

WOODHULL & CLARFLIN'S WEEKLY.

PROGRESS! FREE THOUGHT! UNTRAMMELED LIVES!

BREAKING THE WAY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

Vol. IX.—No. 3.—Whole No. 211.

NEW YORK, DEC. 19, 1874.

PRICE TEN CENTS.

BY AND BY:

AN HISTORICAL ROMANCE OF THE FUTURE.

BY EDWARD MAITLAND.

BOOK IV.

CHAPTER I.

The commencement of the reign of the new Emperor of Soudan was contemporaneous with three notable events in Europe. The first concerned France.

After oscillating for centuries between a rule founded upon the ignorance of its peasant masses, namely, the rule of a priesthood that fostered and threw upon that ignorance, and a rule emanating from and sustained by the enlightened and naturally impatient denizens of its towns and cities—France found at her head one who, while inheriting the most celebrated name in her historic roll, possessed also the Conscience, through the lack of which his ancestors had failed to secure stability for their dynasty and nation.

A Napoleon had now arisen who had the courage to follow an English example, and adopt the only method that could free his country from the evil which had led to all its misfortunes. Seeing that a Henry VIII. was as necessary to complete the emancipation of France as it had been to commence the Reformation of England, this prince determined to play such a part. It is owing to this determination, and the success with which it was carried into execution, that the Gallican Church is now independent of the Papacy, its priests deriving all their honors and emoluments directly from the head of the State, with liberty to marry, and be as other citizens in interest and heart. But this is not all. The race of the Napoleons has never been an altogether unselfish one. The example of England, and his own perceptions convinced the French ruler that there could be no element of permanency in a State the bulk of whose citizens were too ignorant to comprehend the obligations of citizenship. It was not enough that Napoleon had set the Church free from Rome; he must also set the people free from the Church. The second feat was harder of execution than the first. It might suit the priests to hold their functions and benefices from a home instead of from a foreign authority; but it assuredly would not suit them to lose their own authority over their people. They declared themselves content with the change already made, and which, following English precedents, they called the Reformation. But the government was firm in its resolve not to remain behind its great neighbor in respect of that which had been the chief agent of her greatness. France must follow England in having an Emancipation as well as a Reformation. The National Church must identify itself with the National School, and the teaching in both must aim at the free development of the understanding and the conscience. This, as we know, involved the substitution of evidence and utility for authority and tradition, as the basis of all education.

I need not dwell upon the despair of the French priests in presence of the necessity thus forced upon them of going to school again to unlearn all their old habits and ideas. The government was firm with them, but it was also tender. Time was allowed. The old ones were pensioned off. The younger adapted themselves to the new *regime*. And so it has come that France now at length sees her youngest generations growing up in the enjoyment of their rational faculties rationally developed, and her institutions endowed with a stability they have never before known. Under an educational *regime* which repudiates all teaching in favor of that of experience, her ancient *Communitic Doctrinaires* have learned to regard security of individual property as the first essential of civilization. In short, France has, through the education of her people, passed out of what geologists would call the catastrophic era into the era of gradual evolution, long ago entered upon by the Anglo-Teutonic races, and to be adopted finally, as we shall see, even by the dark-skinned Turanians of Central Africa.

But France was not the last of the Celtic race to tread the inevitable path of modern civilization. Ireland remained. And it is to Ireland that the second notable event of this period relates. It was a co-ordinate of the event just described as occurring in France. Kindred alike in race and religion with France, Ireland could not long remain uninfluenced by the progress of that country. Ireland suffered France to do for her what she had persistently refused to accept from England. The essential basis of all modern civiliza-

tion consists, as cannot too often be repeated, in the early development of the popular intelligence. Ireland, preferring the priest to the schoolmaster, had kept her people in the same condition of ignorance as the peasantry of France. France emancipated, and her people educated, Ireland must not lag behind.

But Ireland had not, like France, a strong ruler to urge her onward. It had long been the policy of England to let Ireland do as she pleased, provided only she remained in close political alliance with her. Ireland might emancipate herself, and England would rejoice thereat, but could not help her: so invincible were the antagonisms of race and religion; so strong England's sense of justice and respect for the individuality of peoples.

It was in accordance with the inveterate papalism of the Irish character that even a "Protestant" Church of that country was constituted. A once famous English statesman, having acquired power by the popular sympathies which distinguished one side of his mind, used it for the gratification of the ecclesiastical tendencies which had possession of his other side. Availing himself of a period of dissatisfaction with the then existing state of the Irish branch of the National Church, he declined to wait until the public mind should be fairly enlightened, and took advantage of a political crisis to detach that branch altogether from the nation, and erect it into a sect, endowing it at the same time with a large portion of the National Church property. Thus, deprived of the fund and organization set apart by the providence of previous generations for promoting the highest welfare of the whole people, and handed over almost helpless to the two great religious parties which divided nearly the whole country between them, the progress of Ireland was for centuries put back. Her sole hope lay in the system of national education, which the British Government had already set in operation; a sorry reed to lean upon, when the two dominant parties of Catholic and Protestant Episcopalians, as they were uncouthly denominated, were equally opposed to the development of the popular mind apart from ecclesiastical traditions, and one of them could bring to bear against such development the wealth of the national establishment, with which it had been so unfairly endowed.

Spain, influenced by emancipated Italy, had long been free and her people educated. France and Ireland alone of European peoples remained beneath the shadow of the Dark Age. The former having now emerged, the latter ventured timidly to set her foot on the path of human progress.

Her leading sons said—

"Let us amalgamate the resources of all the religious sects whose principles and divisions have so long ministered to our hindrance. Let us set ourselves free from the trammels of tradition, by remodeling the churches upon the basis of the school, that we too, like Italy, like Spain, like France, and like England, may have one all-comprehending national organization, devoted to the promotion of our highest welfare, intellectual, moral and spiritual, and constituting at once the national church and the national school system of Ireland."

They could not say, Like America also. America never has possessed a national church which she could turn to account in developing the national mind. Her young, it is true, come, as a matter of course, under the beneficial influence of an education provided by the State on a broad basis; but, leaving school early, as her children almost invariably do, they find no high standard of knowledge and thought to sustain them in after life; so that America is still, so far as regards the general education and sentiment of her people, behind the European standard. Her own people, however, say that it is because they have so much land to look after, in comparison with other peoples. This may to some extent account for the defect. Too much of earth is apt to be an impediment to the cultivation of the higher nature, which regards the heaven of the ideal.

The third notable event of this time took place, not upon the arena of nations, but in a chamber in the Triangle. It was a consultation between Christmas Carol and Lord Avenil on the subject of the trigonometrical survey of Central Africa, which was being made by the Emperor of Soudan at the instance of his cousin.

The two former events were in no way connected with our story. They are referred to only for the purpose of illustrating the condition of Europe, as compared with that of its comparatively barbarous neighbor. Europe, freed from

pressure of physical circumstance, could devote herself to matters of high moral import; while Africa, as the event last named shows, was still concerned with the material elements affecting her future welfare; in short, much in the same way that a tribe of savages now existing in one part of the world represents the former condition of civilized races now existing in other parts, as Soudan represented for us very much the condition in which we were at a time not long previous to the Victorian era.

The survey in question was sufficiently complete to demonstrate the feasibility of an idea which had occurred to Criss. As it was a practical idea, and one promising vast material results, it was adopted with alacrity by Avenil. To his own surprise and delight, Avenil found himself admiring a vast conception, and encouraging a vast project, that conception and that project having originated with his dreamy and idealistic ward. As with all vast projects, it would, probably, for some time have remained a project, had not special circumstances occurred to hasten its realization.

A terrible plague broke out in Soudan, ravaging in particular the plains which extend from Lake Tchad to the mountains, and not sparing the white settlers on the hill sides. The plague was caused by the extraordinary overflow of the lake and its tributaries, which kept the surrounding country in the condition of a swamp for a much longer period than was usual. The overflow and the plague were the circumstances which hastened the execution of Criss' project. This project was nothing less than the draining of the Plateau, by converting the river Shary, the main feeder of the lake, and the lake itself, into a regular, well-ordered navigable water system, which could discharge itself into the Sahara, and either by the deposit of its sediment there form a new delta, akin to that of Egypt, or flow, a continuous river, to the sea.

On the breaking out of the plague, Criss, ever on the watch for an opportunity of being useful, had gathered a powerful staff of doctors, and transported them by the aerial transit, with all the appliances of their art, to the afflicted region. As the disease contained symptoms which were new, some little time elapsed before the precise nature of its essential poison was ascertained and the antidote found. When at length the doctors were able to work with good effect, myriads had fallen, and among them the whole family of the Hazeltines, Nannie's relations. Nannie herself escaped unharmed. Utterly forlorn, she accepted Criss' offer of a home with his friends in London, until at least her father could be communicated with. She was, accordingly, brought over, at Criss' instance, by Bertie Greathead, and consigned to the care of the Miss Avenils, while Criss remained at his post of benevolence in Central Africa.

Actuated by Criss' influence, and example, the young Emperor labored assiduously to mitigate the sufferings of his people, and entered warmly into the scheme proposed for preventing a renewal of them. He did not conceal from Criss the passionate preference which he felt for the achievements of war over those of peace; neither did he abandon his desire of vengeance on his hated neighbors, the Egyptians. But of this last he said nothing; for he saw that at present the stability of his throne depended on his following his cousin's counsel, and Criss had given him to understand that he would be no party to a war of aggression. He had not yet been crowned, nor had the sacred talisman of his race yet returned to his keeping. The quiet determination shown by Criss in respect of these jewels had served to rivet yet more firmly his influence over the Emperor.

On the approach of the anniversary of his accession, the Emperor was anxious for the ceremonial which was to complete his dignity. It was with no slight reluctance and chagrin that he adopted Criss' counsel, and issued a proclamation deferring the event for another year. "A coronation," said this document, "should be a season of universal rejoicing. The Emperor, sharing in the afflictions of his people, cannot rejoice while they are suffering, neither can he call on them to rejoice while yet smarting under recent bereavements. Let Emperor and people continue to work together for the general good, and when the plague is happily stayed, and the memory of its sorrows faded, then shall all Soudan join in a grand festival of dignity and delight."

Criss' repeated injunction to his imperial cousin was in this wise: "Do your duty up to the highest point to which it is discernible."

[To be continued.]

W. J. D. S. M. C.

LETTER FROM FRANCIS BARRY.

RAVENNA, O., Nov., '74.

TO THE MANAGING EDITOR OF WOODHULL AND CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY:

Dear Sir—I confess to not a little surprise occasioned by the reading of your article in the WEEKLY of Nov. 21, entitled "Personal and Special." I am surprised, not that Victoria Woodhull has been greatly persecuted, but that she has met any serious inconvenience from the source to which you refer. The opposition from that quarter has been managed with such reckless disregard of good sense and common propriety as to excite only disgust, or at best only pity on the part of right-minded and honorable persons for the unfortunate actor. It is but a poor compliment to humanity if such means as have been made use of in this case can have any other than a reactive influence. Whatever may be true of other classes, it is certain that the free lovers of the country are better friends of Victoria Woodhull to-day than they were before these efforts were put forth. Some of them, to my knowledge, who were disposed to criticise her are now inclined to hold their criticisms in abeyance till they see whether she is to be foully assailed, or treated as an honorable opponent by such as disbelieve, in greater or less degree, in her or in her doctrines.

Accustomed as I am to indulge in great freedom, and, perhaps, severity of criticism, unwarrantably so, doubtless, in the estimation of many, I have criticised Victoria Woodhull as I would Wendell Phillips or President Grant, and in criticising her I have thought of her, not as a persecuted woman, but as a powerful leader, with more enthusiastic friends at her back than were ever before won by a radical reformer. I have no new opinions and no apologies to offer, except for those who have misunderstood me. And it is, perhaps, of very little consequence to others where I stand. It is, however, of a good deal of consequence to me; and I wish all interested in my whereabouts to clearly understand that whenever a woman's private life is assailed, whoever or whatever she may be, or whatever the motives of the assailant, that the outraged party shall have such sympathy and the assailant such execration as I am able to bestow.

I have not a word to say in defense of anything with which Victoria Woodhull has been charged. So far as these charges refer to matters in which the public have any concern, and which may have an important bearing upon the interests of reform, I have been and am still impatiently waiting the proof, but so far as they relate to alleged delinquencies in private life I am a disbeliever, for the reason that every person must be held innocent till proved guilty; and I must for ever remain a disbeliever, for I will listen to no proof, for the reason that it is not a proper subject to investigate.

Prostitution of any sort or degree is not to be practiced or defended for one moment, but no woman can be convicted of prostitution except on her own testimony. Aside from her own testimony no one knows whether she loves or loathes. So the woman charged with prostitution shall escape conviction for want of competent witnesses against her. But whatever he may know who makes the charge, if he has ever sought the embrace of a woman he did not love, or looked upon a woman to lust after her, or worse, indulged the unnatural gratification of his passion, he must go down from the witness stand!

The advocates of marriage should be wary of charging a free woman with being a prostitute. While the presumption is that a married woman is a prostitute, the presumption is that a free woman is not a prostitute. If a free woman is a prostitute, or a married woman is not a prostitute, in either case she constitutes an exception to the rule. Prostitution is to be opposed by every legitimate means in our power, but the only effective way to uproot the evil is to abolish marriage, and in abolishing it secure the universal emancipation of woman.

In conclusion, whatever may be accomplished in the way of depriving Victoria Woodhull or her paper of popular support, whoever contributes to such a result by the means indicated, will find no place among the believers in the sanctity of private life. It is not a question of motives, but if such ever dream of securing the approval of the advocates of freedom they will find they have made a grievous mistake. The central principles of freedom are too clearly perceived and too deeply cherished to admit of the forgiveness and reinstatement of such as have been so egregiously blind to them.

QUESTIONS FOR THE LAW AND THE LEGISLATURE TO SETTLE.

BY WARREN CHASE.

Are all wives, husbands and married parties under the law, the same as Theodore Tilton and Elizabeth? If so, then we would ask: What was or is the real amount of property Theodore owned in the person of Elizabeth? Was it the full value of her person or only a part? Was it her whole person or only some organs? Did she own any part of herself or any of her organs? Could she legally blow her nose or clean her teeth without his consent? Was this property damaged to the amount of \$100,000 by Henry Ward Beecher? Would her consent to the damage or trespass make any difference in the loss to Theodore? Had she a right or not to give her consent? If she had not, had she a right to give the consent in the first instance to the sale or transfer of her person to Tilton? Or did other parties sell or give her to him? How came he by the title to property in her? Was it a legal sale and transfer? Was the property ever damaged by Theodore? Or had he a right to damage it? Did Mr. Beecher damage it to the amount charged, and is it since worthless, or is there still left some property in the person of Elizabeth? and if the latter, who is the owner now of what is left? Does the marriage law recognize the right of property in a wife with title in the husband? If not, how can Tilton recover damage in money value? If so, how does it differ from slavery, except in the first consent to transfer and sale by the girl or woman? If Mrs. Tilton did not own herself how could she own her children? Did not her owner own them also by law? If

she was his property is she not his yet (what there is left of her), and can he not legally compel her to come back to his jurisdiction? How has he lost the right of property in her? Did Mr. Beecher know he was trespassing (if he did) in the property of Theodore, or did he think she owned her own body and had a right to control it? Did he apply to her as owner and get her consent to its use (if the charges are true), or did he know that marriage conveyed the person and body of the wife to the husband legally? Did the acts charged damage the person more or differently than they would if she had been B.'s wife or nobody's wife? Did the trespass damage physically or only morally? If only morally, how can the damage be estimated in dollars? Did the acts charged also damage Mr. Beecher, and how? The same as they did Tilton or Elizabeth, or differently from either? If Tilton were guilty of the same acts as Beecher, would it exculpate either Beecher or Elizabeth? Could she collect for any trespass on Theodore or on herself, if she consented to the trespass in either case? Could Mrs. Beecher recover damage to her husband if he was allured, enticed, coaxed, or gave way to entreaty? Has Mrs. B. any part in the controversy? We are not particularly interested in these parties, but we are in the principles, and when these questions are legally answered we have more to ask on the subject.

TOLD IN A KISS.

BY EBEN E. REXFORD.

Darling, come here, while the twilight falls,
And the whip-poor-will in the shadow calls.

Come, my darling, and, sitting here
In the sweetest season of all the year,

And the sweetest hour of all the day,
Hear what it is that I have to say.

Darling, I love you, but words are weak;
What my heart is feeling it cannot speak.

When the heart is full of a love like mine
It is told in a language of touch and sign.

A glance from the eye, or a touch of hand,
And the heart it is told to understand.

But the tenderest thoughts of a love like this
Must tell themselves in a long, sweet kiss.

Such tender things as I have to tell!
Listen, darling, and heed me well.

I shall always love you! Such love as mine
Grows stronger and richer like rare old wine.

*It will be an elixir to keep your youth;
True love is a wonderful thing, in truth.*

*And those who have it will never know
What it is to be old, though their hair is snow.*

Darling, the depths of my soul are stirred
By a thought so tender, I know no word

To tell it to you, so read my eyes;
Do you catch its meaning, darling, wise?

Can I make it clearer by clasp of hand?
Tell me, love, do you understand?

I fear you do not! O, sweet, bend near,
While I tell you my thought in the twilight here—

The thought too subtle for word or sign,
That you must find out from the lips of mine.

What thought can be sweeter, love, than this
That I tell you in a lover's kiss?

SIXOCTON Wis., 1874.

THE WICKEDNESS OF THE LAW.

PROVIDENCE, Nov. 23, 1874.

The law, it is claimed, is the culmination of justice. But I doubt it, for it is partial. It not only turns aside for wealth and respectability, as the world defines that word, but it violates the rights of one-half of those who are held amenable to it—the female portion of the community everywhere. I do not propose to discuss or illustrate the general question, only a particular phase. We have in Rhode Island a State constabulary, the outcome of the prohibitive liquor law, who are charged with enforcing that law, also that forbidding prostitution and gambling. In the exercises of their powers they have made raids on three or four alleged houses of prostitution, arresting the keepers and inmates, consigning them to the lock-up for the night to be arraigned before a legal tribunal the next morning. In most cases men are found present, but they are never shut up; no locks and bars ever intervene between them and liberty, and no tribunal passes upon their cases. Oh, no; the male prostitutes go free. Nor is this all their immunity. When the raid is chronicled the next morning the names of all the girls are parade, at full length, coupled with some mean epithet, such as "soiled doves." "Soiled doves!" who soiled the "doves?" Not themselves. There was another party, of the male gender, and for him there is no epithet, no lashings, no law. He may make "soiled doves" *ad libitum*, and go unscathed. But the girls, they must be held up as objects for the "slow unmovable finger of scorn" to point at, and be put before the court as "lewd, wanton and lascivious persons," to be sent to prison for a longer or shorter term. Society says amen, and the Church says served them right, though within its fold are numerous moral-male lepers as guilty as those females declared to be "lewd, wanton and lascivious." Why is it that this charge is always laid to females? Why not in justice seize males, notably those in the houses of ill-fame when raids are made. Then how is it with that other class of males who lie in wait for girls in the streets, treacherous tigers seeking their prey. It is notorious that there are such men, veritable "street walkers," though the law and its officers only find female "night-walkers." Let me give an instance as related to me by a young lady of this city. She was passing up one of our main thoroughfares, High street, a few Sunday evenings ago to church when she noticed a man, well known to her by sight, following her, evidently purposely. She slackened her pace somewhat, thinking he would pass her, which he did, asking

her as he passed, "Can you tell me the way to Bridgham street?" when she replied, "Keep ahead," in a tone which gave him to understand she apprehended his object. He was on a street he had traveled over thousands of times. He knew where Bridgham street was, for he lived for years in the immediate vicinity. There was no mistaking his intent; yet he is a very "respectable" man; has been prominent in the politics of the city and State, having once presided over the Common Council of the city and been at the head of a military department of the State. He was seeking an opportunity to make a "soiled dove," and should be classed as a night or "street walker," and receive the same treatment at the hand of the law as the other sex. This discussion of the social question in all its length and breadth has not come a moment too soon. It is in vain that we seek to remove evils until we strike at the cause. We may work at the surface for ages and be fruitless in results. But when we go to the root of the matter and cease to make females exclusively the victims, but recognize the fact that there are male "prostitutes," "night-walkers," and rightfully to be put in the category of "lewd, wanton and lascivious persons," there will be some hope of reform—not before.

WILLIAM FOSTER, JR.

MARRIAGE is peculiarly an institution of time, as free love or familyhood in the large sense, is of eternity. Under the limitation of sin and death—the penitentiary experience of the apostasy—man naturally assumes narrow ties and seeks the consolation of exclusive possession; but let him catch the first breath of sympathy with the resurrection and rise where he can look beyond the bounds of mortality, and he involuntarily sheds the aptitude that is satisfied with such conditions; and sees only in the future a boundless world of love and improvement in the free family of God.—*Oneida Circular*.

SPIRIT OF THE PRESS AND COMMENTS.

What does the *Herald* mean by such language as this which we copy from its issue of the 28th of November:

FAILURE OF NEGRO SUFFRAGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

It is an illogical and unwarrantable inference from the bad effects of negro suffrage in the federal district to argue, as some of our contemporaries are doing, that its failure there proves its inexpediency in the Southern States. And yet the argument has an air of superficial plausibility. The negroes of Washington are probably more intelligent than the average of their race. Most of them were bred in Maryland and Virginia, where slavery was least oppressive. They were the earliest of the negroes to come into possession of civil and political rights, and are presumed to have had superior guidance from friendly whites interested in their welfare. But the Washington local government, founded on their suffrage, proved to be one of the most corrupt and scandalous that ever existed, and Congress was compelled to abolish it and substitute a government from which the will of the people as expressed in elections is excluded. If the comparatively intelligent negroes of Washington cannot be trusted with the elective franchise, the argument is specious and plausible which infers the necessity of also taking it away from the negroes of the Gulf States.

Does the *Herald* mean by this to open the question of general disfranchisement of the negroes? Does it wish to be understood as holding that there can be such a question? "The necessity of taking it away from the negroes of the Gulf States," when we know that necessity in political parlance means only the desires of politicians. Of course the *Herald* says it is an illogical and unwarrantable inference, etc.; but is this not an excuse to broach the question and to make it appear to the people, who know nothing of Constitutional Law, that such an act is possible, provided it should be thought advisable? Besides the *Herald* ought to know, if it do not, that the corruptions in Washington are no more to be attributed to the negroes there than are the corruptions of New York to be attributed to the negroes here. Instead of entering upon the argument, if the *Herald* wanted to express an opinion at all, why did it not say that it would be impossible to take the suffrage away from negroes; that it belongs to them by right of Constitutional Law, which can never be abrogated without another revolution. That "some of our contemporaries" are meddling with this matter is a sufficient warning to the people of the country that the victorious Democracy may mean mischief if they get the reins of government into their hands.

The *Herald* of the same issue also informs us that "there are six hundred and seventy-one women in Paris who sit as models for painters and sculptors, aged from sixteen to twenty years."

We clip the following significant item from the *Sun* of the 30th ult.:

"Those who wish to believe in the innocence of Mr. Beecher must have had their faith sorely tried by reading in Saturday's papers the discussion in the Brooklyn City Court between Mr. Morris, Mr. Tilton's counsel, and Mr. District Attorney Winslow. The question was whether Tilton should be tried upon the indictment for slandering Mr. Beecher, and while his counsel was earnest in his demand for instant or immediate trial, the District Attorney was equally earnest in his endeavor to have the case delayed. Mr. Winslow, it must be remembered, was one of the gentlemen selected by Mr. Beecher to conduct an inquiry and report upon this subject, and his present strange conduct in preventing an early trial of the indictment by a regular court, is very injurious in its bearing upon Mr. Beecher."

It will also be remembered that it was this same District Attorney, according to Mr. Tilton's statement, who endeavored in every possible way, after the appointment and convening of the council referred to, to so arrange with Mr. Tilton as to prevent him from appearing before it to make his full statement. All these facts, it cannot be denied, bear hard upon the supposition of a belief, even in the minds of his friends, of Mr. Beecher's innocence of the charges against him. In fact, does not each man who composed that famous council of investigation know that Mr. Beecher is not innocent, and are making use of all possible means to cover up the facts? And may it not also come out, after all, that all the defense that has been made has been so made by these friends to cover themselves rather than to exonerate Mr.

Beecher; and further yet, that Mr. Beecher has long since prepared a complete statement and justification of his conduct, which while being such a justification is also an unanswerable argument of the doctrine of individual freedom, sexually? If such should prove to be the case it would be in perfect keeping with Mr. Beecher's general course about and manner of conducting reformatory advocacy. Instance his position upon the Sunday question now. Some years ago he was not willing to defend, before a council of Congregational ministers, a brother minister who, partially at least by his own advice, had advocated the running of street cars on Sunday, and by not doing so, had the young and promising minister degraded from the "brotherhood." Now, however, he feels certain enough to even advocate Sunday theatricals and concerts, but takes care to hedge sufficiently to have a safe retreat, at the expense of all logic and consistency, however, as the reader may see by the following, which is from his sermon of November 29, as reported in the *Herald* and *Sun*:

If there be anything that Paul teaches, it is that a man is free to keep a day or not keep it, whether it be feast day, fast day, or Sabbath. The question of a truth, or of a custom, stands differently. A truth or a principle does not depend for its existence on legislation or common consent, but a custom does. Justice, humanity, faith, must derive no part of their virtue from the church, but customs springing from these may be determined by churches for themselves, and by communities for themselves. Any given church may determine its reverence for a day for itself or a community for itself. As regards the Lord's day, the existence of, or authority for, such a day may be left to divines for discussion, but what people may do on this day must be left to the people themselves. The common people must observe the day according to their judgment. It must be a delight to them, it must be made honorable in their sight, or they will override it. The Sunday question ought to be argued wisely so as to receive the sympathy of our fellow citizens. It ought not to be a question between the church folks and the world folks. The Sabbath is a national day in its Jewish origin. It is now taken by law out of the category of secular days, and if it was in the power of legislation to take it out of secular days, it is also in its power to put it back. If those who are prosperous therefore make Sunday a day of rigor, and if the less favored people find it not a day of easement, and a day when the belt is buckled up two or three holes more instead of relaxed, it will end in a revolt and an abolition of it. You must make it approve itself by its humanity, and make it a day of delight. Many of those who come to our shores have been taught to observe Sunday in one way, and we must settle the question without repugnances and disturbances. All social or economic questions will be settled by the wants of the people. Consider the history of fact. When New England was first settled, our forefathers thought that the church and the magistrate should control everybody on that day. That passed away as something that could not bear the light of liberty. Mr. Beecher then detailed the different epochs when questions as to travel, the running of stages, the cooking, the trading, and so forth on Sunday was held in dispute, and in the province of the law to regulate, and how they had occupied the public mind and passed away. Stages run now on Sunday if it pays, and don't run if it does not pay. Now, in all these things men see only a relaxation of conscience. "I see," said Mr. Beecher, "a growing humanity that the common people believe that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. Common sense is regulating things. Those things that play on the animal passions should not be tolerated on Sunday, and will not be, and on the other hand, those things which do not tend to animalize shall be tolerated. The authority for a Sunday is derived from a conviction that it is a public good, that it benefits the community. This should be the teaching. I do not pretend that it is not difficult to regulate the observance of Sunday; but these questions will be settled empirically, not philosophically. We have to avoid extreme views. On the side of the Church, of arbitrary custom and mischievous ordinances. It should be for the Church to take care of its own members—to seek to make the Lord's day delightful and honorable. I know it is part of the doctrine of human depravity that the Lord's day cannot be made pleasant, and the dry doctrines and juiceless sermons are justified in this way. We go to church under this doctrine largely because it is conventional. They go because they must, and the church drones, drones, and drones, and it is demoralizing. It is the duty of every family to make the Lord's day the most delightful of the week."

It is for secular reasons that the Legislature meddles with religion. It defends the Sunday, and does not ordain it. We may call upon the legislature to defend the day, but beyond that we can't go.

Some men think I tend too much to liberalism. I am not a monk. I am not a medievalist. To me Christianity is sweetness, hope, good news. Oh, good news! Religion is love to God—love with head up and heart open, love with the confidence of children. My thought of religion is that a soul shall come all a blossom, bloom, rejoice, radiate. Go to church and be social—not as ghosts. Ask about the neighbor and the family. Come smiling, come cheerful, come with good feelings. One of the effects of the church is to make Sunday a social day, as it should be, in the family. I remember very well when I waked up on Sunday morning once and my brother Charles lay in the trundle bed near by me. I began to make rabbits out of the cotton in the bedquilt, and the thought flashed across me that it was Sunday. "Charles," I said, "it's Sunday." We ducked down under the coverlid and blanket, and expected to be struck dead. Shut up a child like I was, mercurial, nervous, changeable, in a house on Sunday, oh, how gloomy! I looked at the flies, ate gingerbread and cake, tried to read a book I never could understand. My father was too busy to attend to children, and my second mother was good but severe, and my Sunday was the gloomiest day of all the week. How I watched for the sun to go down. I stood by the large dining room window and watched the great red orb descend, and it never seemed to be so lazy as on that day, and when its glimmer was gone I jumped and cried, "Sunday's gone! Sunday's gone! Sunday's gone!"

I teach that the Lord's day should be social, and I say that cultivation of the social feelings, in any way a purification, a cleansing, is part of the day. The best thing that you could do for tenement people is to rout them out into the parks and into the sunlight. I go for humanity, and so I go for the honor any glory of God.

I am asked if I do not consider it a good thing to bring in concerts, theatres and such like places. I say no, I do not. Why should it not be? Why have they not the same right to get inside of a public building and play "Hamlet," providing they do not interfere with anybody else? They have as much right to do that as I have to preach about Calvin. Why not Strakosch give his opera, and why not let him go to the Academy and give opera? He may. At present the law says he cannot. What right have you to make this law, providing those people do not interfere with any one else's liberty? Why have they not the right to observe Sunday in their way? I do not see any ground on which you can restrain them."

How Sunday can be a day to be observed according to the various judgments of the people, and also one upon which every sort of things should not be tolerated, is a paradox which we cannot comprehend. It may however be consistent with Mr. Beecher's kind of consistency to which he has just as

good a right as others have to their kind. If Mr. Beecher sees a growing humanity in the stages, street cars, working and trading on Sunday, which he did not see years ago, may we not hope that the time may come when he will also see humanity in the theatres and concerts.

MR. BEECHER A READER OF LEIGH HUNT.

To the Editor of the Sun:

SIR—You have already pointed out several coincidences in the Beecher letters with passages from other writers, but the most remarkable one, I think, will be found in Leigh Hunt's story of "Rimini." If the following had not been written long ago, it would pass for a new versification of Mr. Beecher's celebrated monumental scene:

Thus lay she praying, upwardly intent,
Like a fair statue on a monument.
With her two trembling hands together prest,
Palm against palm, and pointing from her breast.

—Canto iv.

Is Mr. Beecher a plagiarist?

A. B.

We find the following account of the Spiritualistic Conference on Sunday at the Harvard Rooms in the *Herald*:

The next speaker was a portly and solid-looking gentleman with gray hair announced as Professor Hume, and was warmly received. He said that Spiritualism was making tremendous progress all over the world. Some of the most influential newspapers in the country—at Chicago, Washington, Springfield and in this city—were furthering the cause of Spiritualism and its investigation. There were but few real Christians, as Christianity is understood, and sham Christianity was all-pervading. Science, through such men as Huxley and Tyndall, was achieving wonders, and Spiritualism welcomed science with open arms.

The history in the Bible represented but a speck of time, and there was not any Bible of any account until within 100 years. The basis of Christianity existed in all other religious systems, and it was nonsense and a shame to talk of Christ as a divinity. He was the same kind of medium to the Jews that Socrates was to the Greeks, Confucius to the Chinese and Mohammed to the Turks. In many things the Mohammedan faith was an improvement on Christianity, and for one reason, that it was a later development—600 years later. The Egyptians, the greatest of all peoples, adored a bull. Apis and Isis. The Greeks, succeeding them, pictured a god in the shape of a man, Jupiter, and Phidias wrought for them a host of gods and goddesses—Mars, Venus, Pallas, Minerva, Vesta and others—and the Christian mythology was only a copy of these systems. Spiritualism is the only thing to unite mankind and make them dwell in peace together. Look at the tremendous struggle that is now going on in Europe between Gladstone and Archbishop Manning, and look at Protestant and Catholic pitched against each other as most deadly foes. It is true that Roman Catholicism had raised the white banner of Spiritualism, and it was its chief strength; but our Spiritualism contained everything to perfect mankind. (Applause.) Talk about the world being only 6,000 years old and denounce Darwin because he said that man came from the monkey. Why, geologists can prove by the stones taken from the bowels of the earth that man came from a cell or a globule living in the molusk, and the world of the Bible was but a page of the immeasurable space of time. In all religious systems there was conflict but in Spiritualism. The Shiite and Sunite among the Mohammedans were in interminable conflict, and there were two bitterly opposing parties in the Greek Church; but in Spiritualism there was a breadth and freedom and charity found in no other system. (Applause.)

A SPIRITUALIST ON THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

Mrs. Dr. Hallock, a tall, pale-faced and intellectual-looking lady, was the next speaker. She said that she was opposed to all kinds of dogmatism and intolerance, and churchianity, if the word could be used. Mrs. Hallock said that there would be perfect freedom in all discussion on her spiritual platform. She had received testimony, as a medium, in regard to the immaculate conception, and she could not say that the doctrine was false or that it was true. Yet the inspiration she had received from the other world was in favor of the immaculate conception, but not as Protestants believed the doctrine to be taught. Some Protestants thought that the conception without sin referred to the birth of Christ through Mary the Virgin, but she believed that it referred to the conception of the Virgin herself. Agaasiz and his school differed from Huxley and Tyndall. She had been informed by the spirits that the race which now lived on the earth had in past times come from an entirely different planet, and that the race had degenerated. She believed that there was coming on earth a race of women, perhaps of American women, who would conceive as St. Ann had, in the same way, without sin and without the co-operation of man, and there would be other Christs conceived by this improved race of women. There was too much domination by man; there was too much of the male aristocracy, and women should be allowed to come on the spiritual platform and assert their independent views.

The speaker had been actively engaged among the working women, who had sought to benefit themselves by co-operation, and she had been spoken of as a free lover, and poor women who had met together to take counsel had been compelled to forsake their associates because they could not get work and were marked as having been seen talking with respectable persons, forsooth. The male autocracy was everywhere dominant, and the title of free lover was held over the head of any person who dared to have any independent intelligence as a free woman. She hoped that no such spirit would ever prevail among the men who came to discuss Spiritualism. (Applause.)

We have no intention of entering at this time upon a discussion of the meaning of the Immaculate Conception, but we wish merely to suggest to Mrs. Hallock and to Spiritualists and Christians, whether an Immaculate Conception is not a conception which is perfectly pure, resulting in the birth of a perfect child, physically, mentally and morally; such a birth as Christ's must have been, if we admit that there was such a person with such a life. We state it as an unanswerable fact, that when children shall be conceived in perfectly pure conditions, of pure parents, that they will all be Christs as Jesus was. Our doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is that Jesus was born of a perfectly pure conception, and that the father of the child must have been either a perfectly pure man or a materialized spirit, probably the latter, and that the paternity will yet be established beyond a doubt.

We are obliged to the *Sunday Mercury* for the following evidence of a growing humanity which will protect itself against the hypocritical pretensions of people who profess but who do not possess, Christ. Had Jesus been on the steamer he would have stood by the captain, and against his self-constituted representatives:

The steamer Parthia, at this port, Friday, from Liverpool, brought among her other passengers the well-known Miss Josie Mansfield. She embarked at Liverpool the same as the other cabin passengers, without making herself at all conspicuous. She was dressed well, and had about her all the indications of wealth. Her entrance upon the ship at Liverpool was unnoticed. Soon after the steamer left port, how-

ever, many of the ladies on board became aware of the party who was their fellow-passenger, and thereupon a question was raised as to the possibility of sitting down to the same table with her. The feminine portion of this small community decided that morality would be outraged should Josie be allowed to meet them on a common ground. Opinions ran high and words were the consequence, and words might have ended the matter if a champion had not appeared to sustain the character of the sex. This was a director of the Erie Railway Company returning from London after an effort to negotiate a loan for that company. He met the fair Josie upon the ship, and he felt that not only his own, but the reputations of all on board, might suffer if she was allowed to mingle indiscriminately with the passengers. Full of the importance of his duties to himself and society in general, he objected to her presence. It so happened that Captain Watson, commanding the Parthia, together with this gentleman, Miss Mansfield, and others, occupied the same table, and the champion of morality seized upon this circumstance to ventilate his opinion as to what was and what should be. The second day out he opened his campaign, and at the table he addressed himself to his wife, informing her that her present companions were unworthy of her, and gave her strict injunctions that though the companionship she met with was to a certain extent compulsory, she should beware how she carried the acquaintance beyond the saloon. So matters went on, but Miss Josie Mansfield having a much greater knowledge of the world than most of her shipmates, continued the even tenor of her way, and noticed nobody. She came and went with lady-like grace, and allowed nothing to disturb her serenity. This action on her part inflamed all the dames who were present, but none of them expressed their indignation either so loud or so deep as the gentleman referred to. He referred to Miss Mansfield again at the table, and spoke of the impertinence of persons who had lost their reputations, forcing themselves upon persons whose reputations were intact.

Captain Watson, who commanded the ship, heard all, and thinking the end would soon come, he allowed the gentleman to continue. He, however, disappointed him, for instead of stopping he continued. Finally, when he said "damn," the patience of the captain was exhausted, and rising from the table said: "I have heard enough of this. I am going on deck shortly, and if you have anything more to say, you will please say it to me personally there."

When the captain left the table and went on deck the champion followed him. Upon meeting aft the captain said: "I have heard all I want." "I suppose you have," was the reply; "I am glad that you think the same as I do."

"Sir," replied Captain Watson, "I know nothing of your opinions, nor do I know or even want to know what they are based upon. I wish to say, however, that all my passengers are entitled to all the protection I can afford them, irrespective of who they are or who they may be. It is sufficient for me to know that they are my passengers."

Says the gentleman: "But this woman is a fallen one; she was the mistress of Jim Fisk, can we associate with her? Is it possible that we can meet her day after day in the saloon, and not be contaminated?" "My dear sir," answered Captain Watson, "Miss Mansfield has so far conducted herself equal to any other lady on board, and until she acts otherwise I will protect her the same as I would any other lady; be careful, then, that you do not trespass upon her rights. I would recommend, sir, that you go below."

The self-appointed champion went below, but from that day until the steamer arrived at this port no outward opposition was made to Miss Josie Mansfield.

[From the Santa Barbara Index.]

MRS. VAN COTT'S MISFORTUNE.

Mrs. M. Van Cott, the great revivalist, who has done so much for the Church, lately applied to the Methodist Bishop of San Francisco for ordination.

Says Mrs. Van Cott: "During the last year, through my labors, I have brought one thousand seven hundred and thirty-five persons into the Church. Have I not shown my capacity to fill the position?"

"Certainly," says the Bishop, "you have."

Says Mrs. Van Cott: "In order to accomplish these conversions I have traveled, in one year, 7,208 miles. Have I not shown my capacity to bear fatigue and exposure, and to renounce temporal comforts, in laboring for the faith?"

"Yes," says the Bishop, "you have."

Says Mrs. Van Cott: "In the prosecution of my ministerial work I have written, in one year, 650 letters; and I have attended 828 religious meetings; and I have preached 399 sermons. Could more be asked? What man of you all has done more than this?"

"None," says the Bishop. "None."

Says Mrs. Van Cott: "I have spent 1,776 hours in religious meetings during one year. Has any minister in the land exhibited a greater zeal and a more devoted steadfastness in the faith?"

"None," says the Bishop. "None. You have traveled and written and prayed and preached; and 1,735 persons, received through your ministrations into the Church, bear living and joyful testimony to your power in converting sinners to Christ and saving souls from damnation; but—but—you are a—"

The Bishop paused.

"Speak! speak!" said Mrs. Van Cott. "Say what I am, that should keep me from doing the work of my God and Saviour?"

Said the Bishop: "You—you—Mrs. Van Cott, are a—you are—"

"Oh, go on," said Mrs. Van Cott. "Do not hesitate to tell me what is the terrible thing you would name. Go on. What terrible crime have I committed, that you should disqualify me for Christ's work? Speak—name it—and I will withdraw my supplication."

Said the Bishop: "I will not ordain you. You are a—"

"What am I?" said Mrs. Van Cott. "Out with it. Speak like a man. Name my crime."

"Oh!" said the Bishop, "it is no crime—no crime, I suppose, Mrs. Van Cott, but only a terrible misfortune."

"Oh! name my misfortune, then," said Mrs. Van Cott. "If it is one that debars me from ordination to do the work of my Heavenly Master, then, indeed, is it a misfortune; but I will bear it. Name it, and through Christ's help, I will bear it."

"I will not ordain you," said the Bishop. "You are—you are—God give me strength to speak it! You are—a—WOMAN!"

A DISMISSED colored grand jurymen soliloquized: "I don't understand this business. Looks to me like natural for a man what's in trouble to git his friends on de grand jury if he kin. I reckon if de old Judge hisself was in a tight place, and had to go fore de grand jury, he'd be mighty glad to have his friends on dar."

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.

All communications, business or editorial, must be addressed

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.

Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly,

Box 2791, New York City.

Office, 111 Nassau Street, Room 9.



"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, DEC. 19, 1874.

A NEW AND IMPORTANT PROJECT.

Since the announcement of the sudden and untimely illness of the editor-in-chief of the WEEKLY, and its consequent danger from the failure of her pecuniary contributions to its support, there have been several communications from different parties regarding methods by which the WEEKLY may be put upon a safe basis without being dependent upon her personal exertions. We have long felt the desirability of some such movement being inaugurated, but could not very well suggest it to our friends. We hope, now that the subject has been broached, that everybody who has any suggestions to offer upon the matter may put them in form and send them in. If there should be any such general expression as to give promise of a successful movement, we shall be glad to publish the several propositions at the proper time. We have devoted all that we have and are to this cause; we live only to advance it, and whatever aid our exertions call forth from its friends will be so much given to its promotion. We feel confident that there are enough persons in the country sufficiently interested, and who are able to place the organ of human redemption where no shaft from its enemies will be able to reach it, and thus enable us to devote more of our time to making it a better paper than we have been able to do for the last year.

A THOUSAND DOLLARS.

We need a thousand dollars to bridge over the chasm caused by the untimely illness of Mrs. Woodhull and the consequent compulsory suspension of her lectures, which make it impossible for her to defray the current expenses of the WEEKLY over its receipts.

The following has been received already:

Previously reported	\$143 00
R. M., Aurora, Ill.	5 00
L. M. and M. S. S., Painesville, O.	10 00
G. B. and L. A. S., " "	10 00
T. G. S., " "	1 00
N. T. Cunningham, Mass.	2 00
H. H. M., Springfield, Vt.	5 00
E. K., W. Campton, N. H.	2 00
E. H., Cleveland, O.	1 00
E. T., Detroit, Mich.	1 00
A. V. H., Brooklyn, N. Y.	3 00
H. G., Bunker Hill, Ill.	3 00
C. C. K., Greenwich, R. I.	1 00
D. W., Lebanon, Me.	1 00
Mr. and Mrs. A. G., Charlestown, Mass. .	5 00
A. P. McC., Havre de Grace, Md.	1 00
L. G., Norristown, Pa.	1 00

Total..... \$209 00

Who shall be the next to rally to the support of the greatest, grandest and most glorious cause that was ever advanced in the world—a cause that when gained will result in peopling the earth with a race of perfect men and women, physically, mentally and morally?

THE ALTERNATIVE.

It is unnecessary that we should say that we regret, beyond the power of language to express, the necessity that compels us to reduce the size of the WEEKLY from sixteen to eight pages. We have plainly stated the conditions upon which it has been sustained for the last six months, and upon which it might be continued: but the responses to this statement have not been anything like adequate to its demands; and we have, therefore, only to choose between the alternatives of temporarily suspending the WEEKLY, or of reducing its size, and consequently its expense. These alternatives would not have been presented if we had continued able to maintain the WEEKLY as heretofore. We gladly devoted our labors to doing so as long as we could. When a serious sickness came, compelling a cessation of our labors, for a time altogether, with the prospect of a long season of light work being a necessity to ultimate restoration, we knew that something had to be done—that a crisis had arrived—and we could not and did not hesitate to communicate the facts to its readers.

But crises in the history of reformatory and radical journals are nothing new. Very recently several thus called papers were compelled to ask their supporters to contribute largely to cover the distress caused by large fires. We have had a something worse than a fire sweeping over us during the last year. We have had a mass of filthy, base, unnatural, slimy, devilish, infamous lies—lies absolute and unconditional; or such a falsification of facts as to make them worse than lies—deluging the country. The real instigators of this hellish conspiracy to destroy the WEEKLY—for that is the animus back of all—have long been, desiring to perform "their mission;" but it was only until recently that they could find a tool so low and brutal—brutalized by long-continued unnatural practices—as to be used for the figure-head for such an infamy. This, falling as it has, in a season and year when the general condition of the country of itself is compelling many journals to cease publication, and, as we know, largely reducing the circulation of even the most popular periodicals, together with a nearly fatal sickness, has precipitated the present exigency. By itself we could have bid defiance to the unnatural scheme; but with it added to the general depression, which affects all journals seriously, it has proved too much for us to carry. So, in after time, when the causes that have led to this, are deplored, as they will be when the real work that the WEEKLY is performing comes to be better understood than it is now, let the judgment fall where it belongs.

But, even at its present size, the WEEKLY will compare favorably with other reform journals; it will now contain even more reading matter than many of them contain, and, when the character of its contents is taken into the account, we think that our readers will have no serious cause of complaint about getting the full value of their money. We shall take even more pains than ever to reduce the length of the articles published to the least possible space, in which their real meaning can be expressed, and shall more rigidly scrutinize articles of similar import, so that after all we may really give as much substance as we have been giving, only in smaller compass—the essence without the stalk—the kernel without the husk.

We do not reduce the price save to the extent that the new postal rules require, because we hope that it may not be many months—perhaps weeks—before we can return to the usual size. We know that the cause of social freedom is making rapid progress, and that, as its chief organ, the WEEKLY must come into general circulation. Until such time—which is only a question of time and not of fact—we hope that those who are as fully convinced of its truth and ultimate success as we are, will continue to help us uphold its banner, and to carry it into places where its presence will be welcome, when it is known what healing it brings upon its folds.

Then, instead of the reduction being a cause of suspension of effort, let it be the stimulus to new and better labor than has yet been rendered. Let us appeal to the heart of everybody who loves the race, and who desires to see it delivered from its present weight of shame, of vice and crime. We call upon every friend of humanity to run up the Banner of Social Freedom, and to boldly stand to its defense; to cast aside, as we have done, all fear and hesitancy about effects, and strike out, freed from all shackles and public fear, boldly for the truth. When it shall come about that the people are grown manly and womanly enough to hold and express and advocate what they know to be true the WEEKLY will not want for support. We shall patiently and hopefully wait the coming of that time, knowing that its coming is as inevitable as the ebb and flow of the tides.

Nor should the friends of social freedom, forgetting that it is the WEEKLY together with our advocacy on the platform that has opened up the discussion of the social problems, give their entire support to other journals which are now only brave enough to take up the cause in a moderate way, and follow where the WEEKLY has led. They should remember that if it had not been for our beginning, the social question would have been as dead now as it was before we attacked the false usages and customs that still hold nominal sway, and support it accordingly. Nor, again, should this support be withheld, because we sometimes go further than yet seems good to all. We call attention to the letter of M. L. W., in another column, as explanatory of what we mean; and ask our readers to remem-

ber that three years ago they would have subscribed to scarcely a single proposition that is now thoroughly understood and accepted by them. We cannot stand still. We must continue to go forward, constantly advancing new phases in the social problem. It is as yet scarcely touched, barely opened, but it is to be thoroughly investigated in every possible direction, so that the time may soon come when society shall be organized and children reared scientifically and perfectly.

HOW TO REMEDY STAGNATION.

If Congress wants to provide a remedy for the general stagnation in business, let it order the payment of the bonded debt of the country in greenbacks. This would compel the men who hold the bonds to invest the greenbacks that they would receive for them in business, and this in turn would at once give employment to all the people who are now idle and suffering for the necessities of life, and cure the present stagnation. The cause of the present inclination to withdraw capital from business and invest it in bonds, is because its holders think that they are certain of getting their five or six per cent. from the Government on bonds, whereas they are not sure of making that much for it in business. If Congress provide for funding greenbacks in gold bonds, as is proposed, it will be a further cause of business depression. Are Congressmen wise enough to know anything about finance or not? Or are they sold irrevocably to the money interest? We shall see.

INFALLIBILITY.

The claim of infallibility for the Pope of Rome is a logical claim. If we believed in the special inspiration of the Bible, and that as the successor of Peter the fisherman, he held the keys of heaven and hell, and had power to retain or to remit sins, we could readily credit his infallibility and his impeccability also. But we do not; because if the Popes were infallible the conduct of the Papacy would have been infallible also; and the present condition of Pio Nono, who is merely a state prisoner in a city of which he claims to be the ruler, forbids any such conclusion. Therefore we can readily agree with the statements made by our contemporary the *Banner of Light*, in the following article:

The logical result of papal utterances, now vested with new authority within the Roman Church, says the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, is that the Church is so far above the State that, in case of a conflict, the Church must be obeyed. This principle is destructive of human government, if the Pope so wills. The head of the Catholic Church claims a veto on all human laws and on the decrees of all less divinely ordained rulers. Every government must protest against the principle or lose its power; and when an attempt is made to enforce the principle, it must use the worldly means at its command to crush out the destructive principle. In point of fact, however, the danger disappears before it becomes dangerous. The Pope has no longer the power he wielded in the Middle Ages, when princes went to war or desisted from war at his command; when the terrors of the Church or the Church's favor gave the ability to one pretender to establish himself on a throne and drove his rival into exile; when whole kingdoms were laid under interdict for years at a time, with terrible consequences to the people, and were only released when the rebellious son of the Church became reconciled to the Pope. Yet even then we read of nations wholly Catholic braving the wrath of Rome rather than submit to the extinction of national life. Who doubts that it would be so now? Religious enthusiasts are to be found everywhere in all churches. Practical patriots are more numerous in every country. The kings of Catholic Belgium and Bavaria, the government, whatever it might be, of Catholic France, King Victor Emmanuel, of Italy, the Emperors of Austria and Brazil, have never found any difficulty in holding their subjects to allegiance as against the papal power. Popes and priests certainly have a potent influence over the minds of their flocks, but they would always fail in an attempt to overrule the patriotism of a people.

The important question is: What will our Catholic brethren do, if kings and governments continue to dispute the authority of the Pope? They claim to count more noses than their Protestant neighbors. What would they do if they had faith? They have the rough stuff of which armies are made, but their opponents are organized and in power. But their Bible instructs them that faith can remove mountains, and they believe in present miracles if the Protestants do not. Faith can therefore easily organize armies, which will be needed, for by war only can the Pope be re-established in his temporalities, which is the main question the Catholic Congress about to meet in London is called upon to answer. Now is the time, then, for our Catholic brethren to show their faith by their works; for they may rely upon it that the only way in which the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope can really be established is by the sword.

It is idle folly to say that questions will not arise between civil and ecclesiastical authority. We know that they have arisen, do arise, and are constantly accumulating. The penny of "obedience" has Cæsar's impress; does it, therefore, belong to Cæsar? Catholics have already practically answered that question in the negative in the following instance, which is thus narrated and commented on by our able contemporary the *Catholic Irish World*.

The first attempt of the Kaiser's Government to have priests elected by the congregations to fill the parishes left vacant by the imprisonment of the regular pastors, took place at the town of Landsberg, in the province of Brandenburg, on November the 9th. The result was a failure. Landsberg contains 18,000 inhabitants. At least 6,000 of these are Catholics, and yet, out of this number, "only eleven persons," says the dispatch, "offered to vote." But no matter; Cæsar did his duty, and the principle of divine right was nobly vindicated. The idea that the people have no rights beyond the pleasure of the king, is developed to its fullest extent in the policy of Wilhelm. He claims the right divine of controlling the souls as well as the bodies of his miserable subjects. He believes, too, that he has a divine right to en-

force the observance of his edicts at the point of the bayonet, and to smite to the dust every man who dares to contradict his proclamations. This is what Cæsar asserts in act, and those who advocate the blasphemous theory of the divine right of kings, as opposed to the self-evident truth of the equality of all men, are forced to admit that Cæsar has the best of the argument. If the doctrine of the divine right of kings is conceded in principle, its claims to special prerogatives must be conceded along with it. It is contemptible in Catholic monarchists to whine over the persecution in Germany, while they eulogize the system of Government which invests the monarch with power to inflict that persecution. Declaring against Cæsar is like throwing stones at an upas tree to prevent its growth. It is not of Wilhelm and Bismarck the German Catholics should complain, but of the system of government which they themselves help to build up. If, instead of fighting to enslave France, they had battled against the encroachments of absolutism at home, they would now probably be freemen. At all events, they would have the satisfaction of knowing that they fought, not against, but in defense of their rights. The course adopted by the Catholics of Lombardy, in refusing to elect their own priest at the bidding of Cæsar is laudable. If the other German congregations whose pastors are in prison behave in like manner, the power of German absolutism will receive a shock which may be the first blow toward its final extinction.

Respecting honest believers in any creed who act up to their convictions, we honor the action of our Catholic brethren in the above case. If they hold that infallible spiritual power over them has been conferred by their God on the Pope, their first duty is to obey the orders from the Vatican; Cæsar's ought to be with them a very secondary consideration. Of course we differ from them, inasmuch as we deny that such power is or ever has been delegated to any human being. But we are not of those who repudiate papal authority for the purpose of substituting Protestant dogmatism in its place. We have not defied the power of the old lion with any intention of submitting to be mumbled to death by his whelps. For the legion of sects that lie between the liberty of Spiritualism and the absolute authority of the Catholic Church we have little respect and less sympathy. From the Episcopalian to the Dunker, they are all heretics—that is, "choosers." Indeed, they hardly merit that title, and certainly neither of the bodies specified actually deserve it. During the past half century the poor privilege of "choosing" has been denied to the former by a lay court, the House of Peers, which, in the "Gorham case," and in the "Civil Marriages Bill," compelled it to accept adverse rulings on nice doctrinal points; while, with the unfortunate Dunkers, at their late convocation, the "kiss of peace" was stopped half way on its round of benevolence by the irrepressible negro.

We do not deny the just claims of Protestantism to the respect of the people. We do not blame Martin Luther and his co-laborers for allying themselves with the temporal powers, nor even for purchasing the good will of the same by the surrender of principle, in order to overthrow the arrogant usurpations of Rome. We gratefully acknowledge that to them we are indebted for the right of private judgment which we are now exercising. The Saxon monk is hardly to be censured for not disrobing himself of his priestly vestments when he hurled his defiance at the Vatican. In establishing spiritual liberty he logically overthrew all credal religions, the one which he aimed to set up included; for it has triturated Christianity into a thousand sects, and under it no one of them, even aided with the adjuncts of power and wealth, has proved itself capable of uniting the people of any nation under one form of faith. At the same time each one of these minute divisions has, wherever and whenever it has been able to do so, exposed to the world the same features of greed, cruelty and oppression, as those it condemns in the ancient faith. But this Babel of creeds, and these exhibitions of their rapacity, blood-thirstiness and tyranny were all needed for the instruction of mankind. The wise may learn, and have learned by them, that humanity has no resource against any form of priestcraft, except by the establishment of communal and individual spiritual liberty as absolute as is the surrender of the same now demanded by the Catholic Church. The fact is that bodies of men, termed priesthoods, set apart to dominate over the consciences of their brothers and sisters, are now merely disturbers of the peace of nations and of families, and are not only no longer needed, but are positive nuisances to mankind.

This statement, the truth of which has long been patent to the scientific world, has latterly been verified vividly by the declaration of the "infallibility of the Pope." That there are no bounds to the arrogance of the Catholic priesthood there is no longer room for doubt. The futile effort to cover its assumption by limiting it by the words "*ex cathedra*" is worse than useless. Whose voice will be more potential in deciding whether what is uttered be spoken "by authority of the church," than that of the so-called "infallible" man who sits in the chair of St. Peter? Despots understand this well, and, though all of them earnestly desire the aid of priestly power to maintain their tyrannies, there is not one of them who would be willing, under the above ruling, to lock arms with the impeccable representative of the lowly and false-swearing Fisherman.

But it is needless to pursue the subject, for the finger of fate from its conception has written "tekel" over the word "infallibility" in characters of living light. The great claim has been sprung upon the world too soon. People perceive that it is a mere "brutal fulmen," with nothing behind it to sustain it. The Catholic Church has emulated the error of "Sir Guy the Seeker" in the old legend. "When, in quest of the Sangraell, that knight arrived at the Enchanted Castle where it was treasured, he found the gate closed; on the left side of it hung a horn, on the right a sword. Sir

Guy hesitated a while, but, at last, he drew the horn to his mouth, and blew a blast upon it to arouse the warder thereof. Instead of the gate being opened a mocking voice from within flouted him with these words:

"A curse upon ye hoire in which ye knave was born,
Who failed to draw ye sword, before he blew ye horn!"

As with Sir Guy so with the Catholic Church. It has blown upon the horn the blast—infalibility; but where is the sword to sustain its challenge to all earthly potentates? In the meantime the gates of the nations are closed; the infallible Pontiff of Rome is driven out of his possessions by a fallible king, and the world listens to querulous complaints, from lips that we are told cannot err, against the successful adversary who has ejected him from the throne on which his predecessors have sat for nearly a thousand years.

WHAT CONGRESS SHOULD DO.

- I. It should establish and regulate equal political rights and privileges for all citizens.
- II. It should institute methods by which the unemployed and needy labor of the country may be engaged to the extent, at least, of maintenance.
- III. It should repeal the National Banking Act, and save twenty million dollars per annum to the people.
- IV. It should provide for the immediate payment of the interest-bearing public debt, in non-interest-bearing greenbacks, and save two hundred millions more to the public per annum.
- V. It should provide measures to loan greenbacks to the people at cost, upon adequate security; and abolish legal interest, and, because not needed when there is free money to protect the industries of the country, provide for a gradual approach to free trade.
- VI. It should make provisions restricting the charge for all kinds of transportation to ten per cent. excess of expense actually incurred in running and maintaining the methods by which it is performed.
- VII. It should provide measures to return to the people the special natural wealth of the country—coal, oil, salt, gold, silver, copper and other mineral lands, to be operated for their benefit, instead of, as now, for the benefit of the special few.

WIFE-BEATING.

The late Duke of Newcastle, on being taxed with compelling his numerous tenants-at-will to vote for his parliamentary nominees, is reported to have petulantly replied: "Can't I do what I please with my own people?" It would seem that a similar feeling animates his fellow-subjects, more especially the poorer classes, in regard to their ownership over their wives. A collection of the cruel social statistics of wife-murders and wife-beatings, both here and in Great Britain, is much needed. The WEEKLY has occasionally presented daily and weekly reports of such horrid barbarisms, but has not space to spare in its columns for a full and entire collection of the same. We are therefore grateful to the London *Times* for presenting us with a summary of such doings in England, and also to the *Irish World* of New York, the medium through which it has come to our notice:

Wife-beating has also come to be regarded as an institution peculiarly English. It cannot be said to be of English origin, but it is certain that in no other country in the civilized world are wives and women generally, treated so brutally as in England. As exemplifying the fearful extent of this cowardly crime, we quote from an exchange a summary of cases which, we are told, the London *Times* collected from a few days' police record. The following is the disgusting exhibit:

"We have, for instance, the case of John Bishop, of London, who was brought up charged with having caused the death of a woman with whom he had lived. Mr. Bishop had commenced operations by breaking a number of his paragon's ribs, and wound up by kicking her in the head till she gave up the ghost. Early last week, George Osborne, a laborer, of Warwickshire, on returning home found that his wife had not his tea ready for him. Osborne, being a man and a Briton, justly resented his wife's unhousewifely conduct by knocking her down and kicking her to death. Then, there was the fearful murder which recently frightened Camberwell from its propriety. John Coppen had gone home drunk, had quarreled with his wife, had fatally stabbed her with a knife, has been found guilty of willful murder, and now awaits his sentence. To turn from wife-beatings which have had a fatal, to wife-beatings which have had not a fatal, termination, we find a frightful list of such offenses in a single day's proceedings at the London police offices. John Borrell strikes his wife across the mouth and kicks her in the back. The unfortunate wife tries to back out at the police office of the statements she had made at the police station, and the man escaped with three weeks' imprisonment. Then a fellow named Lewin attempted to stab his wife with a knife. Fortunately for assailant and assailed, Mrs. Lewin's stays acted as a coat of mail, and the knife did not penetrate, so the fond husband, instead of "dancing upon nothing" at Newgate, has escaped with six months in jail. Then there was a certain Frederic Camp, another wife-beater, whose case was touching as an instance of the fidelity with which women cling to the most outrageous villains. Camp was sent to jail for beating his wife, and the poor woman was presented by the magistrate with a half-sovereign out of the poor-box. She spent some of the money in procuring for the brute, who had beaten her almost to a jelly, a good meal before he was consigned to the "skilly and toke" of the prison!"

We wish we could agree with our contemporary, and regard "wife-beating as an institution peculiarly English;" but having reported no less than six wife-murders in one week, and not unfrequently having read of two, three and four wife-beating cases following each other in our police courts, we are compelled to feel that, as a community, we

also are guilty of similar barbarities. The fact is that woman is treated in all Christian countries either as a superior or as an inferior—never as an equal. The rich and the pious are too good to be looked at, and the poor are not unfrequently considered to be too bad to be recognized as human beings by officers of the law. The WEEKLY objects to both extremes, and simply asserts the right of woman to absolute equality with man, no more and no less. When we are sufficiently civilized to grant it things will be different. The wordy supremacy man has granted to woman in the domain of morality is false, but false as it is, he has made and does make woman pay dearly for the compliment, by taking special care to hold her legally, politically and personally as his vassal. True, there are cases in which woman naturally rules her partner, like the Englishwoman who wigged her liege lord for daring to put himself down on the census paper as "the head of the family," and recording her simply as an "individual" therein. But such are few and far between. In general our laws themselves treat women and their wrongs as not being by any means so important as those done to their masters. In proof that this is so, we cite the following cases, both reported in the N. Y. *Sun* of Dec. 2.

At the inquest in the case of Eliza Jackson, who was found insensible and nude in a lot near Marion street, Brooklyn, some time ago, and who died soon afterward, which Joseph Prince, James Kelly, Joseph MacMahon and Adam Well, who were arrested on suspicion, attended, the testimony did not fasten the guilt on any of the prisoners. Kelly accounted for his whereabouts all of the night of the assault.

Officer Connell, of the Second Precinct, Newark, while intoxicated on Monday night arrested two respectable ladies, accusing them of disorderly conduct. Sergeant Meldrum saw that Connell was drunk, and, discharging the ladies, took the officer's shield from him and made a complaint.

Had Eliza Jackson been John Jackson we believe that the *Sun* would have deemed it to be its duty to have given a somewhat fuller report of the inquest. But the deceased was a woman, and as there are some women who practically have no rights that the officers of the law feel bound to respect, it is no wonder that the press follows their example, and treats the case of the probable brutal murder of a poor woman almost with silent contempt.

As to the second affair, in which two respectable ladies were arrested by an intoxicated police officer, we simply quote that to show that to be a woman is getting to be an offense in the eyes of what is called "the law," and no doubt Officer Connell, who had probably been frequently engaged in barbarous raids against dancing girls under police orders, thought it no harm to exhibit a little individual zeal in the cause of "such morality" on his own account. Whilst large bodies of women are so ruled out of the rights of human beings, to us it is simply remarkable that wife-beatings and wife-murders are not more numerous than they are at present.

CITIZENSHIP.

Below we quote the ruling of Judge Buskirk, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Indiana, on the limitation of the educational rights of five millions of emancipated citizens. In his opinion "negro children have no right to attend the public schools of that State, except when separate institutions are provided for them." If this ruling be correct, the laws of any State are superior to those of the United States, and we are not a nation but a simple federation. The case, however, is to be appealed to the Supreme Court at Washington, when, we trust, for the honor of the nation, the WEEKLY will be able to report a reversal of the above decision.

Judge Buskirk, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Indiana, decides that negro children have no right to attend the public schools of that State, except when separate institutions are provided for them. Cary Carter, a negro citizen of Washington township, sent his son to the district school supposing that the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States removed whatever disability had before existed. The boy was refused admission by the teacher, and the trustees sustained the exclusion. Mr. Carter, who is described as a man of wealth and determinedness of character, began a stubborn legal fight to secure the education of his son. In the Superior Court he gained a decision that, until the trustees provided facilities for the separate instruction of negro children, they were bound to admit his boy to the school for whites. This opinion was based upon a construction of the State law as affected by the Fourteenth Amendment. Judge Buskirk reverses it, saying:

"In our opinion the privileges and immunities secured by section 23 of article 1, Constitution of Indiana, were not intended for persons of the African race, for the section expressly limits the enjoyment of such privileges and immunities to citizens, and at that time negroes were neither citizens of the United States nor of this State."

Mr. Carter will carry the case to Supreme Court of the United States, and the negroes of Indiana are disposed to make it a test.

As we look at the above case it is not a question of color, but a question of citizenship. The Constitution says, "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." Indiana, in the above ruling, virtually says they shall not. It is a question between the Nation and the refractory State, whose laws conflict with the rights of American citizens. The position of the negro at present, in many of the States, is an anomalous one. Like woman, he is oppressed by custom. This renders his case more deplorable in some respects than it was before the war, when he was oppressed by law (or edicts in the form of laws) and held in slavery. Then he had but one master, now every white man, in certain States, can boss him, and against the tyranny of hotel keepers, steamboat captains, railroad officials, etc., he has no redress. As a slave he had a status, now he has none, until the Supreme Court in his case pleases to define the rights pertaining to American citizenship.

CHARLESTOWN, Dec. 4, 1874.

Dear Mrs. Woodhull—All this week have I been meaning to write you and send the inclosed money or order for the same, but so much writing have I had to do, that when the time came in which I might have written I was too weary to think even, and I did desire to say something more to you than "please find inclosed," etc. But even now, when I have waited till I do not like to wait longer, I can say but little, for as usual I have exhausted all my energies, not my sympathies, in letters which have gone to the imprisoned.

It is wicked that you should be obliged, in the great work which you are doing, to suffer as you have and do; but be assured there are many who look upon you as the saviour of humanity. I cannot indorse all your ideas, but still I believe you to be honest and to desire the good of humanity; and I know, had you desired notoriety simply, you could, with your talents, have won a more enviable one than that which now attaches to you. There is so much in your teachings that is plainly the lesson for the hour, that I feel when I look upon that part which to me seems not quite right, that it may be from a lack of proper understanding on my part, and so I accept you as the teacher of grand truths, feeling almost where I fail to understand, that even that must be truth, knowing that no true woman, as I know you to be, would risk reputation and even life to establish something which would bring only sorrow to mankind if falsely founded. It is plainly to be seen that the world is in a terrible condition, and seeing as I do each day the need there is of reform in all departments of life, and feeling as I do a desire to do the little I may be able toward comforting and strengthening some of the unfortunate of earth, I can imagine how you, fitted as you are so eminently for the purpose of showing to the world the need there is of reformation, could take upon your delicate shoulders the mighty work of convincing the people of their errors, their mistakes and follies. Of course you expected denunciation, and accepted renunciation of all the sweets of social life for the good you hoped would result to humanity from all your years of toil, sacrifice and nearly death. Angels bless you, Mrs. Woodhull, for all you are doing and all you have done; and even though in all things you may not see with perfect vision, while we know that you act up to your highest and noblest intuitions, we will bless you and wish you God-speed, feeling that as there is so little of honor and honesty usually governing mankind in its movements, that we should appreciate it when we meet with it, feeling that it cannot lead people so far astray as the "policy" that for so many long years has influenced nearly everybody. We want the truth, the naked truth, and if to have it, and live it we must sacrifice reputation, we want it all the same, and we hope you will be enabled to present it so forcibly to people that they cannot fail to see it even as you do. This life for you is hard and trying, but you have food which others know not of, and will be sustained till your work is accomplished, and then you will pass on to hear: "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joys of thy Lord." We want you here, but should you pass on we should rejoice that you had laid off the earth form for a brighter one, and should feel that in the clearer light of eternal life you would still labor for poor, weak, suffering humanity.

We inclose an order for eight dollars—mother sending you five—or, I should say, mother and father, they being one—and I sending three as my subscription to the WEEKLY. We wish it was in our power to make it much more, but know that you will accept it, even though small.

You have our love, sympathy and prayers, also our best wishes for this life and the next. Lovingly yours,

M. S. W.

SPRINGVILLE, N. Y., 1874.

EDITORS OF THE WEEKLY:

The WEEKLY comes regularly, and is a welcome friend. I keep all I get and put them in volumes, so that others can peruse them and learn about the true principles you are practically advocating. I have read your paper and studied you carefully in your course for some time, and am fully satisfied you are safe and in the right, so far as I am able to judge. No person can take up your paper and pamphlets to read but will be convinced that your mission is a true one. I say not this to flatter, but from my soul state my honest convictions. I have received from some people who claim to be Spiritualists letters of rebuke and astonishment, with not a little ill-feeling, because I uphold your philosophy. Many years ago I stepped up the ladder a little higher to take a larger view of life's surroundings and stood alone; but not alone, for I found many minds actively working for justice and truth in the relations of the sexes. Truth with me is a better companion than the friendships formed from time to time with people who seek to limit the powers of the mind in higher spheres of right. The more truth we learn and practice, the purer and freer grow our lives. We must take care of our own individuality, and never allow other people to mark out a course for us to pursue that limits our truest freedom. I decided long ago to do just what pleases and augments my happiness in any relation of life, and to allow no person to restrict me in the right.

In my conversations I often meet with a sarcastic reply, that "no decent person would desire to be a free lover." All the vile, abusive language that can be exercised by such people in their conversations with free lovers only gains the pity of those who seek to benefit humanity. I am often met with the statement that "no free lover could be a welcome visitor—would not be privileged to entertain and instruct little children, or older ones, in the right, if free love was claimed to represent it."

This is just the reason why it is almost impossible for people in this vicinity to subscribe for your paper and purchase your books. They prefer to give the fruits of their toil to a sham theology and a class of tyrants in the garb of piety, who are being benefited to the detriment of the highest welfare of their slaves. I do not wonder at the false and unjust schemes in practical operation throughout the country; but there must be a change, and a bold one, too, that will upset such sordid policies. Let every worker for reformation cease not until justice and right greets each individual equally before the laws. Down with laws that favor tyrants; build up principle in practice, and let individuals strive to work out for themselves their true individual rights in all their relations.

SYLVESTER BARNHART.

BUSINESS EDITORIALS.

THE SICK SHOULD READ THIS.—It has long been felt and acknowledged that there should be a more reliable mode of treating Chronic Diseases than that employed by the Materia Medica. Dr. R. P. Fellows, the renowned Magnetic Physician, has, after years of successful treatment and thorough investigation, established beyond question that his Magnetized Powder is the Remedy. Scarcely a day passes but some afflicted person attests the virtue and efficiency of its potency by rapid and palpable evidences of permanent cure. It only requires a few boxes to test it, and when cured the cause of the disease is entirely removed. \$1 per box. Address Vineland, N. J.

C. W. STEWART may be addressed, till further notice, at McHenry, Illinois.

CAPT. H. H. BROWN and FANNIE M. BOWEN-BROWN, who have been successfully lecturing and holding seances in Iowa for the last six months, have arranged their plans in the same State as follows: Along the line of the C. & N. W. R. R. and its connections during November; over the S. C. & P. R. R., and its northern and eastern connections, in the first part of December, and the latter part of December and January along the C. & R. I. R. R. Parties desiring their services can address them at Mo. Valley, Iowa. After Jan. will go East if desired.

PARKER PILLSBURY, of Concord, N. H., is at present fulfilling an engagement with the liberal societies of Toledo, Ohio, and Battle Creek, Michigan. Two Sundays in a month at each, with headquarters at the former place.

T. S. A. POPE, Inspirational Speaker, is on his way East from Chicago. Societies desiring his services will please address him, care of Dr. E. Woodruff, 44 Canal street, Grand Rapids, Mich.

PROF. LISTER, the astrologist, can be consulted at his rooms No. 329, Sixth avenue. Address by letter, P. O. Box 4829.

MRS. NELLIE DAVIS will lecture in Cleveland, Ohio, during December. Societies, East or West, desiring her services, can address her at 235 Washington St., Salem, Mass.

E. J. WITHEFORD, trance and physical medium. Public seances Thursdays and Sundays at 8 P. M., at 409 W. Madison street, Chicago, Ill.

[CIRCULAR.]

BUREAU OF CORRESPONDENCE
OF THE PANTARCHY.

The increasing number of letters of inquiry, addressed to Mr. ANDREWS personally, and to others known to be associated with him, in respect to the nature, purposes, progress and prospects of the Pantarchy, suggest the propriety of organizing a branch or bureau of its operations for the express purpose of answering such and similar inquiries, as well as for the relief of the parties so addressed, whose time has, heretofore, been gratuitously given to the writing of replies.

There are two other kinds of letters sent in a steady current for many years to the same quarter. The first are letters of inquiry touching social difficulties, and asking for advice or consolation, in the thousand trying conditions in which married and unmarried persons, men and women, find themselves involved. The others are letters asking specific information, on matters of reform, spiritualism, unitary life, the new language, and the like; and even on a variety of topics, concerning science, business, and miscellaneous subjects.

To serve this great want; to organize and economize labor; and to extend this method of giving information into a systematized institution for the use of the whole community this Bureau formed. The aggregate of small fees, will, it is hoped, furnish a means of support to one or several of the wisest and best of the men or women most versed in the social reform, and in universal science, and prove of great use to many an aching heart and to many an inquiring mind. THE BUREAU OF CORRESPONDENCE will undertake to answer ANY QUESTION (admitting of an answer) upon ANY SUBJECT, and in case its efforts are appreciated will take the necessary steps to enlarge its connections and means of information to that end. In the meantime, if the question is of a kind which the Bureau is unable to answer, the fee will be returned.

The fees charged are as follows: For a reply on postal card to a single inquiry, 10 cents; for a letter of advice, information (more at large), or sympathy and consolation, 25 cents. In the latter case, the letter of inquiry must contain a stamp, for the answer. No increase of charge on account of the difficulty of obtaining the information, except in special instances, which will be arranged by correspondence. Newspapers inserting this circular, can avail themselves of the aid of the Bureau without charge.

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

THEODORA FREEMAN SPENCER,
JOHN G. ROBINSON, M. D.,
ASRNATH C. McDONALD,
DAVID HOYLE,
Address Mr. David White, Sec. B. C. P., 75 W. 54th St., New York.

BOARD OF MANAGERS.

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.

THE WEEKLY can be had in Philadelphia at 1,204 Callowhill street. Subscriptions will also be received there.

R. W. HUME, Associate Editor of WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY, is prepared to deliver lectures on Radical Spiritualism, and on all the reforms of which it is the base. For further particulars, list of lectures, etc., address box 3,791 New York City.

E. M. Flagg, dentist, 79 West Eleventh street, New York city. Specialty, artificial dentures.

DR. L. K. COONLEY has removed from Vineland to Newark N. J. Office and residence No. 53 Academy street, where he will treat the sick daily and receive applications to lecture Sundays in New Jersey, New York or elsewhere in the vicinity.

THE Universal Association of Spiritualists, Primary Council No. 1 of Illinois, meets every Sunday at 3:30 P. M., at Parlor 16, 181 Clark st. corner of Monroe, Chicago. Free conference and free seats.

ERNEST J. WITHEFORD, Cor. Sec.

Dr. Slade, the eminent Test Medium, may be found at his office, No. 25 East Twenty-first street near Broadway

CHAS. H. FOSTER, the renowned Test Medium, can be found at No. 14 West Twenty-fourth street, New York City.

AMMI BROWN, D. D. S.—Specialty, operative dentistry and the care of Children's teeth. 145 West 44th st.

THE MICHIGAN STATE ASSOCIATION OF SPIRITUALISTS will hold their Ninth Annual Convention in Stuart's Hall at Battle Creek, Michigan, commencing on the second Friday in December, 1874, at 2 o'clock P. M., and continue its sessions until Sunday evening, December 13. The platform will be free for the discussion of all questions tending to instruct and improve the mind and elevate humanity. Good speakers are expected to be in attendance, and a cordial invitation is extended to all speakers and mediums. Let there be a grand rally of the Spiritualists from all parts of the State and also of adjoining States. The Spiritualist Society of Battle Creek will make an effort to entertain (free) as large a number as possible. Arrangements will be made with the hotels of the city for reduced rates for those who prefer their accommodations. Come one, come all, and let us reason together.

E. C. MANCHESTER, President.

BATTLE CREEK, Nov. 2, 1874.

Spiritual papers please copy.

The Books and Speeches of Victoria C. Woodhull and Tennie C. Clafin 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. Clafin	2 00
The Principles of Social Freedom	25
Reformation or Revolution, Which?	25
The Elixir of Life; or, Why do we Die?	25
The Scare-Crows of Sexual Slavery	25
Tried as by Fire; or the True and the False Socially	25
Ethics of Sexual Equality	25
Photographs of V. C. Woodhull, Tennie C. Clafin and Col. Blood, 50c. each, or three for	1 00
Three of any of the Speeches 50c., or seven for	1 00
One copy each, of Books, Speeches and Photographs for	6 00
A liberal discount to those who buy to sell again.	

PROSPECTUS.

WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY.

[The only paper in the World conducted, absolutely, upon the Principles of a Free Press.]

It advocates a new government in which the people will be their own legislators, and the officials the executors of their will.

It advocates, as parts of the new government—

1. A new political system in which all persons of adult age will participate.
2. A new land system in which every individual will be entitled to the free use of a proper proportion of the land.
3. A new industrial system, in which each individual will remain possessed of all his or her productions.
4. A new commercial system in which "cost," instead of "demand and supply," will determine the price of everything and abolish the system of profit-making.
5. A new financial system, in which the government will be the source, custodian and transmitter of money, and in which usury will have no place.
6. A new sexual system, in which mutual consent, entirely free from money or any inducement other than love, shall be the governing law, individuals being left to make their own regulations; and in which society, when the individual shall fail, shall be responsible for the proper rearing of children.
7. A new educational system, in which all children born shall have the same advantages of physical, industrial, mental and moral culture, and thus be equally prepared at maturity to enter upon active, responsible and useful lives.

All of which will constitute the various parts of a new social order, in which all the human rights of the individual will be associated to form the harmonious organization of the peoples into the grand human family, of which every person in the world will be a member.

Criticism and objections specially invited.

The WEEKLY is issued every Saturday.

Subscription price, \$3 per year; \$1.50 six months; or 10c. single copy, to be had of any Newsdealer in the world, who can order it from the following General Agents:

The American News Co., New York City;
The New York News Co., New York City;
The National News Co., New York City;
The New England News Co., Boston, Mass.;
The Central News Co., Philadelphia, Pa.;
The Western News Co., Chicago, Ill.
Sample copies, mailed on application, free.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL & TENNIE C. CLAFLIN, Editors.

COL. J. H. BLOOD, Managing Editor.

All communications to be addressed
WOODHULL & CLAFLIN'S WEEKLY,
Box 3,791, New York City.

