty to unfold these hideous matters which are now hidden, as well in the homes of wealth as in the scarlet abodes of vice. The day of awakening will be terrible; and it will have to come, and that assuredly. [Cheers.]

The Chairman—The Finance Committee is requested to meet in the ante-room.

Mrs. Lois Waisbrooker—I simply wish to announce that I am here to receive subscriptions for *Our Age*. Those who are afraid that it will fail can have a copy for five cents, but when it fails I shall go to the other shore, sure. You shall have your money's worth, if it takes my heart's blood.

The Chairman—The delivery of thirty-minute speeches is now in order. First upon the list is Mrs. Anne E. Hinman, President of the Connecticut State Association of Spiritualists, but she is not here, and the next upon the list is Mr. W. J. Shaw, of Iowa.

Mr. Shaw—Here, sir—

The Chairman—Please step upon the platform,

Mr. W. J. Shaw—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—In proportion to the interest that, since a conviction of its truth, I have taken in what I hoped would be the leading idea that brought us together, and having within a short time my fears of the results likely to flow from divisions in our ranks upon questions of reform, I stand before you to say a few words. My attention was first called to this so-called social question several years since, and I assure you it presented itself to me in no clear light at all. I gather from the writers and orators upon that subject that spoke for or against it to-day, that on the one side it is affirmed that human love was restrained—that the marital law constituted a bond upon that human love. To a certain extent I was willing to accede to that proposition—to say aye to the proposition that human love was in bonds and under restraint I had settled for myself to be a fact; but I was unable to clearly see that the marital bond had anything or much to do with that restraint or the accomplishment of it. On the other hand, I was convinced that the repeal of these laws, acknowledging the evils that flow out from some corrupt condition somewhere, would let loose seven devils worse than the first. I looked about among the consciences of the people, both among the radical and conservative element—among those who are as radical as any here to-day upon all other subjects, and they could not see but that this step would lead to the result I have stated. When they replied to me: "We must wait for the slow march of progress, for intellectual advancement to elevate us by degrees," I think differently. I concluded society was in a very pretty pickle indeed; much in the condition of the school boy—a little boy whose mother had made for him his first pair of pants, the first, too, that she had made. She made them quite as full in the front as in the behind. He put them on and started off to school. But the boy came back running and calling out "Papa, papa, papa! am I going to school or coming home?" [Laughter.] And so when I look at this and the other as a remedy for an acknowledged evil, I am unable to tell with the school boy whether we were likely to go forward or backward. I indeed was in a dilemma and spent a good deal of thought before I came to a definite conclusion. I am very much in the same perplexity as the Frenchman who came down from his room one morning, after a deep debauch, and meeting the man who had been serving him with liquor on the previous night, said to him: "Vat you call dat liquor vat is a contradiction? Vere dey put in de brandy to make him strong, and the vater to make him weak, and the lemon to make him sorry, and the sugar to make him sweet. Vat you call him?" "Punch." "Punch! oh yes; and him pretty nearly punched my brains out too." [A laugh.] And so when I attempt to understand and comprehend the arguments upon which this social problem is based, I find myself very much in that dilemma. It may possibly be that I have not a brain large enough to comprehend it to its fullest extent—most assuredly I never had one large enough to put it into practice. [A cheer.] I see the common conscience of the country, of not only conservatives, but radicals everywhere, speaking out plainly upon this subject, and I begin to seek some other cause for this trouble—some other cause. With promiscuity I never can have sympathy, I never could have anything in the direction of my sympathy with it. Some may be able to persuade themselves that they may be promiscuous and at the same time chaste, that they can gratify their passions and call it unselfish virtue. They can do this, but for me better the all-sufficient—mark the word—the all-sufficient, because the undivided love of a wife and a little one. By the eternal, the animal within shall be crushed into obedience by the intellectual within me. And I look in vain among all the arguments in favor of this social freedom, from first to last, for any recognition of the intellect controlling these animal passions. And if the President were here, I would say to her that I thus bring my virtue up on to this platform and place it at her feet. [Cheers.] She may imagine the napkin, and she will excuse me if I take her own words out of her mouth and tell her I believe it would be in danger. I have no objection to parties who feel disposed to gratify their passions to an unlimited extent and one at a time. Mark you, I do not say more than that. It is all that the member would ask for in its high position. They may gratify their passions to any extent they please, and plead it hard as a necessity of nature, to account for the posting upon their banners of the uxorious husband and of the uxorious wife, for I believe these bodies go in pairs. I say you can do that for yourselves, for I am in favor of a free expression of opinion, I am in favor of a person believing just what they wish and advocating it publicly; but as for me I prefer to stand upon what I consider right. I have not enough brain probably to imagine for myself any lower sphere than that which makes my social relationship with my wife and family stand dominant over everything else. And now I want to know whence this social problem comes? For I want to strike home. I place myself right here again, and declare that they cannot trace the cause and the evil of promiscuity—widely spread, if you please—and the results of it, whether it is monogamic, standing within the marriage law, or promiscuity, standing without it. I declare that they cannot trace it to the marriage law, and if they cannot and it is not caused in that way, why then do they wish to blot marriage out? I do not object to the fact of marital laws being regulated; and since I recognize the existence of unholy as well as holy marriages, I grant that when married people have reached the point of permanent unhappiness, that I would see in operation such a divorce law as would set people free who are suffering under such conditions; but to do away with the grand sentiment of the masses against promiscuity, being your aim, I will say I cannot go with you, I stand here to-night to charge you, who advocate what you call the society movement, I charge you that in trying to overthrow the sentiment of chastity in the minds of the masses, rather than to overthrow restraining laws, you are seeking to devise laws to suit yourselves. It is not that you want the law changed, but, as your leaders express it, you want the freedom to mate with any person, at any time and under any circumstances that shut you out from the gaze of the

masses. That is the substance of it. And if it be so, what in the devil's name do you call it? I make another charge: Which of you does not advocate your doctrines out of your own experience? Tell me, which among you can rise and say that you have not had miserable difficulties, out of which experience you wish to frame laws to govern others?

Mrs. Barnes—I can, for one. All these ten years of our married life I lived happy with my husband. [Cheers.]

Another lady also arose, in response to the demand.

Mr. Shaw—Two of my friends have arisen, out of the mass, in reply to my inquiry.

Mr. Higgins—Perhaps a hundred could arise if they chose to do so.

A lady delegate—Do you extend that invitation to the audience?

Mr. Shaw—I want to strike now while the iron is hot. I am here for that purpose. [Cries and noises.]

The Chairman—He is entitled to the floor, and he must be heard. Still, if he asks a question, any one has a right to reply to it.

Mr. Higgins—We want all these arguments.

Mr. Dean—Let him be decent, and not make such charges.

The Chairman—Proceed, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. Shaw—I will determine when I will go on. I say this: that the great mass where I have been do not indorse this movement. I assure you that in the district in which I lecture, from among the masses who have been before me evening after evening, you could not take one in more than twenty counties who favor it. This is about the proportion which those who favor this movement hold to the great body of Spiritualists. And I stand here to-night, not on my own account, but on account of the maligned Spiritualism that must bear the brunt of all these attacks. [Cheers.] I know something of the leaders, and I say it is simply disgraceful in them, and against the principles of our philosophy for them to build laws for the masses who are not in need of them.

Mr. Higgins—Have you canvassed the masses?

Mr. Shaw—Yes, sir, so far as I could.

The Chairman—Don't interrupt the gentleman.

A lady delegate—But have you canvassed the masses, please?

The Chairman—The inquiry is made in response to your own demand.

Mr. Shaw—Let me say, Mr. President, you can't prevent these interruptions. The fact is, that your liberalism has brought in the orthodox devil, and it is troubling you. They do not dissent from the speech.

The Chairman—I will.

Mr. Shaw—You do; that is all right, sir. Now, I say, I started out with this proposition, that the very evils of which complaint is made do not arise out of the marital relations at all. And probably, in proof of this, I have no need to go any further than to repeat the experience of those who stood before you to-day. Not one of them could refer back the troubles under which they labored to the marital bond. Each one asserted that the difficulty arose before Society came in to mark the fact upon all that this man had chosen as his associate for life this woman. And that is all the law has really done—almost all. And it is that sentiment that I do not wish to see destroyed. Let me refer you, if you please since these attacks may continue, to the experiences that have been told upon this platform to-day. A lady comes upon it and tells of her marital troubles, and at the outset, I think it was, she said that hers was a marriage of convenience. Well, then, before the marital bond was tied, that woman had become a slave to that man. Why? Because she gave herself to him for convenience, which, I suppose, means the sort of position or situation that he would give her. I say that when a woman comes before this audience and declares that she married for the sake of convenience, and did over again and over again, she is not entitled to the sympathies of any one that hears her, unless, my friends, she was a victim to the conditions to which I am about to refer. It may have been so, and I therefore ask her pardon. I have done nothing with a view to injure her feelings. Oh, my friends, it is not the marital bond; the fate of persons is fixed before that is tied. You never heard of a wife enforcing the law, so that her husband would be compelled to sue out a *habeas corpus*. You cannot point to ten such cases. I assure you that I have known many wives love their husbands and many husbands love their wives; and you and I know that as a matter of fact, there is nothing to compel us to live together except the bonds of love that flow out from you to the children, and from them back to the parents again to bind them.

Mr. Higgins—Where, then, is the necessity of marriage, if love binds them?

Mr. Shaw—I will answer the gentleman. The necessity of marriage is not to protect those who love, sir, but those who, without it, would seek promiscuity.

Mr. Higgins—I want to answer. Promiscuity is the basis of marriage—

Mr. Lynn—I would like to know who those are that cry "sit down," and yet are not members of the Convention?

Mr. Higgins—You take the question of marriage. I want to—[Shouts.]

The Chairman—We shall very soon want order on the other side, and it must be maintained.

Mr. Shaw—I will answer the gentleman. This nervousness shows the sensibilities of the parties with whom we have to deal. I say that three, if I mistake not, of those who have stood upon this platform, every one in their own words, traced their troubles not to marital laws but to other conditions of society out of which the corrupting influence springs. Now, whence come they? I know, my friends, that while I make the assertion I shall place myself under the ban of the plethoric purses, but I do say that it is from the disregard of the basic law of life. The basic law of life takes

hold of the question, whether our organisms shall continue as organisms or not, and of the food that supports it. I say it is the national disregard by the nation of the basic law of life which says that the earth is man's and the fullness thereof is all mankind's, without reference to individuals or sects. That I claim to be the natural law. Jefferson said: Some men were not born into the world with saddles upon their backs, booted and spurred and bridled, and other men were not born into the world to spur and ride them; and when the question was asked one of the Indians long ago whether he would sell his land, pointed to the great spirit and said: "The land is great spirit's; it is not mine to sell." I say this is the basic law. It is the disregard of this law which has caused all your institutions to topple over, and your society to be based on the greatest wrong, by which one man represents 500 cents and another 5,000,000, and may be the control of \$250,000,000. Now, I am getting at the things that lie at the base of all society and corrupt the marital and all other relations of life. I am going to show, if time is given me, that you may as well do away with all the laws against crime as attempt to overthrow marital laws. Out of these conditions comes caste—our positions in society, if you please, which are based upon the amount of wealth that each one possesses. As that wealth, by virtue of its own amount, is accumulative, the great mass of it is going into the hands of the few, while the majority of mankind are becoming poorer. Out of this comes the one great principle of competition, not in the high pursuits of science, not in the direction of virtue, but in the pursuits of ignoble men, leading directly to the acquisition of wealth. Now, I say, ever present in this competition is the dread demon of want, that stalks after every man and woman—that is standing constantly, immediately upon the threshold of the poor, and at the gate-post or somewhere in the long lane that leads to the mansion of the rich. This same devil of want pursues every man with his possibility or his probability, and, as a consequence, each individual is seeking to place as great a distance between himself and that terrible demon of want as he possibly can do; the consequence is, that our friends come on to the platform and say they married for convenience. What does that mean but that they have sacrificed their human love to the same devil of want? seeking a position equal or higher than that upon which they stood. And for this you would desire us to sweep out the marital bond. Now, here, if you please, out of this condition arises, I say, every evil of which our friends complain, every evil in society of which the head of the Woodhull doctrine complains. A voice—"According to your theory, all women married in wealth, ought to be happy; while the very opposite is largely true, consequently your assumption falls to the ground." And the marital bonds, they complain, have lost their restraint just because there has ever been a disposition to prostitute the sexual relation to these same basic conditions of society.

I am not saying that marital laws are not an evil. I look upon them and upon all restraining laws as necessarily evil, because all rights are relative. If we had reached that condition of society, where we might all be lawful and equal in every respect, then we would probably not have any trouble in this regard. [Cheers.]

The Chairman—We must necessarily, in such a discussion as this, have our feelings wrought upon, but I hope I shall be aided by the audience in keeping perfect order. I trust that I shall not have any more hisses on either side. We must all make up our minds to hear that which to others appears to be the truth in the same spirit that we would like to be heard if we were uttering what we believed to be the truth. Respect the golden rule always, "Do unto others as ye would like them to do unto you," in similar circumstances. [Cheers.] I have the pleasure of introducing to you Mr. Cephas B. Lynn, of Massachusetts, formerly a graduate of the Children's Progressive Lyceum. I knew him when he was a little boy. He could hardly speak a correct sentence; but now you will hear him. [A laugh.]

Mr. Cephas B. Lynn said:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—Some say that spiritualistic lecturers use bad grammar; and I am sorry that the President said what he did, for if I make a slip up before I get through, you will remember what the Chairman has said. When I came into the hall to-night, I was requested by the President to make a few remarks, and so I have acquiesced in his request. I want to say at the start that it affords me very great pleasure to be present at the Tenth Annual Convention of the Spiritualists of America. Since I have come to this hall I have had the pleasure of listening to many grand utterances. I have discovered that there are men and women—I am nervous, and must have quiet—in this nineteenth century in existence in America who have their individual convictions upon certain topics, and that, backing up these individual convictions, they have a certain amount of moral heroism which forces them to say what they believe. I hold that the charge of hypocrisy, either on the part of those who stand for or against this question of social freedom, cannot be legitimately presented against this Convention. I have heard many clean-cut speeches from this platform; and I want to show you that our friend who has just spoken to you, and others who may follow him, thinking differently on this subject—that this individual, on the one hand, and these others, on the other, show to you, citizens of Chicago, the breadth and grandeur of the Spiritual platform, which annihilates the gag law, and says, "Let discussion be free!" [Cheers.]

There are those present to-night, perhaps, in the gallery and elsewhere, who have been in the habit of attending Christian Conventions, and because they see that all the speakers do not agree in their sentiments, imagine that the devil is to pay; that we are a terrible set of creatures, and that we have come here to ruin Chicago, if it can be ruined, and to destroy the world at large. But as I gaze around this platform, I do not see the men and women upon it bearing the marks of diabolism, or demonism, or animalism written upon their countenances. I think that I see men and women of intelligence and culture; I say that it is to their

credit that they have come up here and assert their views, even if Mother Grundy, who wears a silk dress that is not paid for, objects. [Laughter.] In the next place, let me tell you that this thing called Spiritualism is misunderstood by the mass. Some of you think that it is a mere sensational movement which came into existence a quarter of a century ago in Rochester, New York. Some of you think its raps run back a quarter of a century, but I am here to tell you that the raps of the Spiritual platform run back into antiquity, and that when the first man on the historic page stood upon his feet and demanded emancipation, that the man then occupied the platform on which we stand here to-night. [Cheers.]

So, then, this being the case, I hold it to be sophistry of the most transparent order to assume that Victoria C. Woodhull, Jennie C. Claflin, and Col. Blood and George Francis Train, of New York [Cheers], or any other man or woman can prostitute this Spiritual platform to the line of animalism, so that it will injure you or anybody else to come here and listen to what we have to say. [Cheers.] I tell you what it is, there are a great many sides to this great question, and as I investigate into the characteristics of the Spiritual platform, as I note the rise and progress of the Spiritual movement, what do I discover? I discover that it is an immense and glorious work that the Spiritual platform is accomplishing, that in the past it has steered clear of the work of a sectarianized religion, and has not built its life upon a dogma. [Cheers.]

We do not make a god of any man, not even of Andrew Jackson Davis; we do not say to every man when he comes upon this platform to speak, that before he can speak he must say, "I believe in Andrew Jackson Davis, I believe in the Divine revelation;" we do not say stop and tell whether you believe in the fire test! No; I will tell you what they said to me when I loomed up on the first step to the platform: "Lynn," they said, "have you any brains?" And I, being a little egotistical, said, "Yes." Then said they, "Pitch in," and I have been doing my best in that line ever since. I have said that the time is coming at last when there shall be a platform in the world not based upon a crystallized definition of theology. [Cheers.] And, ladies and gentlemen, if you were to listen to the words of some of the conservatives in our ranks, what would you hear? Why, you would hear that they want the only pure Spiritualism, they want the old sing-song story of what was done at Rochester a quarter of a century ago; they want the old tale as to how the mediums had nervous excitement, how they had muscular contractions when the spirits first began to influence them. They will want to continue on the same loud talk about the beautiful ideas of the eternal world, of the sentimentalities of the Spiritual philosophy of which some of us have had such a surfeit, that we say, "Hold up a new path, even if Victoria C. Woodhull is the standard bearer. [Cheers.]

Ladies and gentlemen, we hold that the basis of our platform is in the grand idea of progress, which shall lift us up out of the bigotry and superstition that clogged the movements of the past. And I may say here, as a young man—as a student of Spiritualism simply of six years—that it does strike me that the Spiritualists of America show that they are about to anchor themselves to the old, rotten hulk of public opinion, because they are afraid of the little woman of New York. [Cheers.]

What is a family? I am not a married man, and I suppose may, perhaps, be said to know nothing about it. But, I repeat, What is a family? Ladies and gentlemen, when you stand up here and say that Victoria C. Woodhull has it in her power to destroy the morality of the world, you make a concession to the doctrine of total depravity, and you ought to be ashamed of it. [Cheers.] What did Mr. Shaw say? Why, he said "if we were all angels, the doctrine of Mrs. Woodhull would do." Had she not said, "Are men not all angels," when he made that statement?

Mr. Shaw—I hope that—

Mr. Lynn—I understand the gentleman to say that if we were on a higher plane of spiritual life, this doctrine might do. Am I correct? ["Yes."]

Mr. Shaw—Then I repeat—

Mr. Lynn—You were very much excited, and talked a good deal like an orthodox revivalist. [Roars of laughter.] This is an awful gap to put me in. I would as soon select a poor cripple to stand up and take it all. I was in a Cleveland hotel once, and a fellow came in who had taken too much hemlock. He said to me, "If I was a cripple I should want to die." I said, "Which wins in the race—brains or legs?"

Well, he was a pretty funny fellow, and he replied, "Legs." I replied, "The next race that is run, you cut off a man's head and then see which will win—the man without a head or the man without legs." [Laughter and cheers.] I repeat that, according to the admissions of all the opponents of social freedom, if we were all pure and bright, that this doctrine might be good. Now, what is the statement that we make? While we are willing to grant that we are not pure and holy, we say we aspire to be; and we take this doctrine into our lives to make us so. [Cheers.] I tell you that the nonsense of this matter is, that this man has given the man's argument in the matter, and forgotten that of the woman.

But as I was saying, Mr. Shaw has admitted all that we claim. We know the world has not grown to the acceptance of the doctrines of social freedom; but if they were never launched upon the public, the needed growth would never occur. Mr. Shaw admits that if the people were all as good as some of the advocates of social freedom are, that it would be safe to inaugurate the practice of freedom. Again I say, we want no better indorsement than this, and every speaker who has come upon this platform, or upon any other, and said the same thing, as many have done, have paid Victoria C. Woodhull the highest possible praise. Had such people lived in the days of the Nazarene, they would have said that it was a great mistake that he did not put off his coming until the world was ready to receive him. This is the argument they now want Victoria Woodhull to put off the discussion of this question, which is only fit for angels to handle until the people are ready for its acceptance. We

believe in putting forth a better order of things, to invite the people to strive to attain. And this is admitted when the opposition make these statements here, let them say what they may elsewhere.

What has Victoria C. Woodhull said in this house? Has she not knocked into the vilest death the popular, Christian, sentimental humanity which says that if you put a bible against the doors, it makes no matter what you do inside. [Cheers.] And we say that in this land of moral progress we want to destroy this immaculate sentimentality to such an extent that we shall forever cast from the vocabulary of the English language that word which was born in a convention of Christian ministers—the word prostitution. [Cheers.] And we hope that here to-day this argument will come to the women, and will say to their hearts, "If you have made a mistake once, it does not follow that you have gone to hell, and that you can never be a decent woman again." [Cheers.] And I will show you the proof of this before I finish. Why, they said to me when I was lecturing on "Spiritualism and the Social Question," "Great God, Lynn, you are too young a man to talk about social questions!" What did I say? I gave to them the words of an ancient seer, "It is not a question of age; it is a question of Spiritual perception." As the boys would say, that is the kind of man I am. [Cheers.] I would prove to you what I have said with regard to the restoration of the prostitute. What have we heard upon this platform since this Convention opened? Why, we have been astounded to hear an individual get up here and say, "Ladies and gentlemen—I came into the world without the authority of the piece of parchment which constitutes the marriage tie." We have had an individual stand up here and say that he was not ashamed to admit that he was a bastard. Now, what is the significance of that? You young fellows up there don't jump to a conclusion right off. I will tell you what is the significance of that statement. It is, that at last the bastard has reverence for the woman who bore him, because that woman said, "I was seduced several months ago, and I hope to heaven that I may die if I kill my unborn child to keep in respectable Christian society." [Cheers.] So you see this opens up a very broad field, underlying all of which is the one grand idea of progress. And yet some of these friends of mine say that because I have an idea about the freedom of Spiritualism, and will express it, that there will therefore be anarchy, and that I and those that are with me are likely to jump over the sectarian walls and land in the desert. We have had to meet that argument once in theology.

The ministers meet here. There is my friend Jamieson, who is an infidel, and he sides with me. What do these ministers say? They say, "Ladies and gentlemen—If you seek to climb over our sectarian walls, you are lost." But some of us said, "There is that sectarian fence, and some of us can see the pickets on the top, but we will run the risk of being caught on the pickets." And so we have jumped up, and instead of landing in a desert or mud-puddle, we have struck the most fruitful oasis that was ever found in God's world. [Cheers.]

They found that Christianity had not smudged out all the beauty of heaven; they found that the winds of heaven blew the most harmoniously out there. And this same argument will apply with regard to the family. You need not argue that men love the gutter so much that they will not be lifted out of it, for it is not true. And if I may be allowed to occupy your attention a few minutes longer, let me say that some of us have become so fearful that we are afraid of a few pounds of flesh, of a little woman from New York city, showing, as some have done in refusing to open their houses to entertain, that they gave the lie to all the estimates made of the grand moral elevation to which we have attained. I tell you that if we are all right and holy, we can go down into hell and talk with the devils, and lift them up and make angels of them. [Cheers.] I can go into a house of prostitution in the city of Chicago, and talk with the young ladies there, without being obliged to go upstairs with them on the elevator. [Laughter.] Is that obscene? If it is, send for Comstock, the Young Men's Christian Association man. [Cheers.] I am glad that at last we have the courage to speak, that we are not afraid to utter our thoughts; and I am glad when I see these great-hearted sisters, the noble Benjamin Todd, and my friends who are gathered here on this platform, who have labored for freedom for over a quarter of a century. I am glad that they have some young America stock to follow them. And we will follow them; and we will keep the old flag of liberalism floating above us, until death takes our body, and our souls go to heaven where they belong. [Cheers.]

I want to say something else. I wish to say that the efforts of the so-called radicals, the liberals, who have been so maligned here, have been only this: for they have said, "Let us talk about this thing; let us see what can be done toward bringing about a better condition in the future." I want to remind you here of something which I hope you will not forget, and that is, that underlying Mrs. Woodhull's statements of social freedom, there is that sentence which shines beautiful, which glitters as a gem of the first water; there is that declaration which takes one up to the very steps of heaven, and that declaration is, that the highest type of the social relation is the monogamic relation. [Cheers.] That is what the devil from New York city says. Now, look at her; she is a terrible creature, and yet she said that in her first speech on this question, and has repeated it in substance in every one she has since made. [Cheers.]

Now, finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to remark that I believe the time has arrived for us to fully test the spirit of free speech which is abroad in the land, and I, as one of the radicals in this Convention, although I voted with the minority because I should have liked to have seen the minority report right under the majority report, and to have let the people read them both, have discovered that minorities have rights as well as majorities. I hold, ladies and gentlemen, that we can show what we are made of, we can come together like brothers and sisters, and if we differ, do so without feeling. This would have been a dry, one-

horse, miserable, contemptible Convention if we had merely come together to say tweedledum and tweedledee, and then, some of us having bought our second-class tickets, started off home. I say some of us—I mean the poor lecturers, of whom I am one. [Laughter.] Again, I say to the Spiritualists and free thinkers of America, believers in the doctrine of social freedom, let us remember that we are not followers of Victoria C. Woodhull, nor of Tinnie C. Claflin, nor of Col. Blood—I don't wear their shoulder-straps, though I walk barefoot through hell for it. [Cheers.] I say, we must remember that we are not following them, but the idea of progress. [Cheers.] And if at any stage of the game, as a poker-player would say, there are any "full hands," let us remember that back of it all lie the hosts of the eternal world ready to carry us through to victory—and we shall not be poor, for we shall have our wives and little ones with us. [Cheers.]

The Chairman—The next speaker is Mrs. Laura Cuppy Smith.

Laura Cuppy Smith said:

Mr. President—In discussing the social question the gentleman who preceded, Mr. Lynn, seemed studiously to ignore the fact that his own sex are already in the possession of social freedom, and enjoy it to an unlimited extent. [Cheers.] When Mrs. General Spencer, some two years since, visited the principal houses of prostitution in Washington, with other benevolent ladies of that city who desired the elevation of their unfortunate sisters, the Washington *Sunday Morning Chronicle*, reporting these visits and their results, stated that a keeper of one of the most prominent houses affirmed in response to a question from Mrs. Spencer regarding the standing, socially, of their patrons:

"Madame, our support is derived mainly from the married men of Washington and other cities. We find them among the members of Congress, the members of the different churches, men of means and substance who are regarded as the bulwarks of your social condition: they may talk virtue to you, they do not to us. If we relied upon single men we should starve: they depend upon the young ladies of your best society for their sexual gratification, and obtain for love what their elders purchase for money." Upon Mrs. Spencer remarking, "Some ladies of our acquaintance interested in this reform called on you the other day and expressed themselves charmed with your culture and refinement," the lady significantly replied, "Yes, their gentleman friends told me so that evening." [Sensation.] Now these are painful but generally admitted facts, and I am strangely at a loss to know what this distinguished lawyer [Mr. Shaw] is afraid of. We know that men to-day oppose social freedom, and practice social vice, yet this gentleman is afraid that if freedom is assured to woman, she will make such bad use of it that through her influence men will not only become worse than they are already, which is needless, but woman herself become utterly degraded and vile, and I say sir (turning to Mr. Shaw) that this assumption is an insult to womanhood; aye, sir, is an insult to the mother that bore you and the women with whom you associate, for our judgment of a man's female companions is always based upon his general estimate of woman. [Cheers.] Now, I for one am not afraid to trust myself or my sisters with freedom. I have faith in the higher law, in the innate nobility of my sex. While the parks in New York city (those oases of beauty and verdure in that desert of selfishness and sin (were fenced in and protected by iron gateways, there were continued complaints of depredation, but an unusually bright idea penetrated the somewhat obtuse brain of the city fathers: they ordered the ponderous fences down, and put the people "upon honor," and now every wayfarer feels a personal pride in observing decency, and when the people are no longer fenced in by the restrictions of the lower law, humanity will be put "upon honor," and will pledge itself to obey its high behest. Our opposers accuse us of wanting to destroy their "sacred and time-honored institutions." Heaven save the mark! Sacred, indeed! Why, your social structure is one mighty brothel, and we need to pull it down till not one stone is left upon another to infect the air with the poisonous effluvia of its hypocrisy and licentiousness. Do you think me a fanatic upon this question, dealing in visionary speculations and exaggerated statements? I can bring a sickening array of facts to prove the truth of my every assertion. In the quiet city of Providence where my best friends deemed my espousal of Mrs. Woodhull's cause a suicidal act, and prominent Spiritualists "could not afford" to be identified with my public vindication of this brave woman and her principles, I was informed that a policeman of that city vouchsafed the information to a large manufacturer and leading citizen that there were from forty to fifty young girls under sixteen upon his beat every Saturday night who made their living by the sale of their persons. Certainly the virtuous city of Providence should shrink from a discussion of the social question. Then let me pluck an illustration from the other side of the social hedge, and touch lightly upon the morals of "our best society." A legal friend in San Francisco said to me one day, "I intend to go to the Pioneer Ball this year and take my wife, for I met one of the managers just now and he said it was going to be an unusually *recherche* affair, quite select, you know: every possible precaution is to be taken to prevent the admission of any woman of doubtful reputation." "Oh! indeed," I responded, "and pray what precaution will be taken to exclude men of doubtful reputation?" "Why, my dear lady!" he exclaimed, "you are beside yourself; if such a thing as that were done we should have no ball." [Prolonged cheers and laughter.] Of course it would have been terribly humiliating if the gentleman's wife should have accidentally danced in the same quadrille with a woman of questionable virtue, but she received no injury to her morals by waltzing in the embrace of several half-intoxicated rouses during the evening. Truly society revels in nice distinctions. For my part I have the bad taste to declare that I should prefer taking the hands of prostitutes rather than those of the men

who visit them by night and despise them by day. [Cheers.] I charge your present corrupt social condition upon Christianity (so called) and upon the false system of morality that exists under the blighting shadow and protection of the marriage law. To-day parents have one code of morals for their sons and another for their daughters; while they make every effort to keep their children innocent, forgetting that innocence is simply ignorance of evil, a condition impossible and fraught with danger in these evil times, and the little ones go out into the world to gather their first lessons from the hints of the vulgar and the insinuations of the depraved. Mothers are afraid to meet the natural, proper and ever-recurring questions of their children as they awaken to a realization of the phenomena of life, and, covering themselves with the fig-leaves of a false modesty, send them forth to satisfy their legitimate curiosity in some objectionable direction. For instance, the child's first question is, "How did I come here?" and the mother's first answer is a falsehood, after this fashion: "I found you under a rose tree," or "The doctor brought you in his pocket." Innocence soon tires of digging for babies under rose trees or searching the doctor's pockets, and the child arrives at the conclusion that there is a lie somewhere. A truer wisdom would suggest the truth, so told that the child would ever after reverence the sacred mystery of life, now desecrated by unhallowed prejudice. While I speak I see in memory the grave and tearful eyes of my little sons uplifted to mine in mingled awe and love as I answered their questions. Oh! mothers. Oh! men and women, come up higher, for mighty is your responsibility; and daily, aye, hourly, the victims of your ignorance are hastening to the suicide's grave or the maniac's cell. Your daughters fade in their spring-time, and our colleges are filled with your sons, the victims of vices that they would never have contracted but for your lack of moral perception, but for your ignorant and persistent reticence on these vital questions. Never till sexual science is taught in our schools will this wholesale corruption of youth be stayed. Mrs. Woodhull has been regarded as the champion prostitute of the nineteenth century because she has dared to discuss the social question in public. Her opposers have been the profligates of both sexes and the ignorant slaves of Mrs. Grundy, who constantly bow the knee to the golden calf, public opinion. These poor souls would rather be damned in good orthodox fashion than go to heaven in a "new-fangled way." [Prolonged cheers.] Instead of license we seek scientific adjustment, and declare that nothing pertaining to the highest interests of humanity is either "common or unclean." Those who would enforce silence now, and have kept silence in the past upon this question, will be held responsible for the social evil. To-day our opposers have dragged the sexual act down to the very gates of hell. They have rung the changes upon the words "sensuality" and "animalism" till our hearts are sick, and humanity is represented by them as embodied lust, only awaiting freedom from restraint to make the world a scene of wildest outrage. Now, I protest against this profanation of the sexual act, and hold that between souls that love each other it is the very eucharist of the affections, a holy sacrament of love in which shame has no part. I would transmute the old text, "Crucify the affections and lusts," and translate it thus: "Cultivate the affections, they are of God; elevate the passions and consecrate them to the service of love, they can then never become subservient to lust."

When the ethics of social freedom are thoroughly understood, the world will perceive that moral purity is just as essential for man as for woman, because all men will realize their responsibility, not alone to themselves, but to those by them begotten, and learn that vicious tendencies can be transmitted even by "reformed rakes" to their sons, aye, worse still, to their daughters [sensation, and cries of "That's so"]; that every child has a right to demand a healthy, wholesome body as a temple for its immortal soul; has a right to pure conditions claim as its birthright. When the ideas we advocate obtain a hearing, your daughters will cease to regard a comfortable home and a good position in society as the first requirement of marriage, the husband being, as now, a quite secondary consideration. They will seek a companion instead of simply a provider, and they will sacredly guard the interests of those who may result from that companionship. No young man would carry low and debasing thoughts into his relations with woman, but would seek purely and divinely to evolve the highest joys from the association, and, holding his young love in his arms, would realize that the place consecrated by the consummation of their affection was a sanctuary more sacred than Mecca, more holy than Jerusalem. [Cheers.] There has been something said here about illegitimate children. I would remind you that some of the world's most beautiful characters, among them Jesus Christ, Abraham Lincoln, Fessenden and Farragut have been illegitimate children (so called). And I declare to you that the child, the best organized, physically, mentally and spiritually—the child born of the purest love, is the most legitimate child upon the face of the earth, even though the church and the law never accorded it their gracious permission to live and breathe and have its being. [Cheers and hisses.] Your hisses, friends, do not alarm me at all, they are only an assurance that you will applaud me to-morrow. Emerson says, "The test of greatness is to be condemned to-day and recognized twenty years hence." I am speaking to-night from the very depths of my heart, and your hisses cannot make me swerve one hair's breadth from the truths I advocate in the interests of womankind and mankind also. We who advance these principles have resolved to lift the stigma that rests upon the "fallen" (and when you use that word you always apply it to woman), we have resolved that the young girl who has been "seduced" has a right to the same position and respect in society as her seducer, and we intend that she shall have it. [Cheers.] A young lady of Lynn, Mass., was seduced by a young gentleman of that city, who, as soon as he discovered the results likely to follow, took the first train West, leaving

[Continued on page 12.]

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

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

CLUB RATES.

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

FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTION

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

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

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Per line (according to location), - - - - - From \$1 00 to \$2 50
Time, column and page advertisements by special contract.
Special place in advertising columns cannot be permanently given.
Advertiser's bills will be collected from the office of this journal, and must in all cases, bear the signature of WOODHULL & CLAFLIN.
Specimen copies sent free.
Newsdealers supplied by the American News Company, No. 121 Nassau street, New York.

All communications, business or editorial, must be addressed

Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly,

Box 3791, New York City.



"The diseases of society can, no more than corporeal maladies, be prevented or cured without being spoken about in plain language."—JOHN STUART MILL.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCT. 18, 1873.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

Hereafter all communications for the paper, whether business or otherwise, should be addressed to WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY, box 3,791 New York City. Postal orders should also be made payable to Woodhull & Claflin.

AT COOPER INSTITUTE AGAIN!

Again are the halls of New York—closed against us for nine months—now open, and again we shall lift up our voices to advocate the rights of the "Lower Million" as against the "Upper Ten." Victoria C. Woodhull and Tennie C. Claflin will both speak in the large hall of Cooper Institute, on Friday evening, October 17, at 8 o'clock, upon

REFORMATION OR REVOLUTION, WHICH?
OR, BEHIND THE POLITICAL SCENES.

We shall undertake to show that the system of government under which, for the last century, we have lived, has been proven to be a failure; and that even now we are upon the verge of revolution, which probably will not be averted.

We shall also show that the political, financial, commercial, industrial, intellectual, moral, religious and educational conditions; that the monopolies which starve the laboring masses; that the Christian attempt to establish a religious despotism; that the frauds, the corruptions and the general demoralization on all sides evident, and every day coming more generally to the surface, are—first and last, one and all—the legitimate fruits of a government that has been mistaken for a republic.

We shall not war upon Credit Mobiliers, revenue defrauders, bank embezzlers, Treasury thieves, dividend smugglers, interest takers; upon stock, gold, cotton, corn, pork, flour, coal and oil speculators and land grabbers, as individuals. We shall, instead, show that they have been naturally evolved by the system; that the system being faulty, they naturally follow; and, finally, that the only way to mend the ills under which the country now groans is to change the system; and, in conclusion, to show of what this change should consist.

The crisis is upon us. It cannot be ignored. It should be calmly considered, and wise provisions for its exigencies provided.

THE GOVERNMENTAL CRISIS.

It seems to us to be the height of folly to pretend that our national situation is one of promise for the immediate future; and we believe that those who are in position to feel the pulse-beats of the country know that we are upon the verge of tremendous changes fraught with the deepest interests of humanity all over the world.

As long as two years ago, some of the wisest men near the head of the government declared to us that it would be impossible for the country to continue another four years in its then present course, without entering upon revolution. We believed it then, and every movement that has been made since, having a national significance, has confirmed us in that belief; and we now confidently proclaim that before the present administration expires, the country will be plunged in the most terrible war of the ages.

We trust that our readers will look gravely into this matter before dismissing it as impossible. Remember the lesson of the last war. Until Fort Sumter was fired upon, not a hundred persons—and they were considered insane—believed war possible. It came, nevertheless, and it scourged the country as it had never been scourged before. Remember this, and then contrast the present conditions with those which preceded that war. The single question of negro slavery was the bone of contention at that time. They who were interested in maintaining slavery saw that their power was passing away, and that a few added years of exposure for its damning wrongs would crush it, and they, not the abolitionists, precipitated war to save their institutions.

It must also be remembered that the proportion of the people who were for immediate abolition of slavery was very small, and that the large majority proposed never to interfere with its existence in those slave States. The South, however, was wiser than these non-committalists, and saw that it would not do longer to permit the abolition agitation to go on unopposed, and, failing to nationalize slavery, they struck for separation.

What do we find now in the conditions similar to that period? We reply, the same fear on the part of those who control all the institutions of the country, that they are going to lose the control, that the slave-holders had about slavery. Slavery, as a national institution, was proven a failure; but the South did not want to part with their negroes. So now are all the institutions that have grown up under the present system of government proved to be failures; and those in power know if the knowledge of this continue to spread among the people as rapidly as it has recently spread, that they will be called to account, and the power that has been so unworthily wielded taken away from them.

We claim that the developments of corruptions and frauds that have been made during the past four years utterly and absolutely condemn the system under which they have flourished. From Tammany to the most recent Brooklyn expose—first, last, one and all—speak in undeniable tones of the terrible conviction that is gradually fastening itself in every heart that has the good of the race in view. They prove, beyond all cavil, that our government has degenerated into a mere means in the hands of the unscrupulous by which the people are systematically robbed. Look where we may, confirmation stares us in the face. From the head of the government at Washington down to the smallest post office it is the same story—fraud, corruption, speculation everywhere.

What else is to be expected. If the Congress, probably in league with the Cabinet, if not the President himself, can put through a Pacific railroad scheme in order to obtain the pecuniary benefit of a Credit Mobilier, and, being exposed, can whitewash the scheme into respectability by a farce such as was enacted by the last Congress, why, indeed, should not every official in the country go into the same business, and hope to escape in like manner?

It is a fearful thing to contemplate, but we fear that the officials of the country who are honest and free from this spirit of speculation, are the exception rather than the rule. The example set in high quarters is being followed in desperate earnest in all lower grades. Even the highest officials no longer hesitate to openly ally themselves with the professional speculators for the purpose of affecting the gambling market. Can it be true that the people's money, paid by them into the Treasury of the United States, has been put up by the officials as a basis for speculations, that they, even the President himself, should rush so frantically to the rescue of the jeopardized market? Can it be true, as is hinted among those who ought to know, that some of the large banking firms that have recently suspended were operating upon government funds, sharing with the officials? And that with them, as with the case in Washington, the large drafts upon the United States Treasury were recently made to bolster up their trembling ventures?

Nothing is more probable. What else can be expected when officials near the head of the government are known to be Credit Mobilier speculators, and that almost every scheme that has money in it is purchased through Congress, saying nothing about the probability of the needed approval, being also paid for; when St. Domingo schemes and International Steamship Companies' bills are boldly broached, when men of high reputation in the community, and very religious withal—lights in the Y. M. C. A.—friends of the administration—steal a few millions by way of defrauding the revenue, and it is winked at as a mere

mistake; when bank presidents and cashiers remove from the country carrying the people's deposits with them; when a Tammany Ring can embezzle millions upon millions and never be convicted of anything wrong; when hypocrisy can sit enthroned in almost every so-called Christian church, and Christians with sanctimonious faces ask that their God, their Christ, their Bible shall be substituted for the present rule; in a word, when everything that is false and corrupt and damnable can run riot at the expense of the honest, hard-working, industrial masses, is it not time that something come to relieve them from their miseries; is it not to be expected that a tower of Babel built to such height as is this which we call the government will topple over and fall and be buried among its own ruins? We say Amen!

We say the Babel that has been built, and we mean it. We do not war upon the people who have figured in these things. To put others in their places is but to continue the same things. It is the system that is at fault. If it were not for the glaring defects of the system, individuals, however badly disposed, could not take advantage of the positions of trust to which the people elevate them. We therefore repeat again with double emphasis, that our system of government, after a century's trial, has been proved a complete failure. It has ultimated in corruption and speculation in all its departments, and is rotten and ready to fall; and it ought to fall, and it will fall.

We are not able to tell exactly how the crumbling will first become evident to the people of the country; but we can see a number of ways in which it may be brought about. That it will come, however, we do not hesitate to declare openly and confidently. Before another year has rolled away the beginning of the end will be reached, and the strife will be in progress, on the part of the officials, the monopolies, and the Christians, as against the people representing popular liberty. Gladly as we would have this revolution come without drenching the land in blood, it cannot be. The rottenness that has accumulated demands rivers of blood to wash it away, and the price, however terrible, will have to be paid.

It is vain to hope that the tide which has set in can be turned in its headlong course. Things have been going from bad to worse too long a time, and no revulsion can purify the channels in which they run. A system in which disease can generate and spread so as to involve every part can no more be saved by any medication than can rottenness itself. All these things to which we have called attention, and the thousands of lesser ones to which no allusion has been made, are not the disease; they are only the symptoms pointing to the real malady which lies in the system itself. We have tried palliative means quite long enough. In this city the impotency of this treatment has been clearly demonstrated. A change of symptoms only has been effected, while the system trembles with decay, and beasts and birds of prey fatten upon its vitals.

For such things as these there is but one remedy. The people, the great masses, who have blindly trusted their supposed servants, but who have turned out to be their robbers on every hand, must rise in their might, and, guided by the lesson of the present, rebuild their shattered system of government upon a sure foundation—the inalienable rights of every individual so guarded and protected that no abuse of the system can, by any possibility, deprive him of them. In other words, individual sovereignty must be established in the place of the present class rule. And for this event we call upon the people to make ready. The occasion will surely come; let it not find them unprepared, but with the battle-cry of freedom on their lips, welcome what shall be their final deliverance from the last of the series of despotic governments.

REFUTATIONS.—It is not necessary that we notice the various misrepresentations, willful or otherwise, that are current in not only a portion of the religious and secular press, but also in so-called liberal journals, about the action of the Chicago Convention. We simply have to refer all doubters to the published proceedings in the WEEKLY. There every word uttered in the Convention is faithfully recorded. When a lie is seen or heard refer to the WEEKLY, and nail it to him or her who utters it.

THE CHICAGO CONVENTION AGAIN.

Progress is the inevitable law from which there is no possible escape; but the most advanced in its realm seem to be afraid to accept its inexorable logic. Conservative Spiritualists may pretend to think that the thus-far-shalt-thou-go-and-no-farther rule will save their faith; but they must be blind to the spirit of the age, as well as to the lessons of the past, to really do so. The car, once in motion down the incline plane of the future, will, with each revolution of its wheels, increase its speed and momentum. Unfortunately for those who wish it to stop half way down the plane, and who put themselves in its way, thinking thus to impede, if not stop, its progress, it will rush over and past, leaving them prostrate, if not bleeding, for their vain efforts.

The new-departure cry has been raised in the front ranks of reformers within the past two years, and its progress down the incline plane of human destiny brought it to the attention and consideration of the Chicago Convention. Evidences of its coming had been given in various places, and the large majority of the delegates to that body expected, in advance, that it would claim and receive the earnest

thought of the Convention. It did so claim and so receive, and thus it is that Spiritualism has recognized the basic principles of reform.

But some who opposed this movement in the Convention, and more who were not there to know what it really means, will, undoubtedly, use every possible effort to prejudice the Spiritualists of the country against any general indorsement of the action of the Convention. Its work will be misrepresented. It will be charged that the advocacy of sexual freedom means promiscuousness, and that they who champion it are the worst people in the world.

We trust, however, that Spiritualists who have been brought out of religious tradition and bigotry may not become bigots and traditionalists themselves in some other department of life. We trust that they may not take any person's word for what was done at Chicago, but will go to the record and see and judge for themselves.

The results of the labors of the Convention must, of course, be sought in the platform which it enunciated. To this we ask every Spiritualist to turn, and there learn the truth. Even the opposition had to confess, in the words of one of its members, "So far as I am concerned, I ought to say that the majority report contains many propositions to which I cordially subscribe." Let us, then, find out the propositions to which they could not cordially subscribe.

To the eighth proposition of Chapter I, Judge Holbrook offered the following amendment:

"But we do not regard the public platform as the proper place for the discussion and promulgation or explanation of such science."

What science? In the language of the proposition:

8. That perfect physical bodies depend upon perfect conditions of generation, gestation and growth; and that while we ignore no question whatever, these are the most important that humanity can consider, and fundamental to any true spiritual science; and, therefore, this Convention announces that, in its opinion, the first practical work for Spiritualists is to discover, advocate and practice the science of generating, gestating and growing children, so that in the next generation improved humanity may be realized.

Judge Holbrook did not object to the science itself, nor did he say that it ought not to be the work of Spiritualists to discover and advocate it, but he differed from the radicals as to the proper place for the discussion and investigation. Neither he nor any of his side spoke a single word against the proposition itself, and objected only to the methods by which it should be attained.

Now, to us, this matter of a better race of people is of the very first importance. Beside it all other matters of public interest sink into insignificance. It is fundamental. It is the corner-stone upon which the whole structure of society is built, and, above all other things, claims the first attention of the reformers.

If it is impossible to have a race of better men and women, then it would be needless—indeed it would be useless—to investigate the subject; but nobody pretended in the Convention, nor will anybody pretend anywhere, that this is true. On the contrary, everybody will acknowledge that it is not only possible, but most desirable. It may be safely assumed that all are agreed as to this. Perhaps there is no single proposition to which more universal assent would be given, while, certainly, there are none in which the great public interest is so closely involved.

The opposition acknowledge all this, but they would not have it brought to the public platform, nor exhibited in the public prints. Then, how, in the name of common sense, do they propose to educate the people to its reception and understanding? Hardly by teaching it in the common schools; hardly by publishing it in books, open to all classes and ages. We can think of but one method to which they would resort, and that is: it may with propriety be published in medical books.

But here we find an obstacle to prevent. It might very properly be made public in this class of books, but medical authors will not put it there. Indeed, it is barely possible that they do not know enough about it to put it properly into books. But even if it were in them, following the policy of the opposition, it could be read only by individuals. They could not talk about it. Everybody would have to have a book and study it out for himself, and, carrying it to the logical sequence, we suppose everybody having such a book ought to hide it, and absolutely deny that he or she ever knew anything about such a horrible thing! (Such a thing that is unfit to be talked about in public must be horrible.)

But for such sickly squeamishness as this we can entertain nothing but the supremest contempt; and when Judge Holbrook and the other good men who attempted to save Spiritualism at Chicago from becoming the exponent of this science, come soberly to think of what they did, if we are not greatly beside ourselves, they will feel a growing contempt for themselves. For our part, we believe that anything that is good is good enough to be publicly discussed; and especially do we believe that anything so vital to humanity as its own perfection is not only good enough to be talked about on the rostrum and in the prints, but that they who, knowing somewhat of its value and possibility, conceal it with themselves, are public criminals, willing that the race should perish rather than do their duty, according to their knowledge.

The more important a matter is to the public, the deeper in it that the public interest is involved, the greater the need

that it should be publicly discussed. This is so self-evident a proposition that we, even now, can scarcely believe our senses when we remember that people pretending to some degree of sense could have stood up in Chicago and declared that such a matter as the production of better men and women is not a proper subject for public debate; but we feel assured that the good sense of Spiritualists, generally, will incline them to the same belief that we entertain. We are confident that the opposition cannot successfully go before the people with their position. The great public is purer in its thought than they who uphold hypocrisy think, and this impeachment when it comes before the public will be quickly disproved. But let it be remembered that there is no difference in principle, even here, between the conservative and radical Spiritualists. There is only a difference in practice. They believe in the science, but that it is not good for Spiritualists to handle.

If we look further into their opposition, however, we may find a solution for their singular action. We may learn that they are in favor of being right in principle, but wrong in practice. Indeed, if we are not mistaken—and we do not think we are—it will be found in the very next objection that they made to the propositions of the majority report, which was as follows: "That hypocrisy is the most dangerous element of present civilization, and that hypocrites form the most dangerous class of society."

This proposition stirred the opposition to great warmth. Led on by Judge Holbrook himself, all those who could do so made speeches against its adoption. They each and all said it was not true—even going so far as to defend hypocrisy in the abstract. We cannot imagine where they could have borrowed their ideas from. We are aware that Buckle, in his history of civilization, says that the hypocrite is an advance upon the bigot, to which we readily agree; but we must not stop with that assertion. It pre-supposes that it is better than something else that preceded it, and of which it is the outgrowth, and not so good as something that may follow it. Bigotry, out of which hypocrisy grew, is a worse element than hypocrisy, but hypocrisy has supplanted bigotry in this land, and, consequently, it is clear that it is the worst element of modern society.

Hypocrisy is the middle term of the progressive trio, of which bigotry is the first term and truthfulness the last. In advancing from the first to the last, the domain of hypocrisy must be passed. The world is in this domain, while the advance guard of radical reformers are endeavoring to debouch into that of truthfulness; that is, into a sphere where every person shall take his open life and stand with it before the world. Those who have bad principles and who live them thus become examples of warning to the world, instead of examples for practice, as Judge Holbrook argued. All his arguments were based upon the old theological idea of the depravity of human nature, which makes the race inclined to follow after the base instead of after the good.

We think it not only fair, but that it is impossible to conclude otherwise than to say that the solution of the action of the minority in opposing the proposition to investigate the sexual relations, as proposed by the majority, is found in their devotion to hypocrisy as a necessary cloak to the lives which they live. In other words, to investigate, means to them an exposure of the difference between their professions and their practices.

But to proceed. The next proposition to which the minority objected was as follows:

"That the purposes for which Spiritualists should organize should be to secure and maintain religious, political and social freedom."

The point of their objection professedly was, that while they did not object to social freedom of itself, they did to making it a part of the spiritual platform; but it was clear also that they did not want social freedom to be inaugurated, either by the efforts of Spiritualists or anybody else.

In attempting to find a solution for this opposition to social freedom on the part of the minority, we are driven to one of two conclusions: Either that they fear it will deprive them of some control over women now possessed; or that they really do not know what it means. Perhaps it would be nearer the truth to divide the opposition between these two reasons.

In our arguments with men about the right of woman to the control of her own person, they become enraged and unwittingly expose the real pith of their objection. In freedom the money power of man will not be the purchasing power of sex, which it now is. A large majority of men wisely conclude that if deprived of the power to purchase woman by their money that will be destitute of any other means to obtain her. That fully one-half of the intercourse between the sexes is now the result of the power of money or wealth is a fact that needs to be more fully realized than it is, and when it comes to be thus realized woman will begin to understand the ground upon which a large proportion of men object to freedom.

The other part of the objection, that some do not really know what freedom means, remains, to include those with whom money is not the motive. This objection is based upon the theory of human depravity. Its professors pretend to think that the advocates of freedom want it for the purpose of promiscuousness, sexually, and that in a condition of freedom the tendency to promiscuousness would prevail. This argument, however, is anything but flattering to the people who use it. It is their own judgment of humanity based upon the knowledge they have of themselves; that

is to say, they feel if a condition of freedom were inaugurated that they would descend to the bad, and, judging humanity by this, they conclude that it is not safe to trust them with freedom.

But the advocates of freedom deny the depravity of human nature, and affirm that, when any restraints are removed, humanity, as a whole, rises—instead of falls—in the scale. This, we say, is and ever has been the rule. To deny it would be to deny the theory of evolution.

We do not profess that there have not or that there may not be, in future, exceptions to this rule. There will always be some exceptions to all general rules; but these exceptions are the most forcible illustrations of the rules, and prove them, beyond all doubt. We have a right to claim that sexual freedom will result in good to the race, because every other freedom that was ever gained has resulted in good. Nor can anybody make any except an arbitrary denial of this position. There is no example by which to sustain the denial, and those who make it, place themselves just where those stood who, in the progress of events, have assumed the same for all the freedoms that have been gained for humanity. If the minority are content to maintain that position, we shall not object; but they will fail to convince the people that freedom, in any form, is a dangerous thing for them to enjoy.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We ought not to feel obliged to urge upon our subscribers the necessity of promptly renewing their expiring subscriptions. We have been so lenient in the past about subscriptions overdue, we fear it has become fixed in the minds of too many that it makes little difference whether renewals are made or not, since the paper will continue to come in any event. While we could do so, we never stopped a paper on account of failure to pay. We devoted our fortune and our life to the promulgation of the principles of freedom, trusting that by the time our means should be exhausted we should be amply sustained in the work by those whom we should be able to interest in the cause.

But we are compelled to admit that our anticipations have not been fully realized. True, many noble souls have come to the rescue, and by their liberal contributions enabled us to sustain the WEEKLY, when, had it been left to its nominal friends, it could not have lived. To these we return our heartiest thanks, with the assurance that in the future they will have cause to rejoice that they stood by to aid the efforts of freedom when it was struggling for birth. To these special friends, and to such as have heretofore been merely nominal, we again appeal. Let them remember that the WEEKLY needs their support still a little longer, and also that being now entirely cut off from many sources of aid once open to us, that it has more need of assistance now than at any former time.

We must urge every person who receives a notice of expiration of subscription in the shape of a bill for the current year, to give it immediate attention, remembering that delay in this may be the means of putting the cause of social freedom back by many years; and also upon every one interested sufficiently to desire rapid progress of the cause to which the WEEKLY is devoted, that they can show their interest in no better way than by obtaining new subscribers. If one-half of our now regularly paying subscribers would secure a single additional subscriber, the safety of the WEEKLY would be secured against all peradventure.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

This body, now in convention in this city, is certainly a significant prophecy of what is to come. In the language of its members, it means the best method of overcoming infidelity, which, in the sense in which they use it, means overcoming all who are opposed to their ideas of religion. The professedly Christian Church has been wise enough to see that if their religion is to be left to be freely analyzed and criticised, it has no hope in the future. They see that "infidelity" is constantly obtaining converts from the church, while the church only obtains converts from the ignorant classes. This has shown them that the church is really the means by which people come up from ignorance to truth. There is scarcely such a thing known as a convert from "infidelity" to Christianity. The logic of this fact is not mistaken by the "anointed" of the various churches, and they see the need of getting together to eradicate a common enemy—let the differences between themselves be as great as they may—and that common enemy is what they call "infidelity."

This alliance is a part of the other movement to establish a national religion in this country. It is to be especially noted that this is the first time that it has had a convention in this country, and that this one was called at a time when the movement to revolutionize the government of the country is about to assume an open position. We know that among those who are opposed to this movement very little alarm is felt about its proportions and intentions; but we tell all such that they are even now standing on the crater of a terrific volcano, that any day may begin to vomit forth its flame and deadly missiles.

What we have said before we repeat, that however peaceful and temporizing may be the speeches and actions of the God-in-the-Constitution people before they secure their aims, that their action afterward will be in perfect keeping with

that of their Bible-God. They will earnestly invite you to come to Christ, but if you fail they will name a judgment day and try your faith as by fire. We must be insane to pretend to think that they will not resort to equally as extreme measures to save your souls as those to which their God resorts; and failing, that they will not re-echo the words of their Christ: "Depart ye cursed into everlasting torment." We repeat that they are fools who think these people are hypocritical in their professions about a God of vengeance, or that they do not mean to become his vicegerents on earth. In other words, they intend to force upon you that rehash of old mythology, now known as the Christian Bible, and to vitalize its long dormant teachings, as they were vitalized in the earnestness of purpose that once erected the racks of torture and lighted the fires of the stake, to convert souls from the ways of the devil to those of God.

We are compelled to admit, however, that they are going to succeed. They will reduce this country temporarily to a religious despotism, and they will do it while yet their future victims are sleeping over what they intend. Of course those who now stand out boldly and expose their real intentions will be the first victims to their fury, which will know no bounds, when the power is once obtained to vent it. For our part we expect to be numbered among the very first, but if our blood, mingled with others, help to rouse the avenging angel in the souls of humanity, that in turn shall rise and smite this damned thing and its aiders and abettors out of existence, it will be freely given. We warn both them and you in time. You, to resist successfully as you may, if you will, their intentions; and them, that however much they may succeed at first, the retribution that shall follow will be proportionately terrible. The Bible, God, Christ and the Holy Ghost of old mythology are doomed. Their sentence is written on the face of nature, and the struggles to revive its wasting power will only the more certainly speedily aid on its final doom. We repeat, then, do not be misled by the assumed humility that will characterize the movements of the God-in-the-Constitution people, or their ally, the Evangelical Alliance, for they mean business after the method of the God of the Bible.

AN ANTIDOTE TO MADNESS.

An effectual antidote to the ravings of the Religio-Philosophers is the published proceedings of the Chicago Convention, phonographically reported for this specific purpose. We knew that this good class of persons would go into all sorts of absurd antics, and as we did not wish them to get stark mad, we took the precaution in advance to prepare this antidote. We assure them if they will take even homeopathic doses of this report their ravings will certainly become milder in form immediately, and ultimately be altogether removed. We are sorry that they should have been so unpleasantly to themselves wrought upon, and hasten to suggest the remedy before the disease shall become chronic. By the way, we noted the conspicuous absence in the Convention of those who have had this disease badly for the last two years. Even the heretofore inevitable Baily was not there to rise to points of order, and thus to make the proceeding perfectly legal, which with him as with marriage, needs to be legal if nothing else. Well, it is perhaps better to have legality than to be entirely destitute of everything; but for our part we like a little soul mixed up with formality, even if it be at the expense of form.

THE DUTY OF THE HOUR.

Assemblages and conventions of the people are very necessary adjuncts to all reformatory movements, often giving point and direction as well as unity and power to them. It is also at these that the various crude ideas of reform are analyzed and the absurdities separated from the principles; and these in turn formulated so as to become self-evident truths, capable of being comprehended and appropriated by all minds possessed of the capacity of reason, and emancipated from the thralldom of bigoted and dogmatic assumption.

It has, however, been true in the past that, with the excitement of the moment passed, the individuals composing the conventions fall into an indifferent if not lethargic condition, lacking either the capacity or the stimulus to carry forward in individual spheres the work laid out by the convocation. This is an indication that the earnestness born of general unity did not reach to earnestness of individual convictions. He or she who arrives at full conviction about any important subject of reform, is equally as enthusiastic when removed from the stimulus of the multitude as when under its inspiration, since the source is principally from within and not entirely from without, as in the case of those who fall from grace when the external excitant is wanting.

We have said all this simply as introductory to the lesson that the Chicago Convention should teach each and every one of its members. The declarations of principles were almost unanimously adopted, and this too not in the informal manner in which such things are usually done. The promptitude with which opposing propositions were laid on the table, showed that the Convention had fairly made up its mind about what it had done, and that to discuss the same things over again would be a waste of time merely.

This platform of principles stands to-day as the representative of the concentrated meaning of the organized Spiritual movement of the country, and will so remain until it is amended or abrogated. This, however, commits no indi-

vidual to its support who was not active in its construction. No person whatever is bound to accept the platform as representing his or her views or convictions who does not cordially assent to its statements; but what we desire to impress is this: they who adopted the platform must be considered as standing upon it, until they announce a change of mind in regard to its declarations.

The support of the principles was either a passive acquiescence in or an active acknowledgment of them on the part of the delegates, to be determined by the manner in which they are now and in which they may be hereafter advocated. They whose acceptance was merely passive will go on in their usual manner, scarcely indicating that there has been any such platform put forth; while they whose acceptance was active and real, will go forth heralding to the world its sublime yet simple truths that so stirred the Convention that adopted them as its concentrated wisdom.

A hundred and fifty active workers for the new departure in Spiritualism, for its *entree* upon its practical era, can do a most important labor in the ensuing year. They can carry the principles broadcast over the country, and be the means of organizing a thousand primary councils of the Universal Association of Spiritualists, which in turn will send their proper quota of representatives to the next annual convention.

Therefore the duty of the hour is that every person who believes in the new departure should work earnestly to forward its mission, speaking upon its principles wherever they go, and elucidating its application to reform in all their walks and conversation, and in the legitimate fruit of this advocacy securing the primary organization of Spiritualists in all directions. The plan adopted for this will be contained in the next number of the WEEKLY, and should receive the special attention of every Spiritualist. The Evangelical Alliance now in session in this city is a timely warning of the absolute necessity for organization. This Alliance means the unity of all religious sects against what they denominate infidelity, meaning Spiritualism, Free Religion, etc.

In such an exigency there is no excuse for time-serving and expediency, and no Spiritualist should either countenance or support these things either in individuals or in journals. Let them be pronounced either for or against this new movement for organization. Let them speak out about the platform. Let them say plainly and distinctly what they condemn and what indorse, and not stand upon the fence ready to drop either side as the tide may set in for or against it. As it stands to-day, THE WEEKLY and *Our Age* are the only journals that boldly maintain the action of the Convention. Let these be sustained by active effort on the part of every speaker in the general field, and of every laborer in the more limited local circle. Let every person whose soul is stirred by the interests of coming generations do something to spread this glorious work, so that the nations may see and recognize that Spiritualism is in reality humanitarianism. Go preach this doctrine, then: The personal freedom of every individual—self-ownership—and the need that individuals should organize for protection against those who are organized to rob them of these inherent, God-given rights.

THE REPORT OF THE CONVENTION.

To the many inquiries about the proceedings of the Convention, we reply that they will be published verbatim, first in the consecutive numbers of the WEEKLY and afterward in pamphlet form, making a book of something near two hundred pages. The extraordinary demand for the WEEKLY containing a part only of the first day's proceedings has exhausted the edition. To accommodate those who desire the proceedings complete, we have decided to issue it as above. Price, single copy, 50 cents; per dozen, \$4.50; and per hundred, \$30.

CEPHAS B. LYNN.

We desire to call especial attention to the very able speech made by this young though earnest reformer at the Chicago Convention, published in this number of the WEEKLY. Following as it did the rabid, unreasonable and personal remarks of a member of the opposition, who, finding himself bereft of argument, was obliged to resort to badinage, it was both happy and timely. The effect upon the Convention was as happy as it was marked. We have watched his course pretty thoroughly since we met him two years ago in Troy, and we are glad to learn that he is a general favorite in the West, where he is best known. That a certain class of professed Spiritualists feel his strength and influence, is shown in the utterly-without-foundation attack made upon him by their special organ. The very night upon which it accuses him of being intoxicated he accompanied us to our hotel from the Convention, and we happen to know its untruth; but we trust our young friend may not even waste a thought upon anything that may appear in the columns of any journal that is an open advocate of the hypocritical wing of Spiritualists. The best refutation of any unfounded charge is its falsity, therefore we hope that advocates of advanced ideas may not spend their time and talent upon the gnats and fleas that would fasten upon them to hinder the advance of reform; but, being clothed upon by the armor of truth, be thus made impregnable to all attack. We trust

that the common-sense logic and the persuasive eloquence of Cephas B. Lynn may be heard in every hamlet in Michigan, and that they may bring thousands to the realization of that peace and glory alone to be found when freedom is born into the soul.

"SPIRITUALISM vs. FREE LUST."

PROF. E. WHIPPLE TO LYMAN C. HOWE:

My Dear Brother—I confess to some surprise as I read your letter in the *Banner of Light* of October 4, under the above caption. From my intimate acquaintance with you, I had supposed that, while you were moderately radical and healthfully conservative, you nevertheless interpreted the doctrines and motives of the leaders in the modern social agitation quite different from what is expressly stated in your communication to the *Banner*. You will please pardon an old friend if he asks you to specify your reasons and evidence for the grave charges you have volunteered to publish. You ask:

"Must we be compelled to yield tacit assent or open indorsement of theories that are forced into organic expression in the name of the National Association?"

I suppose you have reference to the "Majority Report," passed at the recent Convention in Chicago; especially to Chap. II., Section 5, and the whole of Chap. III. It is familiar knowledge, my brother, that our conventions—not omitting the National Association—have been in the habit of passing resolutions indorsing and claiming both religious and political freedom as natural rights. Nobody said anything about being "compelled to yield tacit assent or open indorsement of theories that were forced into organic expression." The great body of Spiritualists were prepared for the acceptance of these simpler forms of freedom as a principle. I have been present in conventions where, if I mistake not, you voted in favor of such resolutions. Now, there are a few points which I am constrained to ask you to explain a little more at length. Mrs. Woodhull will certainly give you space in the WEEKLY; but if you don't like the company kept there, undoubtedly Bro. Colby will welcome you to the columns of the *Banner*.

Please tell us what it is you refuse to be "compelled" to yield tacit assent to? Is social freedom, as one of the objects Spiritualists should organize to secure, the thing that troubles you? Upon what principle of logic do you yield "tacit assent" to an object which aims to secure religious freedom, and then raise the cry of protest when it is proposed to add another object which shall aim to secure social freedom? What limitations, in your opinion, attach to the question of social freedom that do not equally apply to religious freedom? But perhaps this is not what you object to, and so I wish to be enlightened in regard to the real grounds for complaint.

Again, you seem to treat the term social freedom as synonymous with sexual promiscuity. Are you willing to be credited with any monstrous belief or form of worship, simply because you hold the doctrine of religious freedom as a principle? Why should the claim for social freedom carry with it the implication of promiscuity any more than the claim for religious freedom should commit one unconditionally to infidelity? I do not see why one who holds the doctrine of social freedom must therefore be either a monogamist or varietist. For my part I deny the dogmatic assumption of anybody as a finality. My own social criterion is that of monogamy. To a single mate my soul gravitates, and in the society of my own wife my life finds complete fruition. Please tell me whether I can live a monogamic life and at the same time consistently hold the doctrine of sexual freedom? But I elect monogamy for myself, not for my neighbor. In religion you grant expression to freedom in the "lower" as in the "higher degrees." Love springs from organs and faculties that are subject to evolution and growth. They, too, have their lower as well as higher degrees. Are we to understand that you grant freedom of expression to the religious faculty in the lowest degree (so long as its exercise does not encroach upon the freedom of another) and refuse expression to sexuality in its lower degrees? The question is not as to what is right and proper for the individual in these matters, but it is a question as to what authority society and the State have a right to exercise over the individual. Will you please explain to us the nature of those limitations and restraints which the State has a right to impose upon the sexual liberty of the individual which do not apply equally to the religious liberty of the individual? If you have no time to think out the distinction, I would refer you to John Stuart Mill's work on "Liberty." Please consult the chapter on "The Limits of the Authority of Society over the Individual."

I believe this whole subject is an open question, and must be studied inductively in a condition of freedom before we can formulate a social criterion which shall express a law of nature. But, perhaps, I mistake you here also, and so I ask you to rise and explain.

As Mrs. Woodhull is, in the language of Warren Chase, "the point of attack, the centralized point at which the opposition is directed in this movement," it is a matter of some importance whether she be rightly or wrongly judged. You say: "Mrs. Woodhull is not an advocate of freedom."

Now I had fully persuaded myself that she was an advocate of freedom, but as you say she is not, please define for our better understanding the following points:

1. What conditions must be fulfilled to constitute one an advocate of freedom?
2. In what respects does Mrs. Woodhull fail to embody these conditions?

Again, you say "She is a fanatical devotee of passionary slavery."

A slave is one who is compelled against his choice, constrained against his will. Do you mean to say that Mrs. W. has subjected any one to passionary slavery? or that she has advocated the right in anybody to subject another to passionary slavery? But, perhaps, you refer to slavery in a more restricted sense—slavery to one's own impulses. Does

the statement that one has a natural right to exercise sexuality—that sexuality in itself is good—carry the implication that Mrs. W. is a “fanatical devotee of passionate slavery?” If so, would not the advice to use any other faculty or follow any other attraction make a “fanatical devotee” and “slave” to such faculty or attraction?

You further say that “obedience to impulse, in defiance of reason, law or moral restraint, is her avowed doctrine.” “Avowed doctrine!” “In defiance of moral restraint!” Those are serious charges, brother Howe, for one who stands high in the esteem of the Spiritualists of America to prefer against a reformer who has secured the attention of the world to the most reluctant question of the ages. But it is not simply the person of Mrs. Woodhull you implicate. There is a large class of intelligent men and women in this country who are identified with her published utterances and committed to her social theories. You charge them equally with Mrs. Woodhull as being in the attitude of “defiance of moral restraint.” If I really understand Mrs. Woodhull, I am with her in her doctrine of social freedom, and you will please count me in the same condemnation with her. I cannot allow this charge to pass unchallenged. Give us the evidence, that the public may be able to decide for themselves the justice or injustice of your inferences.

Be assured, my brother, that any differences of conviction or opinion we may each cherish will not have the effect to change my personal esteem for you. True, if circumstances find us marshalled in opposing armies, we cannot afford each other that helpful sympathy and mutual interchange of thought and feeling which unanimity of views would make possible. But I hold loyalty to truth and duty above all personal considerations. The age and hour are fraught with terrible meaning. I had hoped that when the contest came you would be arrayed on the side of freedom. I have held in the highest esteem your earnestness, your manhood and your eloquence; but if the choice is between you and freedom, we shall have to spare you. Each must elect for himself the side he will take in this last great struggle for liberty.

I am, your brother,
CAMBRIDGE, Mass., Oct. 6, 1873.

E. WHIPPLE.

THOMAS COOK.

This noted Spiritualistic speaker designs spending the next two months in the East and the winter in the South. For engagements, address him at Berlin Heights, Ohio, care of A. F. Page.

[From the New York Times.]

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL AND HER ADMIRERS— A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN DENOUNCES THEM FROM THE ALTAR.

On Wednesday evening Rev. Father Damien preached an eloquent address to a very large congregation at the Church of St. John the Evangelist, in Fiftieth street. The reverend gentleman spoke of the large number of religious denominations every day springing up on all kinds of pretenses, many of which were highly dangerous to virtue and morality, and said that probably the next new religion would be that founded by Victoria C. Woodhull and her admirers. He looked upon it as a bad omen for the morality of this city to see men and women sit, aye, even stand, and listen to the vile attacks made by such a woman on religion's holiest institutions for two hours, and vehemently applaud when she ridiculed what every Christian was taught to believe most sacred. New York society must be in a deplorable condition when men and women of wealth and genius, moving in the highest circles, paid homage to a woman who declared that she was a free lover and gloried in the title, and grew enthusiastic when she called on her female hearers to pay no attention to what she called the “hollow, meaningless ceremony of marriage,” but to declare themselves Free Lovers, as she had done. The reverend preacher closed his address by warning his congregation against all doctrines so dangerous as those of Victoria Woodhull and the Free Lovers.

PIOUS FRAUDS AND IMPIOUS LYING.

“These infamous impositions.”—Mosheim.

“It was an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by such means the interests of the church might be promoted.”—Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. 1, pp. 116. (McLaine's translation.)

“It is almost incredible what a mass of insipid fables, what a host of pious falsehoods have, through all the centuries, grown out of it.”—Mosheim.

“I came here to advocate what I believe, and what to me is the highest truth.”—Victoria C. Woodhull.

“For years upon years myself was made the special target for every marksman with shot-gun, and bow and arrow. It would be impolite, not to say profane and vulgar, to put in print the stories which refined and wealthy church members, including very respectable ministers of the several orthodox denominations, privately and publicly circulated against me. I was reported and denounced as the walking embodiment of all that was vile and Satanic. * * * The blighting and hampering influences of my respectable enemies and slanderers meet me at every turn in life, in society, in business, in every relation I sustain to my fellow-men.”—Andrew Jackson Davis.

Christians said it was “An act of virtue to deceive and lie.”—Mosheim.

“I want you to know you [Spiritualists] have made a poor woman of me.” “It has been mine to say the unpleasant truth, to stand in the fore-front and receive the heaviest of the fire. It has been mine to be aggressive and merciless, when of myself I would have been peaceable and sympathetic.”—Victoria.

“What have I done to stay the power of my traducers? They have ‘damaged’ me beyond measure. * * *

In my business as author and publisher, my adversaries have damaged me to the amount of at least \$100,000.”—Andrew.

“Two years ago, when I came to your Convention, I was what the world called a financial success. I had my elegant home in New York, and earned my \$250 per night for my lectures. I came to your Convention and became your President, and from that moment the foul opprobrium from the result of your own lives has been heaped upon me, until you have slamed me all over and held me up to the world as something awful and fearful, and that must not be touched.”—Victoria.

“I am silent. I make no answer.” “I shall not stop to contend with evil.”—Andrew.

“There will be an avenging angel after them; and for every lie they utter, the truth will come out in thunder-tones.”—Victoria.

What mean these quotations? I answer: To impress the minds of readers with the needed lessons of the hour.

Let us continue them. The *Religio-Philosophical Journal* says that “no decently-framed resolution could find support” among the 115 delegates composing almost the entire body of voters at the late Convention in Chicago. The proceedings nail that assertion.

“The reader should not forget that no effort was made by a single society to send delegates to represent them.”—Jones' *R. P. Journal*.

I have, as Secretary, in my possession the papers from many States, which prove that to be a journal lie.

If no society sent delegates to represent it, then what business had W. J. Shaw, Cotton and Holbrook there? These are the much-lauded Spiritual *saints* of the *Journal*. They were *frauds*, if it tells the truth.

The *Journal* wades through six or seven columns to try and prove that Mrs. Woodhull and the Universal Association of Spiritualists are committed to licentiousness.

What says Warren Chase: “We would remind those who pretend to think this Convention advocated and defended lust and licentiousness, that it passed in full session, *without a dissenting vote*, the following resolution: ‘That we most earnestly protest against all forms of licentiousness, whether within or without the pale of matrimony.’”

The *R. P. Journal* is either ignorant of the proceedings of this Convention, or hopes, by a systematic course of falsehood, to “promote” “chastity and purity.”

It evidently forgets that it teaches licentiousness, the very doctrine it now professes to condemn, while I have proved, in this article, that the Tenth Convention repudiated it. Let the editor refresh his memory. Here are the words in one of the back numbers of the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*: “In licentiousness we find an outcropping of the God element in man.” Thus, the God of the *Journal* is a libertine. A pretty paper, indeed, to set itself up as the organ of “chastity.” Its readers may be deluded, for a time, with its hollow pretense of snow-flake purity. But its falsehood and vulgarity are too unmistakable. Why, think of it! Some of its chief supporters came into our late Convention and openly advocated hypocrisy. In this respect they practice what they preach. The advocates of hypocrisy and licentiousness now propose to call a convention of pure (?) people.—W. F. Jamieson.

SPIRITUALISTS OF VINELAND.

Do you know what you are doing? Is it not enough that you have tortured one woman, until life was a prolonged agony of crucifixion, because she dared to be true to her highest conception of right? Can you afford to also cast our brave and true Elvira Hull before the Juggernauts of *secrecy and respectability*? Why do you not rather go to her and bless her for her devotion to the truth? She has nobly served the world's most pressing need—the need to know just what is going on in every household and in every heart. Nothing but knowledge of principles and obedience to them can relieve society of its burden of vice and suffering; and nothing will so soon establish it in these principles as knowledge of facts in experience. Ask them to know more rather than less of that tortured life which is willing to open anew its partially healed wounds, that you may have the benefit and be saved the suffering. If you think she is wrong, tell her so kindly and frankly, and be willing to hear her justification. You cannot afford to scorn and ostracize any human being, much less one who is willing to brave so much, in doing what she felt to be a simple duty. You have made high professions of liberality—see to it that you are not found lacking.

Yours, for humanity,

OLIVIA F. SHEPARD.

VINELAND, Sept. 18, 1873.

THE “PURE QUILL.”

Brother K. Graves, of Richmond, Ind., informs the dear public, through the Banner of Light, that he's “all right” on the social question. He tells us the question is settled in the minds of all philosophers and scientists that promiscuity is bad, and that monogamy is good. Brother Graves advocates the good. Moreover, Brother Graves is in the lecture field, and the malcontent societies who have departed from Woodhullism, and are just beginning anew, will be pleased to learn that Brother G. offers his services for *three dollars* and

thirty-three cents a lecture. There is no taint of free love (?) in what he preaches, neither. Won't the “New Departure” people feel rejoiced now that they have *somebody* to preach the pure, unadulterated Gospel! Brother Graves understands they are poor, and so he generously tells his patrons they may make their application for his services with *postal cards*, instead of three-cent letters.

Yours, for the missionary cause,

E. WHIPPLE.

Editors Weekly—“The Creed of a Reformer,” which you have credited to me in your issue of October 6, is Mary Tillotson's and not mine. By her permission I copied and forwarded it to you, that was all. Please see that justice is done her, and oblige, yours,

OLIVIA F. SHEPARD.

ANOTHER DIVORCE.

That no inharmony may result from the influence of our past act in being lawfully married, we having, as per Quaker ceremony, married ourselves, by simply proclaiming, in the presence of a witness, that we took each other to be husband and wife—in the presence of the world, as a witness, we now proclaim our divorce, thus revoking all that was then done, and that we depend, henceforth, on the higher law—the bond of love.

SARA W. RUMFORD.

PLANO, CAL.

ISAAC B. RUMFORD.

A CARD.

To Hattie E. C. Barnes, Anna Kimball, and other Ladies.

I take this method of expressing my most grateful thanks for the very generous subscription obtained by you among the members and attendants of the recent Convention at Chicago. Allow me to express the sentiments of my heart and soul in saying to you that this act of favor and generosity will always remain in memory wherever I go, or whatever shall be my fate or fortune.

Your friend,

V. C. W.

Dr. Slade, the eminent Test Medium, may be found at his office, No. 413 Fourth avenue.

Charles H. Foster, one of the oldest and most remarkable Test Mediums of the country, may be found at his rooms, No. 19 West 22d street, during the present month, after which he leaves the city en route for Melbourne, Australia.

Wanted—By a lady, thirty years of age, a situation as attendant upon an invalid, in exchange for a home. Address H. F., New York P. O.

LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.

Those who desire to secure the services of Mrs. Woodhull at any time during the coming lecture season, should make early application. She expects to make a trip during the fall reaching as far West, probably, as Salt Lake City.

PREMIUMS TO CLUBS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BILLS FOR SUBSCRIPTION.

The names of all persons to whom bills are sent will be stricken from the list after a reasonable time has elapsed in which to make a remittance. As a duty, we urge those who do not wish to continue the paper to so advise us at once. Hereafter bills will be sent at the expiration of the time for which payment has been made. Friends will please give attention to this notice.

[Continued from page 7.]

his victim to her fate. Her parents discovering her condition, and being "eminently respectable," turned her out of doors, and the next morning she was found drowned. "Another unfortunate gone to her death." Do not be too indignant with those parents, remorse will do its work with them be sure, recalling through long nights to come the pale face and dripping garments of the child they drove to despair and suicide. Reserve your scorn for the society that makes such brutality possible, for the "Sacred Institutions" that nurture unnatural parents in the name of virtue and morality. [Cheers.] A learned judge stood up in this hall the other day as the eulogist of our present social condition and of the hypocrisy which he said was an encouraging sign of the times, he declaring that it was far better (and he may have spoken from experience) to advocate good principles and live bad lives, than to advance pernicious principles and live good lives. A novel doctrine, but quite in accordance with the opinion of a gentleman in Pennsylvania, who, in opposing Mrs. Woodhull's views, blandly stated that he "loved to sin," but always sinned under protest, and with deliberate conviction that he was exceedingly wicked. This enlightened individual, permit me to say, regards Free Love as exceedingly pernicious, and ourself as a dangerous and incendiary character. We have been accused by the signers of the "minority report" with seeking, by the aid of a subtle, soul-destroying philosophy, to palm upon the world a system of wholesale prostitution. The charge is false, and I hurl the impeachment back upon those who conceived it, and would recommend to these gentlemen the study and practice of the principles they so despise.

Free Lovers, as our opponents term us in derision, are the most fastidious and least promiscuous persons in the world. They have placed themselves in antagonism to established laws and customs, after gravest and most earnest thought and from deliberate conviction, and have found that isolation—I had well-nigh said desolation—is one of the penalties of growth, and to be misapprehended and condemned, their inevitable lot. Thus, "hating no one, they accept the isolation of hatred" as their portion, and are prepared to lay their all, if need be, upon the altar they have dedicated to human redemption. I, for one, have felt my cheeks burn, and every pulse of my heart throb in indignant protest against the manner in which the opposition have discussed woman, and the creature they have depicted her. I really scarcely know which has disgusted me most—their compliments which were insults, or their sneers which were compliments. They have questioned, first, our right to freedom; secondly, the use we should make of it if we had it. Now, inasmuch as we have associated with men all our lives, more or less, and are not quite depraved, I think we may be trusted; and, for my part, I hold my soul and the temple it dwells in as so holy that I deny any man, or set of men, the right to say how I shall dispose of either. The man that inspires my truest affection, that comprehends my aspirations and brings completeness to my life; the man who can attune to divinest harmony the shattered chords of a well-nigh broken heart, that man I have a right to love if I choose, and no one can decide for me what shall be that love's boundary or limitation. [Cheers.]

Oh! friends, are ye not the temples of the living God? and do you fear to trust your own souls with freedom? Aid us, then, in ushering in a new era, in laying the foundation of a new social order, based upon exact justice and complete sexual equality. [Applause.]

Mrs. Woodhull (who was received with cheers) said:

You will have to be very quiet while I talk to you to-night. Latterly—

The Chairman—Mrs. Woodhull has been very ill, and you will have to be very quiet if you wish to hear her.

Mrs. Woodhull (coming forward with a ghastly paleness)—Can any of you tell me where I am? For my own part I am not entirely certain of my locality. Still I ought not to be mistaken in my companions. These seem to be those whom I have known before. And unless I am thoroughly beside myself, this is the platform on which we have stood for two days; but I have been so completely dazed this evening by what has been said, that I do not know whether I belong here or not; and you must bear with me, friends, until I come to myself—until I return from the horrid picture that I have been exhibited here as being, by those who seem to know more of me—of my life and my motives—than I do myself. I want to feel that I have a right to stand here and to speak for myself, before intruding upon you, and to realize that I am not deceived by my own senses.

[Apparently recovering herself.] I appear before you to-night, perhaps the most fearfully-outcast woman in this or any other country. And for what? Is it because I have committed any crime that can be brought home to my door; is it because I have fearfully debauched myself in any manner that can be proven to have occurred? No! But simply because I have said I believe that every person is entitled to personal freedom—that each individual has a better right to regulate his or her own personal matters than anybody else has to do it for them. This declaration has carried consternation, seemingly, into every household, and even the women of the street catch the mad influence and pass me by on the other side; notwithstanding I am usually classed with them by such as have presented me to you as I appear to their imaginations.

When I sat listening to these terrific denunciations from the male virgins and immaculates, I could not help remembering an incident that occurred to me a few days before I left New York to come to Chicago. I had occasion to go up town, and took a Broadway stage. As I entered I observed that it contained several gentlemen, evidently respectable business men, going home from their labors, and an elegantly-dressed lady. Without noticing her particularly I seated myself beside her. She immediately attracted my attention by putting her fan to her face and whispering, as she turned near my ear, "For heaven's sake, Mrs. Woodhull, don't recognize me here; it would ruin my business!" I then recognized her as the keeper of a fashion-

able assignation house, to which I had been upon an errand of inquiry. I could not at first comprehend what she meant by being ruined by my recognition; but it soon occurred to me that some of the gentlemen present were her customers, who, seeing that she knew me, would never again dare to visit her house. So you see I am ostracized by those whom the world calls prostitutes almost as fearfully as I am by those whom I call the real prostitutes—those who come before you with a sanctified look, and with meek voice parading their virtue, which they profess to be in deadly fear of losing should social freedom prevail. [Cheers.] So you must pardon me, friends, if sometimes I am somewhat in doubt if I belong anywhere, as I was when I rose to address you.

As the gentleman was painting me to you an hour ago, I wandered backward in my life to the time when my young and agonized soul was first brought face to face with this social question, about which some people are singing such anthems of praise. Twenty years ago I was married, at the age of fourteen, to a man who was considered a very desirable match. His family was among the first in the country. I supposed that to marry was to be transported to a heaven not only of happiness but of purity and perfection. I believed it to be the one good thing there was on the earth, and that a husband must necessarily be an angel, impossible of corruption or contamination. I imagined that the priestly ceremony was perfect sanctification, and that the sin of sins was for either husband or wife to be false to that relation.

But alas, how were my beliefs dispelled! Rude contact with facts chased my visions and dreams quickly away, and in their stead I beheld the horrors, the corruption, the evils and the hypocrisy of society, and as I stood among them, a young wife as I was, a great wail of agony went out from my soul, re-echoing that which came to me from almost every one with whom I came in contact. I soon learned that what I had believed of marriage and society was the merest sham, a cloak made by their devotees to hide the realities and to entice the innocent into their snares. I found everything was reeking with rottenness. Everywhere I was surrounded by men and women who pitied me for my simplicity, and who were loose in what the world called their virtue. I stood a little fragile thing by his side, and with terrified earnestness asked him what all this meant? But I received only this answer: "You will learn enough as you grow older without any aid from me." I shrunk into myself and knew that my hopes were wrecked, and I realized from that day that I should wage war against this seething impacted mass of hypocrisy and corruption, existing under the name of the present social system.

And now, when I hear these immaculate men singing the glories of the "blessed state," I wonder if they think they are designing knaves or presuming fools. They go on as though they think none of us know anything of what we are talking about. Do they imagine they can mesmerize us into the belief that they bring to us a sphere of unadulterated purity, as even measured by their boasted restraints of law? Do they think they can convince us that their virtue is so ethereal that the discussion of sexual things will sully its fair face? Or what is it that they are after?

I can tell them what I am after, and I can assure them I am after it in desperate earnestness; I am seeking for the truth about sexual intercourse, and I will follow it if it lead me either to heaven or to hell. [Cheers.] And as Horace Greeley told us what he knew about farming, so will I tell these fearful ones what I know about sexuality. And in advance, I may assume that I know quite as much about this as farmer Horace did about growing cabbages. [Cheers.] I am going to tell them, and convince them too, that the great fight in the future is to be, indeed is now, between bestial sexuality and natural coition. I know that there is scarcely such a thing in the world as natural intercourse. Everywhere it is restriction and repression, or else debauchery and disease.

But these male dictators demur to being taught by women. They have so long held them to be nonentities in so many ways, that they have come verily to believe that no good can come out of a female Nazareth. [Cheers.] They stand up with all the impudence imaginable, and talk to us as a set of people who have never done anything to render life more desirable. I know they have heretofore succeeded in holding the lawmaking power and compelling us to obey their legal behests; but in this movement for social freedom they find they are going to be outflanked, and they are already beating a hasty retreat upon the rocky fastnesses of old-time despotism. One would imagine, from some of the speeches made on the platform, that we are about to return to the days when witches were burned, Quakers hung, all for Christ's sake. But I can tell them there will be a fight first, and that when it comes women will not form the reserve corps either.

But let me put this thing where it belongs. For one, I say that so long as women have no voice in making the laws, either by vote or by sitting in the halls of legislation, I will not be bound by them; I will not either respect or obey them. I will defy them, as I have done, and as I hope to induce every other woman to do. Men may make such laws for themselves as they please, but I respectfully decline their jurisdiction. I think I know just a little better what my need and the needs of my sister women are than they can know; and especially will I spit upon the man-made social laws, when I know they are framed especially to subjugate women, without the slightest idea that men will conform to them at all. [Cheers.]

But the cry is raised, "You don't accomplish anything; you are not practical." Have we not accomplished anything? Two years ago it was almost impossible for a woman to go alone to any prominent hotel in the country and obtain its hospitality, unless, forsooth, she carried about with her the certificate of her minister that she was a respectable woman. Now, I can walk into almost any hotel, and without a certificate secure what I need. And what is more, there is not a person set to watch the doors of the room

either. It is said this is a small matter, but I reply it is a beginning only, to be quickly followed by all the privileges that men enjoy, upon equal terms.

This little success has been gained principally through the discussion that grew out of the fact that my sister and I were turned out of a first-class hotel in New York because we advocated in our paper that legal prostitution under the marriage law was equally to be condemned with common prostitution. The proprietor would not have objected to the utmost freedom in his hotel; we might have lived there as the mistress of any man; but we ought not to talk out loud in the halls and parlors about social reform. They told me that "they admired us for the course we had taken, but to have it known that Woodhull and Claflin were living at the hotel, would frighten away all their family boarders."

But, as I said, we have fought it out until the right we claimed is acknowledged [Cheers]; and I appeal to the manhood of man, and to the dignity of womanhood to aid this work onward, until hotels everywhere shall be as open to women as they are to men.

Again, we went into Wall street, not particularly because I wanted to be a broker in stocks and gold, but because I wanted to plant the flag of woman's rebellion in the very centre of the continent [Cheers], and to show men that women equally with them are entitled to carry a pocket-book and manage a bank account of their own, and that they have the ability to do it as successfully. And now that all this is conceded we have retired from that locality.

During the three years we were there many singular incidents occurred to us. A lady called one day when there was several gentlemen in our office. Almost the first thing she said to me, as we passed into the private office, was this: "How do you manage to get along with so many different men without being insulted?" I replied that I was no more liable to insult here in daylight than she was in her own parlor by gaslight. [Cheers.] Your husband was in my office this morning [Cheers] and he didn't insult me, but, on the contrary, treated me with marked respect and deference, and said he wished his wife and daughters would imitate my example and endeavor to become self-supporting. [Cheers.] I could not help saying, "My little woman, what have you been doing with your husband that you expect him to insult me when he comes to do business with me." [Cheers.] I tell you that men will always respect women when they compel it, by their actions; and if women to-day would rise *en masse* and demand their emancipation the men would be compelled to grant it. The women of the country have the power in their own hands, in spite of the law and the government being altogether of the male order. Let women issue a declaration of independence sexually, and absolutely refuse to cohabit with men until they are acknowledged as equals in everything, and the victory would be won in a single week. [Cheers.] I have got my freedom in spite of the laws, and I defy any man or set of men to wrest it from me. [Cheers.] And every woman can have her liberty at the same or less price.

And yet it is said, Nothing has been done. Nothing done! Why, what do they mean who raise the cry? Is it nothing that to-day we can stand on a free platform and discuss any and all subjects, even those that heretofore have been scarcely breathed aloud, except in the dark or behind the door, and have what we say printed in the newspapers? Why, this of itself is a revolution. Last November I was arrested in New York for printing "The Red Token of Her Virginity." Now the newspapers talk as freely as need be of sexual intercourse, sexual organs, begetting children, etc., etc., and there isn't a Comstock to be heard of, or that dare show his miserable head. [Cheers.] If we keep on as fast as we have been going recently, we shall soon have a science of sex developed that will be as admirable as it is desirable. We shall be able to talk of the methods by which human beings are created without a blush, and therefore to arrive at a solution of this whole question.

And right here I wish to say that this Convention owes a vote of thanks to Chicago and its press for the courteous attention that has been given to the speakers upon these radical subjects. It has been unusual and, to me, rather unexpected, and goes far to show that the social question is accepted as a legitimate subject for public discussion in the columns of the press and on public rostrums. I see by your approving smiles that not any of you are afraid to hear any subject pertaining to our common welfare frankly and fully discussed, and any false modesty that might be assumed by a few would not meet with any encouragement here.

Everybody knows that I am now specially interested in the social question; and why? Because I know that nearly all the misery in the world is caused by the false conditions in which it is now involved. As I said before there, is scarcely such a thing as natural sexuality in the world. There is a disgust growing up between men and women as they are now arranged under the galling of the various kinds of restraints that are enforced. If there is not some change; if the divergent course now running, continue a generation longer; if the present universal indifferent and unsatisfactory sexual relations turn, as they must, into as universal disgust, the present race will go down in eternal darkness. Remember what I say, and mark it well. I repeat, if there is not a change for the better in our sexual relations within the next few years, this civilization will be blotted out. Let these immaculates prate of vulgarity, indecency and obscenity as they may, I will not hold my peace and permit this destruction, which I see clearly, to come upon this world.

Not speak of these things upon the public rostrum! This is simply insanity. Where else, if not upon the public rostrum and in the public prints, should a public danger be discussed? I say it is criminal not to ventilate this matter in every possible way; as criminal as it would be did we know a plague was to sweep over the land and carry off the whole people, which, by timely warning, might be averted. Indeed, this is a plague—a horrible scourge; and I summon every lover of his kind to rise against it, and turn its course into channels of peace and happiness.

All honor is due to this Convention for the glad welcome its members have extended to this question, and to the speakers who have had the courage to advance and discuss it. Upon none but a spiritual rostrum could such things have been done. Let whatever effort have been made elsewhere, it would have been shut out. Two years ago, at Troy, even upon the Spiritual platform, the consideration of the relations of children to society had to beg for admission; while the consideration of the political rights of women was at first denied. But when the Convention had listened to the rights of children, and had made the speaker President for having advocated them, then, unanimously, they invited the presentation of the woman question; and they are no longer side issues.

Spiritualists, however, who were not there, and who, consequently, did not hear, raised so great a noise about this lugging in of side issues with which to break down Spiritualism, that almost the whole body of Spiritualists were up in arms about it; as perhaps almost the whole body will now be up in arms, because you have permitted the social side issue to be saddled upon Spiritualism. But before two years more, all the clamor will have turned into praise that you have done it, as the previous clamor has turned into praise that at Troy the other was done.

For the constant pressure that I have made to open your doors and platforms for these questions, I have had to stand your jeers and hisses, and to be paraded before the world as the vilest of women. Some of your "great lights" have felt called upon to personally denounce me as the advocate of theories calculated to excuse the foulness of my life, being themselves, as I know, fresh from the arms of some immaculate sister, who is now terribly shocked at the horrible doctrines of Free Love, or who is trembling lest Moses Hull may name her as one of those who had been his companion in the experiments he has been making to discover a way out of his living death. Now let me give these sensitive people a single word of advice, which it will be well for them to ponder well: When we hold up the looking-glass of social freedom on this platform, each person sees his or her own visage in it; and I do not wonder that some are awfully frightened. I think I should be were I in their places [Cheers.]

But, as I said, I kept sailing onward as regardless as I could be of all the fright, until at last the reflection of my work has penetrated your hearts and brain, and you have recognized the fact that all this is the very essence of Spiritualism; that upon which the bright future of Spiritualism must be built if it appear at all. I knew you when I first went to you. I had faith that you would do all this, and also in the Spirit world who prompted me to say the things I did say.

When asked, as I have been, "Mrs. Woodhull, I am told that you believe in promiscuousness?" I have replied, "I do not believe in it at all; I know it exists in every crack and corner of the earth, and that it exists because society compels it by the unnatural restrictions it places upon natural passion." I know that the very people who, in parading me before the world as a bad woman, aye, even those who appear upon this platform and denounce me and all other advocates of social freedom, and who hurl their javelins, poisoned by the corruption of their own body, into my soul, are the very ones who are its unprincipled devotees. These are the ones who fear open discussion, since when the sisters begin to relate their experiences, as they will, they know their names will embellish the stories, like the editor of the *R. P. Journal*, who, for the last two years, has published the most contemptible articles. There is a woman in the audience who last night told me her personal story about this pure man, and asked me to relate it from this platform, but I hardly like to keep my promise. The story is rather too obscene for me to repeat. I propose that she come up here and tell it herself. You know, of course, that I am a little sensitive on this point. There may be a Chicago Comstock present, who would scent the obscenity were it to come from my lips, who would never think of such a thing coming from others. [Laughter and cheers.]

The real point however, which I wish to make is this. I have been asked what I thought of our present condition including the little clique that meet in the gallery, over there in the corner, just after the close of the afternoon session. Now if you really want to know what I think, I will venture to tell you plainly: For twenty-five years Spiritualism had been gestating her natural child, social freedom; and it was born on the second day of last November, when the key turned on Victoria Woodhull in Ludlow-street jail. But a condition of puerperal fever has been raging ever since, because the after-birth remained. To-day, however, thank God and the spirit world, it was sloughed off up there in the gallery [Roars of laughter]; and though its stench, for a time, may offend our nostrils, I feel certain that from the moment that event occurred, the symptoms of the fever began to improve, and I have the utmost faith that the patient is even now convalescent [Cheers], and that there will be no more delirious raving or *mania a potu* frights to prevent active and rapid progress. [Uproarious applause.]

To-morrow evening I shall deliver the most radical and searching speech that I have ever made. I shall go to the very depths of the sexual question and plunge the surgical knife to the hilt into the horrible carbuncle, which you are even now endeavoring to make me and the world believe has no existence. I shall tell what I know about life and death; and if you do not recognize the things I shall say the scientific world will take them up, and in after years emblazon them in books, and that in time they will go to the world as a part of the bible of the future. You talk to-day as if there were no such thing as anarchy in the world, bringing death in its train and spreading destruction everywhere. To-morrow I shall tell you how to escape both; I shall speak about The Elixir of Life; or, Why Do we Die? I hope this hall will be packed, and I shall expect, as I have to-night, to receive the attentive courtesy of every man and woman in it. [Prolonged applause.]

The Convention then adjourned.

THIRD DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

The Chairman said—The hour for conference has arrived, and ten-minute speeches will be in order. The Finance Committee is requested to meet as soon as possible.

Mrs. Sarah J. Penoyer, of Saginaw, Mich., said:

My friends, I have only a few words to say to you, and these, I hope, will meet with your favor. I have not made any expression of my feelings since I came here until this morning, and I purpose doing so now in a few brief words. I think when we hear such expressions as those that have come before the public this morning, that it is time for every woman with a woman's soul to stand up and express her thoughts, and inner feelings too. I have had these thoughts for many a month and many a day candidly acknowledge, but I have not had the moral courage to express them, except to a few of my friends. But now I think the day and time has come in which every person who has a thought should express it; that those who have the interests of humanity at heart will express a few thoughts on the subject. I read this morning in the *Chicago Times* something like this: "Evil spirits—They move in Chicago—A gang of shameless men and women come to Chicago—Another day among the Free Lovers at Grow's Hall—An exciting debate upon the adoption of the present platform." I tell you here and now that I come joyfully to this obscene platform. You may call me obscene. I prefer the liberal part of it; but not that I have no sympathy with the conservative, for I have been one myself till within the last few months. But I have been growing; I have been learning some of God's blessed truths, and I thank God and the angel world for revealing to me some of these truths. [Cheers.] I wish to say first that this is the first Convention of the kind I ever attended, but I hope it will not be the last. It has filled my heart and soul with feelings and my mind with thoughts that I have never had before. I have heard some truths given from the enlightened and progressive men which have stood on this platform that have rejoiced my very soul. Years ago, when the agitation of the anti-slavery movement was begun, I rejoiced to come out and say that I was an abolitionist. I gloried in the name, and now I say that I am a free lover. I glory in the name, because the name is divine. [Cheers.] There is nothing corrupt, obscene or wicked in it. There is nothing on God's earth but is good and true and holy. I acknowledge to you all I have a big, loving heart; but that does not mean that I am ready and willing to take you to my embrace. No, sir; if you think I do you are as mistaken as can be, for my love is not like that. There are no words in human language that can express it, and I do not hesitate to say that when I want to love anybody and anybody wants to love me, I do not care a fig for what anybody may say about it. I expect always to live up to my highest sense of right and duty, and so sure as one of you dare to throw any vile or infamous slanders upon me, just so sure as there is a God in heaven and an angel world, just so sure will all these vile epithets be thrown back upon yourselves. Thank God they cannot injure me; they will bound back and only injure the aggressors. Remember that, Mr. Reporters, who are writing those obscene, damnable head-lines for the *Times*. I never had the privilege of hearing Mrs. Woodhull speak until the other evening. The divine spark of God's blessed truths shone from her eyes. I knew, when I saw the light shine from her countenance, that she was a good and pure woman, and I love and honor her, as I do all those who stand up for truth. Yesterday I thought I would have liked to have a daguerreotype of those persons who claim that the social part of our platform is obscene and unfit for any one who is respectable to have anything to do with, and that I could place them side by side with our beautiful sister Victoria. I do not mean to be personal, but I am a physiognomist, and when I take a diagnosis of the two, but little difficulty could be experienced in telling which of the two led the purest life. The peculiarly red face of her opponent indicated to me that either the gentleman had a very bad form of erysipelas, or he had a considerable quantity of very bad whisky in his stomach. There is just one thing more I wish to say—

The Chairman—Time's up. In regard to that report in the *Times*, I will only say its editor will yet live to see the day when he will be ashamed of his remarks.

Mr. Gage—I move you that the Business Committee be instructed to nominate a President and Officers of the Association for the coming year.

The Chairman—They are already doing that.

Mrs. Severance—I come before you to make only a few remarks, and those to the point. In the first place, I rejoice to-day at this tenth anniversary of Spiritualism, that, notwithstanding we have adopted a platform, we have not received one-half the opposition that we had at our first Convention in this city when the loyal resolution was introduced for a side issue. This shows the progress we have made. Another thing I wish to call your attention to is this, that the disturbance which we had at our meeting last night came almost entirely from outsiders. Now for criticism upon Spiritualism. In the first place there are only two animals that hiss, one is the goose, and the other the serpent. Let us remember this, and let us never indulge in hisses, no matter what the speaker has to say. And another thing I want to say to you, fellow speakers, and those who occupied the rostrum last night, it would show much more dignity to have waited until they had finished their remarks before attempting to reply. Another point I wish to make is, we, as Spiritualists, have an influence in the land. We ought to have a power over the press in the land, and we can. And now let me recommend to you to mark well the course of the press in this city, and only support those papers that dare tell the truth. Let us support no papers that give such reports of our proceedings as was given in the *Tribune* of this morning. Another point to which I want to call your attention for the first time. I have seen a man brave enough—and I was going to say green enough, but I will leave that word

out—to stand up and advocate hypocrisy. I never heard it advocated before from any rostrum, and it is not indorsed by many Spiritualists. In conclusion, let me say that I trust in our proceedings this morning we will look to the cause of truth and justice. Every true Spiritualist, every radical reformer should, when we come to dispose of the business of the day, vote aye to the name of Victoria C. Woodhull for our next president. It has been said that any woman representing the principles set forth by Mrs. Woodhull would do as well for the position. But let us take our advocate in the person of the woman who represented our principles when they were not popular and has led us to our present position. [Cheers.]

Mrs. Laura C. Owen—I come before you this morning to explain a little; that is all. I came to the Convention as a delegate from Cincinnati, as a conservative, and I feel a little sorry. I want the friendship of all, for they place a great deal of confidence in me in Cincinnati, as shown by their appointing me one of their executive committee and as a delegate here. I wrote a little speech when at home thinking that I would not have confidence to speak to you without preparation, but I have just been converted to radicalism. [Cheers.] I have my speech here with me and I think I will read it to you. It is as follows:

Sisters and Brothers in Convention assembled—This is essentially a thinking age; and the great aim of the people is for liberty. To-day—at this very hour—the cry from every soul of this beautiful earth is for liberty! The blow has been struck; a great plot is being made, or rather hatched, and not only the masses, but each individual, demands that liberty that gives freedom to both body and soul. I am an individual, and my soul is my standard of authority in determining what is true or false in principle, and right or wrong in action. I am with you to-day as one of the delegates of the "Mass Meeting of the Spiritualists of America," held in Cincinnati, May 23, 24, 25 and 26; and the great object of that meeting was to discuss the questions of organization and true Spiritualism. The question was raised as to "What do they mean by true Spiritualism?" Now, Spiritualism is a science by itself, and its facts are facts by themselves; and, as such, the doctrine should be studied and weighed well in the balance of reason. I do believe the Spiritualists are to-day attempting too much in the name of reform. Why be burdened with so large a load, before the first portion is rightly adjusted? We all know that Spiritualism embraces many reforms, yet their consummation is greatly retarded by our running away with ourselves. Let us reform our National Association, put our State organizations in a more flourishing condition, and what few local societies we have, make them more harmonious. Be not afraid of organization and popularity. Let us clear up our houses while the sun shines, and get in the better class of Spiritualists and teachers that are to-day as silent as the grave. Every reasonable Spiritualist knows what our National Association of Spiritualists have done in the few years past. We know of the small number of votes recorded at the last annual meeting. We know there have been things done by this Association that do not meet the approval of a large number (if not the majority) of the Spiritualists of America; and we also know, without a doubt, that there have been enterprises and reforms entered into by this Association that do not meet with a general response from the Spiritualists, in personal or financial assistance. I work for the ballot and temperance; I work with the benevolent, and I am willing to work for a reformation in the laws regarding marriage, but I would do so only in a political, legal way. Spiritualism and Socialism are essentially different: Spiritualism is a beautiful science of future individual life; while Socialism is a social theory, entertained and practiced by persons both honest and dishonest, that conjugal love between the sexes should be regulated by affirmative inclinations only. As such they challenge a thorough examination. The facts of Socialists should be fearlessly met, and their arguments should be squarely weighed in the limpid light of principles. There are many Spiritualists who are open and avowed Socialists, yet I affirm that Spiritualism is not responsible for the existence of Socialism, nor can the teachings of Spiritualism be made to sustain any unholy conduct on the part of its advocates. If this National Association does not see fit to change its channel a little, and let its torpid stream become pure and crystallized once more, so that all may view its precious jewels deep down beneath its rolling waves, why, then I am ready, as one of the Executive Committee of the Cincinnati Mass Meeting, to call another similar meeting, and will most assuredly vote in favor of division. Let the trying ordeal come. If it be sound—its principles immutable—then forever will Spiritualism stand; if not, let her die and be buried, as other dark ages of the past.

Mrs. Owens criticised the speech as she read it, and at its close said:

I had this speech written, and the Convention gave me instructions to vote against Mrs. Woodhull, but I am going to vote for her. [Cheers.] I want to agree with brother Lynn. As to the manner in which the different religious denominations endeavor to force their peculiar dogmas upon our children at the different schools. I always attended the Presbyterian church until I was a Spiritualist, and I say that we should have schools in which our children might be taught that knowledge which we think is most proper for them. I come before you as an exposé of physical mediums. I made an *expose* of Ida Hart and Charles H. Reed. The Spiritualists should be careful of these mediums, for there are false ones and true ones.

Mrs. Todd was about to speak, when she was interrupted.

The Chairman said—

I wish to call the attention of the Convention to a paragraph in the *R. P. Journal*, which has some degree of interest for us all. It is there stated that the books and papers of the treasurer had been sent to Mr. S. S. Jones. The letter which accompanies them reads like this: "Bro. S. S. Jones: I forward to your care my treasurer's account, and also a let-

ter to the American Association of Spiritualists, resigning my position as treasurer, and will you be kind enough to hand these documents over to the officers of the Association." There was a gentleman yesterday who said he had a letter from Mr. Peter B. Good, the treasurer. I told him that he must take it to the Executive Board, who would consider it. Since then I have not heard a word about it.

Mr. Shaw—I have been waiting an opportunity to present this letter to the Convention, although it goes through the Board of Trustees.

The Chairman—You had better take it there. I will read the whole communication to S. S. Jones:

Dear Bro. Childs—A newspaper informs me of his resignation and his action in regard to forwarding his books. Please take charge of my papers."

This is signed "Peter P. Good, New Jersey."

Mr. Shaw—I want to inquire through you, Mr. Chairman, of the Committee of Arrangements with reference to the speaking, etc., especially since the evident design and intention has manifested itself to make what is called free-loveism the chief.

The Chairman—Order!

Mr. Shaw—Excuse me; I mean what is practically called free-loveism or Woodhullism. I desire to know what time the committee propose to give the minority for the purpose of explaining its views, or whether the majority will monopolize the whole time.

Mr. Lynn—I deny that we have monopolized all the time.

Mr. Shaw—And I deny that we have had an opportunity to reply to your arguments except on one or two occasions. Now I want to tell you a fact right here, that I understand and will probably be able to substantiate the fact, that the Convention will cost you, ladies and gentlemen, over \$1,000 in order to carry your point before it, and that you have sent for speakers to help you out of your present position, in forcing upon Spiritualism subjects to which the great mass are opposed. I wish to know if we are to learn from the Business Committee how many or how long speeches we are to be allowed to deliver this evening?

The Chairman—The committee for electing speakers have endeavored, so far as the names were handed in, to apportion them out equally. The idea of this charge of complicity in getting this Convention together is only equalled by the apathy on the part of those whom in part you represent; as a consequence you have no right to complain.

Mr. Shaw—I wish you would answer my question and not argue about it.

The Chairman—What I say is, that so far as the Business Committee is concerned, it has been their endeavor to give every side a fair and equal chance. So far as I am personally concerned as presiding officer of this Convention, I have no partiality.

Mr. Shaw—That is all very well. And now, again, I will ask you if they have given our side a fair chance, when they have allowed a platform of the Convention to be filled with speakers on their side, while only one or two have been able to say anything in our behalf. It seems to me that the right of a minority should go hand in hand with that of the majority. I think this is the true philosophy of harmony which we boast.

The Chairman—I don't want to argue the matter. The committee can speak for themselves.

Mr. Todd, the Chairman of the Committee on Business, said:

On the first appointment we made we put on Mr. Randolph, who refused to speak while the people were coming into the hall, hence time was occupied. The next day we made arrangements for speeches expecting the propositions would get through in the afternoon. When the speakers were put on their places there were four chosen for the evening besides Mrs. Woodhull, and these gentlemen were given one of them, which was certainly fair, when the proportion between the two classes of representatives is recollected. Yesterday afternoon the discussion on the propositions destroyed our arrangements for the afternoon. Some said let's go to work and figure out a new arrangement, but it was impossible.

Mr. Cotton—May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. Todd—I only want the thing perfect.

Mr. Cotton—I want to ask a question. Have you made a wise discrimination in the men who represent the minority here, who are not prepared to go so far in their adoption of extreme views as some of their brethren?

Mr. Todd—I will answer you that the matter was up before the Convention, and your own name was up among the list of speakers who had made themselves prominent in the Convention. We did not want to crowd the minority, and we proposed to allow them the privilege of speaking in proportion to the representation they have here. Now, 113 votes were cast on one side and 23 on the other, and I ask you if any unjust advantage has been taken. Remembering the speeches of Judge Holbrook on yesterday afternoon, have not the minority obtained a fair ventilation of their views? That's all I have to say.

Mr. Lynn—I want three minutes myself.

The Chairman—Is the Business Committee ready to report?

Mr. Todd—Yes, sir. The Business Committee report the names of candidates for offices in the Association to the Convention for its action. The nominations are as follows:

For President of the American Association of Spiritualists—Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull. For Secretary of this Association—W. F. Jamieson. For Treasurer—Hon.

Warren Chase. For Trustees—Mrs. J. H. Severance, Wisconsin; Benjamin Todd, Michigan.

Mr. Jamieson—I object to my name—

The Chairman—Wait until the proper time.

The report was accepted.

Mr. Todd—I move that it be adopted.

The Chairman—It cannot be adopted. The constitution requires that it should be voted upon by ballot.

Mr. Higgins—I move that we proceed to the ballot for the candidate for the President's office.

The motion was adopted.

The Chairman—It will be necessary to have tellers.

On motion, Messrs. Randolph, Lynn and Higgins were appointed tellers.

Judge Holbrook—I think it is proper and honest and honorable, and will aid in the expedition with which this work may be conducted, if I say that, so far as I am concerned, and I am justified in speaking for quite a number of my coadjutors, that this effort on our part has been merely tentative, one of trial; one to make the Convention what we would like to have it. Failing in that, we do not expect to take part hereafter in this Convention. We do not now conceive that we want to remain and consider ourselves as members during the year that is now opening. These remarks refer to quite a number of us, and we will consequently take no part in the election.

The Chairman—That is, you do not intend to vote.

Judge Holbrook—Not expecting to remain with you, we would not think it fair to take part in this vote, because the officers stand for next year.

Mr. Randolph—The minority having expressed their intention of not voting, I propose that we abandon the ballot and take the vote *via voce*.

Mr. Shaw—I wish to announce that, as an individual, I shall take no part in this election, and, for one among many reasons, because it is all out of order.

Mr. Jamieson—I call the gentleman himself to order.

The Chairman—He is certainly out of order.

Mr. Shaw—I do not want more than two minutes.

The Chairman—It is all right; nobody must be choked off.

Mrs. Middlebrook—Has everybody in the Convention a right to explain their position?

The Chairman—Everybody has a right to put themselves straight.

There was considerable disturbance, during the course of which Mr. Shaw retired from the platform.

The election was then proceeded with by ballot of the several delegates.

Mr. Shaw—I hoped that as this was a Spiritualist Convention, composed of liberals, the resolutions offered by the minority would have been allowed to have come in after those of the majority.

Mr. Lynn—That is what I voted for them for.

Mr. Shaw—But instead of that the resolution was laid on the table, the opportunity of discussing it being cut off.

The Chairman—Let me say this is out of order.

Mr. Shaw—Well, sir.

The Chairman—Do you want proof of it?

Mr. Shaw—Well, I only want three minutes.

The Chairman—Let the ballots be taken. "Let us do unto everybody as we would that they should do unto us."

Mr. Todd—I move that the vote be taken by States, and that when the name of each individual is called, he or she step forward and deposit her ballot.

The suggestion was adopted, and the ballot was proceeded with. Mr. Cephas B. Lynn announced the result as follows:

Total number of votes cast, 124. Victoria C. Woodhull, 115 votes; Mrs. Severance, 3; Mrs. H. F. Gardiner, of Boston, 2; Mrs. L. C. Smith, 1 vote; Judge Warren Chase, 1 vote; Addie L. Ballou, 1 vote; and Judge Holbrook, 1 vote. The result was received with tremendous applause.

A delegate inquired if the Convention could instruct the Secretary to cast the vote of the Convention for the other officers.

The Chairman—I think it will be better for us to finish this part of the proceedings first.

The Secretary declared the result of the ballot, as given above.

The Chairman—I therefore declare that Mrs. Woodhull is re-elected President of the American Association of Spiritualists for the coming year. [Cheers.]

Mrs. Woodhull on coming forward, was received with every demonstration of delight. She said:

I thank you for the honor that you have conferred, not upon me but upon the principles that I advocate. [Cheers.] The more especially do I feel this, as the principles, since during the past two years they have been before the whole world, and have been "cussed" and discussed to your heart's content. [Cheers.] Hence, I am certain that when we go from this Convention, there will be no earthly chance for our opponents to say that it has been snapped upon them. I warn the people that having cast their vote for these principles, that they knew what they were about—that we have thought and read about them, and had lived under them, to find out that they are good enough to live by, and good enough to die by. [Cheers.] One thing more. The assertion has been made that I have packed this Convention. It was no insult to me, but it was an insult to all the delegates assembled here. Now what I ask is this: that the people who have been bribed by me will step forward and tell us how, and when, and where they have been bribed? [Cheers.]

Mr. Barrett—I move that the Secretary cast the ballot of the Convention for the remaining officers.

Mr. Todd—I will announce that there is another Trustee to be elected, and would nominate for that position Mr. L. K. Coonley, of Vineland, our Chairman. [Cheers.]

Mr. Lynn, seconded the motion.

The Chairman—The next thing is to ballot for Mr. Jamieson.

Mr. Barrett—There is a motion that he cast the ballot of the whole Convention.

The Chairman—As he is a candidate, that cannot be done.

Mr. Barrett—I move that Mr. Lynn be so instructed to cast the ballots.

This was carried unanimously.

On the confirmation of Mr. Jamieson as Secretary, the Chairman said: Mr. Lynn will cast the vote for the Convention for Mr. W. F. Jamieson, there being no other candidate.

The appointment was ratified unanimously by the Convention, amid cheers.

Mr. Jamieson—Ladies and Gentlemen I thank you. I will try and do the best I can for you.

The nomination of Hon. Warren Chase, to the position of Treasurer, was also carried unanimously.

Hon. Warren Chase—I do not know what you call me up here for, unless it be to see my face. This office of Treasurer, is a rather singular one to put me in; but I have been in almost every other department, and I suppose that it is my turn now to come into the finance department. As Treasurer of this Association I shall endeavor to do my duty and take care of the funds that may come into my hands. [Cheers.]

The Chairman—The next offices we have to fill are those of the trustees. One is to take the place of Mr. A. A. Wheelock, who has resigned; the other vacancies occur in accordance with the rule of rotation.

Mr. Lynn cast the ballot of the Convention in behalf of the persons nominated, and they were declared duly elected.

The Chairman—The question is, whether the Convention, after its vote on the presidency, should not pass a resolution similar to those passed in the case of other officers, namely, a motion should be offered making his nomination to the office unanimous. [Cheers.]

The motion was made as suggested, and carried unanimously. On its being so announced by the chairman, there was a loud burst of applause.

Mr. Walter Wood, of Illinois—And Mrs. Woodhull is indorsed by the spirit world. I have a message here that I received this morning before coming to the Convention:

Good morning, Walter T. Lee. You are exultant over the success of a dear sister who has been chosen to do a work that should endure for all time. History shall paint in gorgeous colors the record of the life-sacrifices of Victoria C. Woodhull. Gloriously bright will be her entrance into spirit life. Mortal mind is incapable of conceiving the joyous greeting that awaits her pure spirit. It is the unfoldment of divine love that will take the faithful, weary and worn child of earth's struggles into sweet rest, joy and peace. I would like to talk all this day to you, my earnest brother, but something is in the way now. Yours, J. W.

Col. Blood—On behalf of the Committee on Organization and By-Laws, I beg to present this basis of organization and constitution:

[The basis of Organization and Constitution will be published next week.]

The Chairman—You have heard the report, what will you do with it?

The report was received.

On the motion for adoption—

Mr. Shaw—I have only a word to say, and that is in reference to the principles of the Association, and the statement that when these principles are promulgated, that the existing difference in wealth will not stand in the way of equal assessments. I give the subject of it. I fail to see any definite declaration of what this brings about. I should like to have this matter of what the principle is to which reference has been made in the report.

Colonel Blood—The committee supposed that the adoption of the resolutions yesterday showed pretty clearly what the principles of the association were.

Mr. Shaw—This report does not refer to the propositions specifically. Is it intended to incorporate them in the report?

Colonel Blood—So far as the principles of this new association are concerned, they have never been adopted; and secondly, there is no association in existence.

Mr. Kates, of Ohio—I should like to know, with my friend Shaw, before I adopt this constitution, what principles I will be asked to subscribe to before I can become a member of the primary council.

Colonel Blood—This question was considered in the committee and was discussed pretty thoroughly, and they supposed that having adopted this constitution, it would incorporate in with them the propositions passed on yesterday. But that is not done yet, nor can it be done until the Convention accepts and adopts the constitution.

Mr. Shaw—I simply want to know if that is the project.

Mr. Kates—I think, Mr. President, that it would be necessary to incorporate these principles with this constitution. I am not a public speaker, but you touch my hobby; and when you commence making a creed for me, compelling me to subscribe to any principles before becoming a member of this Association, and before I shall vote to adopt any organization that prescribes principles, I want to know what I am doing.

Mrs. Severance.—I want to ask a question of the gentleman just speaking. Do I understand that you are one of those that have seceded from the Convention?

Mr. Kates—No, ma'am, I am not. I am neither a radical nor a conservative in this matter; I am not here to get up any feeling on one side or the other; I came here to do as far as I could what was for the best interests of our cause in this country; and as I said this morning, that is one of my hobbies—that nobody shall bind me to subscribe to any creed. We have heard enough here of freedom, and I believe in that in the fullest sense. If we are to base the constitution upon that one question, then all I can say is, that I shall keep clear of it.

Mr. Todd—I move to attach to that report the propositions that were passed yesterday, as our principles to be added to it.

Mrs. Severance—I will second that.

Mr. Cotton—I have an amendment to offer, as follows:

"That the last clause read be adopted as our creed and not as a declaration of principles."

The Chairman put the question on the amendment, which was lost unanimously.

The Chairman—Creeds are gone overboard. Next comes the attachment to the constitution of the principles to be adopted.

Mr. Barnes—I would like to ask a question: We have before us a constitution that harmonizes well with my interior [Loud laughter.] If these principles that are before us will harmonize with the fundamental principles of God's divine government, if not, they will not stand.

Miss Hinman—The Committee on Finance is requested to meet at once.

Mr. Barnes—We are called and invited to meet the needs of the family, of the nation, and if we have anything that the world wants, if we have the right man in the right place, if we have come to the right moment and have the right men and women at our head, then we will speedily have a body of population that will be established and founded on principle and who will prove the saviours of the race. [Cheers.]

Mrs. Severance announced that an admission fee of fifty cents would be charged to the evening session.

Mr. Anthony Higgins—I call for the previous question on the amendment.

Mr. Barnes—You are under the controlling power of darkness. What did I say when I was last in the city of Chicago? Did I not predict the awful times that have come upon ye? Did I not tell you that the powers of darkness would have your city and others. I say honor to God and angels, but ye say honor to the power of darkness. [Cheers.]

Judge Holbrook—Out of chaos shall come order. Mr. Chairman, I want to keep your ear until I move an amendment; but how does it stand before the Convention now?

The Chairman—The amendment has been voted down, and it now comes upon the first motion.

Judge Holbrook—I move as an amendment, so as to bring the matter before the Convention, that "It shall not be in order to speak in advocacy of (nor in opposition to) those subjects which are removed from Spiritualism, and in no especial degree based upon or connected with its facts, theories, demonstrations and philosophy, among which are enumerated the general questions of politics, government, the Woman's Suffrage movement, and social freedom; but persons may be specially invited to speak on special subjects, by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the Association represented in Convention." Now, Mr. Chairman, one word in reference to that.

Mr. Chairman—I would ask if your motion is seconded?

Mr. Shaw—I will second it.

The Chairman—The amendment is before the Convention, and Judge Holbrook has the floor.

Judge Holbrook—Now, Mr. Chairman and members of this Convention, I say that I have come to this Convention, in my own mind, as a harmonizer, for the purpose of making the Convention as near what I would have it as I can, and of such a character that I could remain with it and work with it from year to year; and also I think I represent a large number of Spiritualists. The complaint has been made, that everything has been admitted upon the spiritual platform, and the effect of this complaint is, that if you allow everything to come upon your platform, you lose the character of a spiritual organization—having nothing left but the name of it. What I have submitted suggests itself to me as a proper principle and rule to govern our action. In the first instance, there should nothing come upon our platform but what is called Spiritualism proper—its facts, theories, philosophy, demonstration. But now comes the compromise in this matter. Those whom I represent are willing to concede this much, that on the vote of two-thirds of the members of a society any speaker can be invited to speak upon any subject. I do not propose this in any captious way, for I believe that it is the principle that will be adopted throughout this country in course of time, to bring order out of chaos. We may all have our rights and yet concede something; and we will see that it will work beautifully. Here we are in this Convention; we all run one way, and under this rule of mine we can invite one speaker to speak on one thing and another on a second, so that it would be a fine thing for all of us, which I am free to confess I do not think it is at present. I therefore move that my amendment be adopted and incorporated into the rules which you propose for the government of your respective societies.

Mr. Higgins—I call for the question.

Dr. Merton—Excuse me; I hope that this amendment will

be adopted, for this particular reason, previous to the consideration of which you will observe that the principles for which we fought yesterday, and if I am not correct the secretary will correct me—these principles declared that Spiritualism included all the various relations of men; and if this be true, if Spiritualism does reach down into all the subjects that may be legitimately brought before a spiritual convention, then, my friends, see that they are not subjects which are removed from Spiritualism. These two propositions will be in such sweet and everlasting and beautiful harmony, that I do hope Judge Holbrook's amendment will be adopted. [Cheers and laughter.]

Mrs. Severance—Just one word about this. I do hope that none of you will be absurd enough, after passing unanimously that Spiritualism covered all reform, to pass this which says that it does not.

Mrs. Mills, of Illinois:

Mr. President, I am in favor of the adoption of the proposition which the Judge has just made, and although my name is on paper, I want it understood that I am in favor of free and public discussion of every subject that interests humanity, and Spiritualism embraces the whole universe. I want to state for myself wherein I differ. Four years ago I wrote some articles during the earliest days of the discussion of this question, and the first paper headed one of them, "Mrs. Mills on the Marriage Institution in Danger." I believe that he did it honestly, knowing that the whole social system was corrupt. I go farther, and say I believe that the evil laws of the country are inefficient, and are all absolute failures in controlling social relations upon the highest basis known among men, or among angels, or to God himself. Now, I want to stand fair, for I was misrepresented from one end of the country this morning. I protest to-day that our friends are unable to come forward to-day and reply to the question, "What do you call love?" Do you mean lust is a manifestation of love? I understand you to say so, and for that reason I protest. I stand here as an angel-inspired one; I stand here feeling that the social evil penetrates from the highest to the lowest, and that we have to talk this question with the world. I believe that on the summit of the blood-love plane are some of the finest women and children, because it is natural; but when you say that blood-love means that you shall gratify, as you call it, the magnetic love that is within you; if a man comes to a woman, and with all the sympathies of her soul in its native purity, she is drawn out by his magnetic influence, while he is simply gratifying his appetite, then it is lust, and I cannot stand it, and all I ask on this platform is that you will define your position. We ask Mrs. Woodhull to define her position.

Mr. Kates—I desire that we shall all understand this amendment. It says that it shall not be in order to speak in advocacy nor in opposition on those subjects which are removed from Spiritualism. Mark the language of the proposition which enumerates the general questions of politics, government, the woman suffrage movement and social freedom. It is said that Spiritualism embraces all these things. True, it does; but they are special subjects on which it shall require a two-thirds vote to allow them to be touched. The feeling of those who wish this amendment made is this: that the discussion of this social question has for the last three years occupied the time to the detriment of everything else connected with Spiritualism; to the detriment of the organic functions of the work; to the detriment of the work of organization, of societies, of employment of lecturers, and of that very thing that they wish to see started, a true, successful Children's Progressive Lyceum that you are—probably I had not better finish the sentence. I want you to understand our aim in this movement, believing that if it is successful, we of the minority can co-operate with you of the majority. If not, then we must go somewhere else. [Cheers.]

Mr. Todd—I move that we adjourn.

Withdrawn temporarily.

Mrs. Middlebrook—I hope that Spiritualists will remember that about three-fourths of the speakers on this platform are influenced by spirits, and that when they come to a place to deliver a series of lectures, it is impossible for any society, or any set of men, to tell what the subject will be upon which the speaker will enter. The proposition offered by Judge Holbrook is simply and wholly a muzzle of the worst kind. [Cheers.]

Mr. Barnum, of Michigan—I cannot vote for the proposition, for these reasons: First, I believe Spiritualism is a religion, and I understand religion to be the manner in which we live out our relations in life. Anything short of this does not cover my idea of religion. Therefore, when a Spiritualist lecturer ascends the platform to deliver an address, I say we will not put restraints about her, but let her do as she thinks best under the guidance of angel power. If the people do not wish to hear them, they may remain away. So long as I utter my own sentiments, no one has a right to say to me that I shall not do so. [Cheers.] Whether I am in sympathy with the extremes of one side or of the other, matters not; but this I do say, that I object to the proposition, and will vote against it.

Mr. Shaw—Are there two minutes left?

Chairman—Yes.

Mr. Shaw—I would simply inform the brother that this proposition does not cover the outside operations of the lecturers in the field.

Mr. Todd—I renew my motion that we adjourn; but before it is put I wish to say that when the Convention opens this afternoon, the motion will be made to add, as a sort of preamble to the body of the rules of the Association, the platform of principles adopted by the Convention yesterday. The Convention then adjourned until two o'clock.

(To be continued.)

BUSINESS EDITORIALS.

KURTZ' RESTAURANTS.

Among the many permanent institutions of the city are the several restaurants of Mr. Fred. Kurtz, located at 23 New street, 60 Broadway, 76 Maiden lane and at the corner of Fifth avenue and Ninetieth street. Undoubtedly Kurtz excels all competitors in the conduct of a first-class eating-house. Besides being thoroughly versed in stocking his store-rooms, he understands just how to please the general palate in the preparation of his dishes. Success is the best test of merit, especially in this business; and if Kurtz' merit is to be so tested, he stands pre-eminent over all other caterers. Each of the above places will accommodate from one to two hundred persons, and all of them, at almost any hour of the day, are filled. Strangers, visitors and residents will find Kurtz' the most satisfactory, as well as cheapest, first-class eating establishments in the city; while those who visit Central Park should not fail to call at the new and elegant retreat at the corner of Ninetieth street.

Send Austin Kent one dollar for his book and pamphlets on Free Love and Marriage. He has been sixteen years physically helpless, confined to his bed and chair, is poor and needs the money. You may be even more benefited by reading one of the boldest, deepest, strongest, clearest and most logical writers. You are hardly well posted on this subject till you have read Mr. Kent. You who are able add another dollar or more as charity. His address,

AUSTIN KENT, Stockholm, St. Lawrence Co., N. Y., Box 44.

APPROACHING CONFLICT—

The irrepressible issues between universal liberty and despotism to precipitate a terrible war within five years that will terminate in the overthrow of the American Republic and the establishment of a military dictatorship.

Church, State and Capital are combined, under the leadership of the Republican party, to precipitate the conflict that will end in a defeat of their aspirations, and the ultimate triumph of industry, socialism and rationalism.

The nation is slumbering upon the brink of ruin as unconsciously as the citizens of Pompeii and Herculaneum in that awful moment that preceded the belching forth of Vesuvius.

The most astounding foreshadowing of the future destiny of this nation ever issued from the press.

A book of 250 pages will be sent to any address, post-paid, for \$1.50. Liberal terms given to agents.

Address, JOHN WILLCOX,
172 and 174 Clark street, Chicago, Ill.

WHITMAN'S CANDIES AND MINERAL WATERS,
MANUFACTURED FROM THE WATERS OF THE DEEP ROCK
SPRING, OSWEGO, NEW YORK.

The testimony of the faculty is that as remedial agents these waters stand unrivaled.

Particularly efficacious in all affections of the kidneys or bladder; also beneficial in rheumatism, dyspepsia and all diseases arising from a disordered condition of the blood.

For sale on draught, or in bottle, by George A. Marble, dealer in all kinds of mineral waters, 23 Maiden lane, New York.

YEARLY CONVENTION.

The seventh annual Convention of the State Association of Kansas Spiritualists will convene at Leavenworth, on Friday, October 10, at 2 o'clock P. M., and continue three days.

Prof. Wm. Denton, Hon. Warren Chase, Mrs. Mattie Hallett Parry and others are expected to be present.

Friends from Missouri are cordially invited.

Per order, H. L. CRANE, President.
G. B. REED, Secretary.

We take great pleasure in announcing that Mrs. Addie Ballou intends coming East on a lecture tour. For the last five years this highly-gifted lady has confined her labors mainly to South and West, where her name stands foremost in the ranks of Spiritualism and reform. As she has never been East, we prophesy for her a most cordial welcome; and would recommend all spiritual societies desiring an intellectual feast to engage her without delay. All spiritual and reform societies seeking engagements with her can apply to Mr. Anthony Higgins, 151 Jersey avenue, Jersey City, N. J.

DIRECTORY OF SOCIAL FREEDOM.

We desire to present from time to time a list of the writers and speakers who advocate Social Freedom. The time is not far distant when it will be necessary that these shall know each other, and it is at the suggestion of one of the most able writers and speakers, and most earnest of them all on this subject, that we now invite names for this directory:

Francis Barry, Ravenna, Ohio.
Julia H. Severance, Milwaukee, Wis.
Thomas W. Organ, Tuscola, Ill.
Loren Hollister, Turner, Ill.
J. W. Evarts, Centralia, Ill.
Laura Cuppy Smith, care this office.
Anna M. Middlebrook, Bridgeport, Conn.
J. K. Philleo, Parkman, Ohio.
L. K. Joslin, Providence, R. I.
E. H. Heywood, Princeton, Mass.
— Heywood, Princeton, Mass.
Seward Mitchell, Cornville, Me.
Carrie Lewis, Cleveland, Ohio.
Daniel Wood, Lebanon, Me.
Jessie Goodell Steinmetz, Amherst, Mass.
Nellie L. Davis, North Billerica, Mass.
J. K. Moore, Oil City, Pa.
Mrs. M. E. B. Sawyer, 27 Milford St., Boston.
Frances Rose Mackinley, 769 Mission St., S. Francisco.
Sada Bailey, Waukegan, Ill.
James Ormsby, 127 Spring st., Milwaukee, Wis.
T. S. A. Pope, Grand Rapids, Mich.

The Most Wonderful Discovery of any Age.

PROF. D. MEEKER'S

INFALLIBLE CURE FOR THE OPIUM HABIT.

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

Address,

DRS. D. & L. MEEKER,
P. O. Drawer #75, La Porte, Ind.

ART

Should Adorn and Beautify every Home,

The Orphans' Rescue,

Engraved on Steel by J. A. J. Wilcox, from the Original Painting by Joseph John.

This beautiful picture, and one of the most thrilling sentiment, lifts the veil of materiality from beholding eyes, and reveals the guardians of the Angel World. Fancy fails to picture what is here made real through the artist's hand, and words but feebly express the responses of our soul, as we look upon the boat with its hapless freight of children, beautiful and fascinating in tragic attitude and expression—the silvery lighted angels in their descent so soft, their flight of ease and grace, their countenances radiant with love so tender, combined with energy and power as they hover near with outstretched arms to save.

In a boat as it lay in the swollen stream, two orphans were playing. It was late in the day, before the storm ceased, and the clouds, lightened of their burdens, shifted away before the wind, leaving a clear bright sky along the horizon. Unnoticed, the boat became detached from its fastenings and floated out from shore. Quickly the current carried it beyond all earthly help. Through the foaming rapids and by precipitous rocks dashed the bark with its precious charge. As it neared the brink of the fearful cataract the children were stricken with terror, and thought that death was inevitable. Suddenly there came a wondrous change in the little girl. Fright gave way to composure and resignation as, with a determined and resistless impulse that thrilled through her whole being, she grasped the rope that lay by her side, when to her surprise the boat turned, as by some unseen power, toward a quiet eddy in the stream—a little haven among the rocks. The boy, of more tender age, and not controlled by that mysterious influence, in despair fell toward his heroic sister, his little form nearly paralyzed with fear. But means of salvation calmed the "heart's wild tumult" and lighted the angry waters as the angels of rescue—they who were their parents—came to the little voyagers on waves of undying affection; when through that love which fills alike the heart of parent and child, a power was transmitted that drew the boat aside from its impending doom and lodged it in the crevice of the rocks, and they were rescued.

This Work, whether considered in its happy conception and design, or in its fine rendering in line and stipple, is a triumph in art and exalted sentiment.

Size of Sheet - - - 24x30 inches.
Engraved Surface - - - 15x19 1/2 inches.

RETAIL PRICE - - - \$3.00.

FOR SALE AT WHOLESALE AND RETAIL AT OUR PUBLISHING ROOMS.

Those who reside at a distance can remit \$3.00 and receive the Engraving securely rolled and prepaid by return mail.

Canvassing Agents find in this new work great elements of popularity and sale. Agents are wanted in every county.

R. H. CURRAN & CO.,
PUBLISHERS,

28 School St., Boston, Mass.

42

THE
"Victor" S. M. Co.'s
NEW SEWING MACHINE

"Victor"
Runs very Easy.
Runs very Fast,
Runs very Still.

HAS A NEW SHUTTLE SUPERIOR TO
ALL OTHERS.

Defies Competition.

GREAT IMPROVEMENTS IN
NEEDLE.

Cannot be Set Wrong.

AGENTS WANTED.

Address The "VICTOR" S. M. CO.,
862 Broadway, N. Y.

DR. P. J. KOONZ,
Dentist,

No. 1 GREAT JONES ST., NEAR BROADWAY,
NEW YORK.

Laughing Gas administered for the Painless Extraction of Teeth.

SPERMATORRHEA

CURED BY A SPIRIT PRESCRIPTION, AND
WARRANTED, FOR \$10.

It is an outside application. No medicine given.
Send for free circular to

DR. E. WOODRUFF,
Grand Rapids, Mich.

PROTOZONE.

THE FINEST AND MOST PERFECT
BRAIN AND NERVE
INVIGORANT IN THE
WORLD.

Physicians and others will find it wholly unequalled in all cases of illness arising from excessive or perverted sexism, even when insanity and chronic unrest have resulted. The female illnesses springing from bad magnetism, inducing amative horror and disgust, brain disturbance and exhaustion, vital depletion and suicidal thought, all yield to PROTOZONE, while barrenness, sterility and brain softening are at once relieved. There is but one place where it is made, viz.,

Protozone Laboratory,
17 CAMPBELL BLOCK,
TOLEDO, O.,

and but one agency in America, viz.,

MR. SARAH P. THOMPSON,
1 Phillips Court, Boston, Mass.

Price (single pot and flasks) - \$5.00
DISCOUNT DOZENS OR GROSS. ADDRESS AS ABOVE.

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

OFFICE HOURS,
9 to 11 A. M., 4 to 6 P. M.

PSYCHOMETRIC EXAMINATION OF DISEASE CORRECTLY
MADE FROM A LOCK OF HAIR.

SELF-CONTRADICTIONS OF THE BIBLE.

One hundred and forty-four propositions proved affirmatively and negatively from Scripture, without comment. Mailed for 25 cents. American News Co., New York.

PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD.—
UNITED RAILROADS OF NEW JERSEY
DIVISION, foot of Desbrosses street and foot of Courtlandt street.

Change of hour. Commencing Sunday, Oct. 27, 1873.
For West Philadelphia, 8 and 9:30 A. M., 12:30, 4, 5, 6, 8:30 P. M., 12 Night.

For Philadelphia via Camden, 7 A. M., 2 P. M.
THROUGH TRAINS.

9:00 A. M., Great Southern Morning Express, for Baltimore and Washington; for the West, via West Philadelphia, Baltimore, and for the South, via Baltimore, and via Washington, with Drawing Room Car attached.

9:30 A. M., Western Express for West Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and the West, with Pullman's Palace Cars, through from New York to Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne and Chicago, Columbus, Cincinnati and Louisville, and with Parlor Cars from New York to Pittsburgh.

1:00 P. M. Express for Baltimore and Washington, and for the West, via Baltimore, with Drawing Room Car attached.

*5:00 P. M. Daily Western Express, for Pittsburgh and the West, with Pullman's Palace Car, through from New York to Pittsburgh, Indianapolis, Louisville and St. Louis, to Columbus, Cincinnati and Chicago.

*7:00 P. M., Daily Western Express, for Pittsburgh and the West, with Pullman's Palace Cars, for Pittsburgh, Cincinnati and Indianapolis.

*8:30 P. M., Daily Western Express, for West Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and the West, with Pullman's Palace Cars, through without change, to Pittsburgh, Crestline, Fort Wayne and Chicago.

9:00 P. M., Daily Great Southern Evening Express for Baltimore and Washington, with Reclining Chair Cars, and with Pullman Palace Cars through from New York to Washington.

Tickets for sale at Ticket Offices, foot of Desbrosses and Cortlandt streets, and in Depot, Jersey City; and at New York Transfer Co.'s offices (Dodd's Express), No. 94 Broadway, New York, and No. 1 Court street, Brooklyn. Passengers, by leaving suitable notices at these offices, can have their baggage called for at residence or hotel, and carried through to destination.

Tickets for seats in reclining chair cars and compartment cars for sale at the Desbrosses street office.

A. J. CASSATT, F. W. JACKSON,
Gen'l Manager. Gen'l Supt.

* Daily.

Champion Cure and Liberal Institute,
AT CARVERVILLE, BUCKS COUNTY, PA.,

WILL BE OPENED FOR PATIENTS
and pupils SEPTEMBER FIFTEENTH, 1873.
The Medical Department is under the charge of Mrs. Maud C. Walker, M. D., a regularly-educated physician, of wide experience in hospital and ordinary practice. She will be assisted by S. M. Sawin, M. D., an experienced army-surgeon, educated at Conception Medical College, Chili, S. A. The Academic Department is headed by S. N. Walker, A. M., a graduate of Vermont University, to whom application for circulars should be made.

ERIE RAILWAY.—SUMMER ARRANGEMENT of trains, taking effect June 23, 1873. From Chambers Street depot (for Twenty-third street see note below.)

9 A. M.—Cincinnati and Chicago Day Express. Drawing-room Coaches to Buffalo and sleeping coaches to destination.

1 A. M.—Express mail for Buffalo and Niagara Falls. Sleeping coach to Buffalo.

7 P. M. (daily).—Cincinnati and Chicago Night Express, Sleeping Coaches through to Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Cincinnati, Detroit and Chicago without change. Trains leave for

Port Jervis 8, 9, 11 and *11:15 A. M.; 4:30, 7:30 and *7 P. M.

Goshen and Middletown, *6, 8, 11 and *11:15 A. M.; 3:45, 4:30, 7:30 and *7 P. M.

Warwick, 8, 11 A. M., and 4:30 P. M.

Newburg, 11:30, 9 and 11 A. M., and 4:30 P. M.

Suffern, *6, 8, 11 and *11:15 A. M.; 3:45, 5, 6, 7:30 and *7 P. M.

Ridgewood, Hohokus, Allendale and Ramsey's, *6, 8, 11:30, 11, *11:15 A. M.; 3:45, 5, 6, 7:30 and *7 P. M.

Paterson, *6, 6:45, 7:15, 8, 11:30, 8:45, 10, 11, *11:15, 11:30 A. M., 12 noon, *1:45, 3:45, 4, 5, 5:15, 6, *6:30, *7, 8, 10:30, and *11:30 P. M.

Newark, *6, 7:15, *8:45 and 11:30 A. M., and 8:45, 5:15, *6:30, P. M., and 12 Saturday nights only.

Rutherford Park and Passaic, 6:45, 8, 11:30, 10, 11, 11:15 A. M., Passaic only; 12 noon, *1:45, 4, 5:15, 6, *6:30, 8, 10:30 and *11:30 P. M.

Hillsdale, Hackensack and Way, 5, 8:15 and 11:45 A. M., 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 P. M., and 12 Saturday nights only.

Spring Valley and Way, 5 and 9:30 A. M., 4:45 P. M.

Englewood, 5, 8, 11 and 9:30 A. M., 1:30, 3:15, 4:15, 4:45, 5:30, 6:30 and *7:45 P. M. and 12 and Saturday nights only.

Cresskill, 5, 8, 11 and 9:30 A. M., 1:30, 3:15, 4:15, 5:30, 6:30 and *7:45 P. M., and 12 Saturday nights only.

Sparkill, 5, 8, 11 and 9:30 A. M., 1:30, 3:15, 4:15, 4:45, 5:30, 6:30 and *7:45 P. M., and 12 Saturday nights only.

Piermont and Nyack, 8, 11 and 9:30 A. M., 1:30, 3:15, 4:45, 5:30, 6:30 and *7:45 P. M. and 12 Saturday nights only.

N. B.—Trains leaving Chambers street on even or half hours leave Twenty-third street 15 minutes earlier than above time. The 5 A. M. and 12 mid. trains start from Chambers street only.

N. B.—Trains on the N. R. R. and Newark Branch leaving Chambers street on quarter hours leave Twenty-third street 30 minutes earlier than the above time.

Tickets for passage and for apartments in drawing-room and sleeping coaches can be obtained, and orders for the checking and transfer of baggage may be left at the Company's offices, 241, 529 and 957 Broadway; corner 125th street and Third avenue; 2 Court street, Brooklyn; at the Company's depots and of agents at the principal hotels.

JOHN N. ABBOTT, General Passenger Agent.

* Daily. *+ Sundays Middletown only. + Sundays only.

THE NEW MOLA!

Kate Corson's Discovery!

THE LAWS AND PRINCIPLES OF

MAGNETISM, CLAIRVOYANCE & MEDIUMISM.

This is unquestionably the most important monograph on Mediumship ever yet published in any country on the globe.

How to obtain the Phenomenon in all its phases—Conglomerate Mediumship.—New and Startling Doctrine of Mixed Identities.—A handbook of White Magic.—Explicit forms for all phases of Cabalistic Incantatory and Thaumaturgic Science and Practice.

Miss K. V. Corson, Editress and Publisher, Toledo, O.

It is requested that subscriptions for this extraordinary Treatise be in Clubs to one address, rather than by single copies, to save time and trouble in mailing, as they

COST BUT FIFTY CENTS EACH.

Synopsis:

White Magic an actual fact.—Identification of the returning dead.—Conditions essential to their reappearance. Essentials of Mediumship and Clairvoyance.—Blonde and Brunette Media.—Curious reasons. A vast discovery of inestimable importance.—Conglomerate Circles.—The Yu-Yang.—Psychic Force.—Medial-Aura.—Spanning the Gulf of Eternity.—A Spirit.—Electric People.—To get the Phenomena when alone.—Odyllic Insulation.—To form a Splendid Circle.—Double Circles and new arrangement of the sitters.—Materialization of Spirits, and how to bring it about.—The Phantom hand of Toledo.—The Spirit-room.—Machinery essential to Physical Manifestations.—An Astonishing Idea: Atrilism!—Mergement of Identities.—A dead one walks, talks, eats, drinks and does what it chooses while occupying another's body, while the latter's soul is quiescent, and consciousness and identity wholly lost! A most momentous problem, of enormous importance to every Physician, Judge, Juror, Minister, Spiritualist, husband, wife, in short to every human being. It is the most astounding thought yet evolved since Spiritualism became a fixed fact, as it accounts for much heretofore wholly unaccountable.

PART II.—How to Mesmerize.—Clairvoyance.—Psychometry, their laws and differences.—The Eastern Mystery of obtaining Seership.—The Mystical Mirror, in a drop of common ink.—To reach Clairvoyance.—The Breath-Power.—An Arab Secret.—Magnetic Spells.—"Voodooism" Black Magic.—Second Youth and how to gain it.

Single Copies, 60 cents.

CHIROPDIAL INSTITUTE.

Corns, Bunions, Ingrowing Nails, Frosted Feet and Excessive Perspiration, WARTS AND OTHER EXCRESCENCES

CURED WITHOUT PAIN BY

DR. W. E. RICE,
208 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Corner Fulton Street.

BUNIONS, NAILS, ETC., AT MODERATE RATES.

Rice's Corn, Bunion and Pile Cure sent by mail on receipt of 50 cents.

A Certain Cure if used according to directions.

FREDERICK KURTZ'S

DINING ROOMS,

23 New St. and 60 Broadway

76 Maiden Lane & 1 Liberty St.

AND

Cor. 5th ave. & 90th st.

Mr. Kurtz invites to his large and comfortably furnished dining apartments the down-town public, assuring them that they will always find there the choicest viands, served in the most elegant style, the most carefully-selected brands of wines and liquors, as well as the most prompt attention by accomplished waiters. 140

LONG ISLAND RAILROAD COMPANY.

On and after Saturday, July 26, trains will leave James Slip as follows:—Leave Thirty-fourth street, East River, 15 minutes later.

7:30 A. M.—New London express train, connecting with the steamer Sunshine, arriving at New London at 2 P. M.

7:30 A. M.—Greenport and Sag Harbor, Mail and Rockaway excursion trains.

9:30 A. M.—Port Jefferson, Locust Valley and Rockaway excursion trains.

12 M.—Rockaway express train.

12 M.—Special train for Newport, R. I., with drawing-room cars attached, stopping only at Jamaica, Mineola and Riverhead, arriving at Newport at 7 P. M.

3 P. M.—Rockaway and Hempstead express.

3:30 P. M.—Greenport, Sag Harbor and Locust Valley express trains.

5 P. M.—Port Jefferson, Locust Valley and Rockaway express trains.

6 P. M.—Northport, Locust Valley and Rockaway accommodation trains.

Trains connect at Jamaica with East New York and at Mineola with Hempstead.

Sunday trains leave Hunter's Point as follows:

9 A. M.—Port Jefferson, Northport, Locust Valley and Hempstead excursion trains.

10 A. M.—Rockaway excursion train.

1:30 P. M.—Rockaway excursion train.

7 P. M.—Northport, Rockaway and Hempstead trains.

7:30 P. M.—Rockaway accommodation trains.

TWENTY YEARS' PRACTICE.

DR. PERKINS

Can be consulted as usual at his office,
No. 9 FIFTH STREET (South Side),

OPPOSITE PUBLIC SQUARE,

KANSAS CITY, MO..

or by mail, box 1,227, on the various symptoms of Private Diseases. The afflicted will take notice that I am the only man on the American continent that can cure you of Spermatorrhea, Loss of Manhood, etc., caused by self abuse or disease. I challenge the combined medical faculty to refute the above statement by successful competition. The symptoms of disease produced by nightly seminal emissions or by excessive sexual indulgence, or by self abuse are as follows:

Loss of memory, shallow countenance, pains in the back, weakness of limbs, chronic costiveness of the bowels, confused vision, blunted intellect, loss of confidence in approaching strangers, great nervousness, fetid breath, consumption, parched tongue, and frequently insanity and death, unless combated by scientific medical aid. Reader, remember Dr. Perkins is the only man that will guarantee to cure you or refund the fee if a cure is not permanently made. Also remember that I am permanently located at No. 9 Fifth street, south, opposite the public square, Kansas City, Mo., and I have the largest medical rooms in the city. Call and see me; a friendly chat costs you nothing, and all is strictly confidential. Post box 1,227.

DR. PERKINS, Kansas City, Mo.

MRS. M. M. HARDY,
TRANCE MEDIUM,

No. 4 Concord Square,
BOSTON.

HOURS FROM 9 A. M. TO 3 P. M.

Terms (for Private Seance: in Regular Hours): \$2.00.