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The purpose of this objective study in the oral style of American women speakers is (1) to make a compilation of the speeches of American women speakers; (2) to support or disprove the statements on the characteristics of oral style as set up by rhetoricians; (3) to compare the oral style of women speakers with that of men speakers; (4) to compare the oral style of the earlier American women speakers with that of the later American women speakers.

The procedure of study includes (1) a summary of the rules of rhetoric that influence oral style; (2) a compilation of speeches of twenty successful American women speakers; (3) an analysis of the speeches by objective criteria. The speakers chosen are Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, Ernestine L. Rose, Lucy Stone, Mrs. E. C. Stanton, Caroline H. Dall, Julia Ward Howe, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, Frances E. Willard, Mary E. Livermore, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Victoria Woodhull, Mrs. Devereux Blake, Clara Barton, Mary E. Lean, Mrs. Chapman Catt, Jane Addams, and Judge Florence E. Allen.

The objective criteria for analysis of the speeches includes (1) calculation of average sentence length; (2) classification of sentences, grammatically according to use and structure, and rhetorically according to artistry;
classification of personal pronouns as to person and number; (4) enumeration of fragmentary sentences, slang phrases, abbreviations and contractions; (5) enumeration of the references to the speaker, the audience and the occasion.

The characteristics of oral style that are frequently found in the speeches of American women are (1) variety in sentence length; (2) variety in sentence type, structure and artistry; (3) frequent use of the first and second personal pronouns. The characteristics that are not frequently found are (1) references to the audience, occasion, and speaker; (2) use of fragmentary sentences, slang, abbreviations, and contractions.

The comparative study of the oral styles of men speakers and women speakers gives the following results that are statistically reliable:

1. Men used a greater number of declarative, complex, and compound-complex sentences.

2. Women use a greater number of interrogative, simple, and compound sentences.

3. Men use a greater number of first person, singular pronouns than women.

4. Men use a greater number of references to the particular audience than women.

The comparative study of the earlier and later woman speakers does not reveal any outstanding differences. However
the earlier women speakers use a greater number of interrogative, imperative and exclamatory sentences than the later women speakers.

In general, American women speakers use many characteristics of oral style as set up by rhetoricians. They use, especially, great variety in sentence structure and directness of appeal, through frequent use of the first and second personal pronouns. The compilation of speeches draws together material that has not been available before and should prove to be excellent source material for further research.
INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this objective study in the oral style of American women speakers is (a) to make a compilation of the speeches of American women speakers; (b) to support or disprove the statements on characteristics of oral style as set up by rhetoricians; (c) to compare the oral style of women speakers with that of men speakers; and (d) to compare the oral style of the earlier American women speakers with that of later American women speakers.

Previous Objective Studies in Oral Style

Three objective studies in oral style have preceded this study. They are:

1. A Study of Oral Style by Gladys L. Borchers, Ph. D. Dissertation (University of Wisconsin, 1927)
3. Objective Studies in Speech Styles with Special Reference to One Hundred English Sermons by Henry L. Ewbank, Ph. D. Dissertation (University of Wisconsin, 1931)

This study makes use of the findings of these earlier studies as needed.
CHAPTER I

Procedure

In the course of this study

I. Rules of rhetoric that influence oral style are summarized.

II. Speeches are compiled with the following considerations:

A. Twenty successful American women speakers are chosen, an effort being made to choose women whose work presents a view of the complete historical development of the public speaking by American women.

B. Only speeches that have actually been delivered are used.

C. Speeches for at least five different occasions for each woman are chosen.

III. Analysis of the speeches are made in the following-named ways:

A. The average sentence length is calculated.

B. Sentences are classified in three ways:

   1. Grammatically according to use.

   2. Grammatically according to structure.

   3. Rhetorically according to artistry.
C. Personal pronouns are classified in two ways:
   1. As to person.
   2. As to number.

D. Fragmentary sentences are counted.

E. Slang phrases are counted.

F. Abbreviations are counted.

G. Contractions are counted.

H. References to the particular speaker are counted.

I. References to the particular occasion are counted.

J. References to the particular audience are counted.

IV. A comparison of the oral styles of men and women speakers is made by:

A. Using the data from this dissertation for women speakers.

B. Using the data from Dr. Borchers' dissertation for men speakers.

V. A comparison of the earlier American women speakers with the later American women speakers is made.

A. Ten women are used in each group.

B. The approximate division between the two groups made by the Civil War is noted.
I. Review of the principles of rhetoric that influence this study.

Any study of oral style needs to consider the words of the rhetoricians from ancient times down to modern times. The first step, therefore, in this study is to review the rules and suggestions that have been set up as characteristic of oral style. A compilation of such rules and suggestions has been made by Dr. Borchers. Stated in comparison with written style, they are as follows:\(^1\)

In oral style:

1. The sentence is shorter.
2. There is greater variety in sentence structure.
3. Sentences are less involved.
4. Fragmentary sentences are used.
5. Personal pronouns are more numerous.
6. Slang may be used.
7. Contractions are used more often.
8. References to the speaker are made.
9. References to the audiences are made.

10. References to the occasion are made.
11. References to the subject matter are made.
12. Euphonious language is used.
13. Indigenous language is more predominant.
14. Repetition is more necessary.
15. Concrete words are used more often.
16. Effusiveness is more predominant.
17. Vehemence is more predominant.
18. Rhythm is more predominant.

In preparation for the study of sentence length and sentence variation, Dr. Henry L. Ewbank, in *Objective Studies in Speech Styles*, reviewed the theories of many of the rhetoricians. The information that he found can be summarized as follows:

1. Aristotle was the first writer to distinguish between loose and periodic styles. He preferred a style containing periodic sentences to the style composed of free-running sentences.

---

2. Cicero stressed the necessity of composing sentences that sound well and lend themselves to vocal utterance.

3. Quintilian, presented as the master teacher of rhetoric and oratory of antiquity and perhaps of all time, warned against obscurity and said that there was a rhythm of words in sentences that must fit the matter and mood of the occasion. Quintilian, like his contemporaries, looked down upon the short sentences, as if they were a necessity for children, and believed a style characterized by longer sentences infinitely better.

4. Lysias believed that the length of sentences of Attic orators showed that the structure of sentences varied with the subject of the speech.

5. Isocrates believed in the elaboration of sentence structure.

6. Isaeus wanted to be free from restraining rules. He found that the short, abrupt sentence gained vigor.

7. Aeschines varied his sentence length considerably.

8. Demosthenes believed the form of the sentence was subordinate to the purpose.

Among the English and American orators, Dr. Ewbank found the following:

9. Thomas Wilson, in the *Arte of Rhetorique*, 1553, the first English Rhetoric text, believed that sentences should be neither too long nor too short lest they ruin the meaning.
10. George Campbell, in *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 1776, believed in the economy of attention. He saw the value of both the periodic and the loose sentence, but saw the value for the speaker of the loose sentence, especially.

11. Hugh Blair, in *Lectures on Rhetorique and Belles Lettres*, 1759, suggested that the loose and periodic sentence should be used in accordance with the nature of the speech.

12. Richard Whately, in *Elements of Rhetoric*, 1828, stated that the opening sentence should be short. He believed that all sentences must be intelligible to the reader. (His book was revised in 1846.)

13. Henry Ward Beecher, in *Yale Lectures on Preaching*, 1878, warned against the musical or balanced sentence that might lose its meaning.

14. A. S. Hill, in *Principles of Rhetoric and Foundations of Rhetoric*, in 1892, said that the idea was the important factor and the sentences should comply accordingly.

15. Davis S. Hill, in *The Science of Rhetoric*, 1867, wanted variation in sentence length and believed that faulty arrangement rather than length was the cause of failure.

16. Barret Wendell, in *English Composition*, admitted that theoretically the best style was periodic, but warned students to make their style as periodic as they could without palpable artifice. He thought that according to the principle of unity, the short, periodic sentence should be preferred.
17. Scott and Denney, in Composition and Rhetoric, 1897, stressed the superiority of the short sentence in making transitions and in attracting attention.

Contemporary American writers believe as follows:

18. J. P. Genung, in The Working Principles of Rhetoric, 1900, says that the standard of all prose writings is naturally and properly the spoken word, or conversation. He thinks a mixture of long and short sentences may secure the effect desired.

19. Ashley Thorndike, in Elements of Rhetoric and Composition, 1905, gives the average length of a sentence as thirty words.

20. John M. Manly and Edith Rickert, in The Writing of English, 1919, believe the prime consideration of the construction of the English sentence is not the length but unity. They also add that sentences of over thirty words should be divided by a semicolon. The average length, they believe, is between twenty and thirty words.

21. J. R. Hulbert and V. B. Hulbert, in Effective English, 1929, believe that the average sentence length of amateurs is less than that of professionals.

Rhetorical principles in texts on Public Speaking and Speech Composition may be summarized thus:

22. C. M. Brink, in The Making of an Oration, 1917, reiterates Hugh Blair and states that opening sentences should be short and concluding sentences should be longer.
and more complex.

23. C. R. Brown, in The Art of Preaching, 1922, warns against the long sentence.

24. J. M. O'Neill and A. T. Weaver, in Elements of Speech, 1926, suggest the characteristics of oral style as short sentences, repetition and the use of personal pronouns and questions.


II. Procedure by which speeches were chosen.

A. All speeches were chosen from American women of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This choice was made because such a list would include the whole time that American women have been speaking in public. Such a group would also be contemporary with the men used in Dr. Borcher's study. In that study the chronological arrangement was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph W. Emerson</td>
<td>1803-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. E. Gladstone</td>
<td>1809-1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>1809-1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Phillips</td>
<td>1811-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Huxley</td>
<td>1825-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bryce</td>
<td>1836-1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur James Balfour</td>
<td>1848-1931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Woodrow Wilson 1856-1924  
Theodore Roosevelt 1858-1919  
John Morley 1893-1923

It was discovered that the arrangement for the women by date of birth did not give a true picture of the history of their speaking. Many of the early women were forbidden to speak in public when they were young and many of them were denied an education during their childhood. Consequently the women often educated themselves and therefore made a late start on the speaking platform. The chronological arrangement of the women was, therefore, determined by the dates of their first speeches. The complete list follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucretia Mott</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan B. Anthony</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernestine L. Rose</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Brown Blackwell</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Matilda Cage</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Stone</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Wells Dall</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Ward Howe</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anna Howard Shaw</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances E. Willard</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E. Livermore</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Beecher Hooker</td>
<td>1870-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria C. Woodhull</td>
<td>1871-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Devereux Blake</td>
<td>1874-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Barton</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elizabeth Lease</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Chapman Catt</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Addams</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence E. Allen</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. With the exception of two, all the speeches included were actually delivered in public. They were listed as speeches, lectures or sermons. The two that had not been
delivered, at least not up to the time of their publication, were *The First Pronunciato* and *The Tendencies of Government*, by Victoria Woodhull. They were prepared for oral presentation when Victoria C. Woodhull was a candidate for the presidency of the United States in 1872 for the Equal Rights party. It was necessary to include this material in order to complete the total number of sentences necessary for the speaker.

C. At least five different speeches were included for each woman. This requirement was set up in the original plan, when it was expected that five sources would be sufficient to furnish the necessary 500 sentences for study. However, since many of the speeches were not long enough, the original plan to follow Dr. Borchers' pattern of analyzing one hundred sentences from each speech by taking twenty sentences from the first part, twenty from the last part and dividing the rest of the speech into six equal parts and analyzing the first ten sentences from each part, could not be followed exactly. Sometimes speeches were studied completely; sometimes they were studied in parts; but records of the sources for all sentences were kept.

It is to be regretted that certain women could not be included in this study because of lack of sufficient material. Such women are Angelina Grimke, the first anti-slavery speaker among women, whose date of speaking goes back to 1833; Anne Dickinson, who was considered the best lyceum
lecturer of her time, and Mrs. Clarinda H. Nichols, who was invited to deliver speeches to the first assembly of both the House and the Senate in the state of Kansas in 1861. Still another capable speaker whom the writer would have been glad to include here, is Maria Sanford, the first teacher of Rhetoric and Oratory at the University of Minnesota, and because of her many speaking tours in behalf of human welfare, the most beloved woman of the state. The speeches chosen are listed chronologically:

LUcretia Hott

I. Sermon to Medical Students 1849
II. Answer to the Reverend Mr. Dana 1849
III. Discourse on Women 1850
IV. Sermon at Yardley 1850
V. Sermon at Bristol 1850

Susan B. Anthony

I. The Daughters of Temperance 1849
   Short Speeches at Woman Suffrage Conventions
II. Woman's National Loyal League 1863
   Patriotic Resolutions 1863
III. The Court Trial Speech 1872
    Constitutional Argument 1872
IV. Women Want Bread? Not the Ballot! 1873
V. Social Purity 1875
ERNESTINE L. ROSE

I. Woman's Rights, Duties and Relations 1850
II. Bible Argument 1852
III. National Woman's Rights Convention 1856
National Woman's Rights Convention 1860
IV. Question of Divorce Laws 1860
V. Woman's National Loyal League 1863

ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL

I. Bible Argument 1852
II. World's Temperance Convention Speech 1853
III. Tenth National Woman's Rights Convention Speech 1860
IV. Woman's National Loyal League 1863
V. Landmarks 1893

MRS. MATILDA JOSYN GAGE

I. Speech at Syracuse Convention 1852
II. Is the United States a Nation? 1873
III. The United States has Eight Classes of Voters 1873
IV. No Title So Proud As U. S. Citizen 1878
   Speech before Committee of Senate 1876
V. Decision of the Supreme Court 1880
   Women in the Early Christian Church 1886
| LUCY STONE |
|-----------------|-------|
| I.  | American Anti-Slavery Convention | 1853 |
| II. | Woman and Temperance | 1855 |
| III. | Speech at New England Anti-Slavery Convention | 1855 |
| IV. | Speech at Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Convention | 1854 |
| V.  | Woman Suffrage in New Jersey | 1867 |
|     | Address before New Jersey Legislature | 1867 |

| MRS. ELIZABETH Cady Stanton |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| I.  | Address to Legislature of New York | 1854 |
| II. | Speech at the Constitutional Convention called by New York Legislature | 1867 |
| III. | National Convention of Woman's Rights | 1867 |
| IV. | First Woman's Suffrage Convention in Washington, D.C. | 1869 |
| V.  | Thirtieth Anniversary of First Woman's Rights Convention | 1876 |
|     | Speech at Senate Committee | 1888 |
|     | National Woman's Suffrage Address | 1890 |
CAROLINE WILLS HEALEY BALL

I. Women Do As Much As Man 1859
   (100 sentences)

II. The Opening of the Gates 1859
   (100 sentences)

III. Verify Your Credentials 1859
   (100 sentences)

IV. Death or Dishonor 1859

V. 20 sentences from Death or Dishonor 1859
   80 sentences from Verify Your Credentials 1859

JULIA WARD HOWE

I. Speech at Legislative Hearing 1864

II. Speech at National Woman Suffrage Convention 1869

III. The Salon in America 1873

IV. Let There Be Light 1905
    The Patience of Faith 1908
    Boston, a Little Island of Darkness 1908

V. The Position of Women in Plato's Republic
DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

| I.       | The Heavenly Vision, a sermon                      | 1867 |
|          | The National Council of Women Speech               | 1891 |
| II.      | God's Women                                        | 1891 |
| III.     | The Fate of Republics                              | 1893 |
| IV.      | Eulogy on Susan B. Anthony                        | 1908 |
|          | Speech on Sixtieth Birthday                       | 1907 |
| V.       | Speeches made when President of Woman's Suffrage Association | 1911-15 |

FRANCES E. WILLARD

| I.       | My Own Call                                        | 1879 |
|          | Some Political Party Will Respond                  | 1881 |
|          | Our Temperance Round Up                            | 1884 |
| II.      | Nomination Speech for Gov. St. John                | 1884 |
|          | Address to W.C.T.U. Convention                     | 1888 |
| III.     | The Greatest Party                                 | 1888 |
|          | Social Purity                                      | 1888 |
| IV.      | National Council of Women Speech                   | 1888 |
|          | International Council of Women Speech              | 1888 |
| V.       | Women and Organization                             | 1891 |
|          | Gospel Politics                                    | 1891 |
|          | Presentation Speech of Mrs Hayes'                  |     |
|          | Picture to White House                             |     |
MARY ASHTON LIVERMORE

I. First American Women Suffrage Convention at Cleveland 1879
II. What Shall We Do with Our Daughters? 1870-80
III. Has the Night of Death No Morning 1870-80
IV. The Boy of To-day 1870-80
V. The Battle of Life 1870-80

ISABELLA BEECHER HOOKER

I. Speech at Washington Convention 1871
   Thanks to Judiciary Committee 1871
II. Address to Senate Committee 1872
III. The Constitutional Rights of Women 1888
IV. Women in Politics and Jurisprudence 1891
V. Memorial of the Connecticut Association 1905

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL (MARTIN)

I. Address to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives 1871
II. A Lecture on Constitutional Equality, Lincoln Hall, Washington, D. C. 1871
III. The New Rebellion, at Apollo Hall, New York 1871
IV. Social Freedom (short speeches from biographical study of Victoria C. Woodhull Martin, E. Sachs)
V. First Pronunciato*, New York 1870
VI. Tendencies of Government* 1870

*Speeches were revised by newspaper report.

1 Married an Englishman by the name of Martin but known in America as Woodhull.
MRS. DEVEREUX LILLEY BLAKE

I. Commemoration of the Centennial of the Battle of Lexington 1874
   Arguments of Judiciary Committee 1884
II. Home 1883
III. The Unknown Quantity in Politics 1884
    Speech at National Suffrage Convention 1884
IV. A Clever Satire on the Rights of Men 1887
V. Women as Female Patrons
   Our Forgotten Foremothers 1895

CLARA BARTON

I. Talks to Soldiers
   The Founding of the Red Cross 1882
II. Address to Congress of United States 1882
III. The Red Cross at the International Council of Women 1888
IV. What is the Significance of Red Cross in Relation to Philanthropy 1893
V. Address to the President and Congress 1898
MARY ELIZABETH LEASE

| I. | Farmers' Alliance Speech | 1890 |
|    | Kansas Speech to Farmers | 1890 |
| II. | Women in Farmers' Alliance | 1891 |
|     | The Alliance League | 1891 |
| III. | Debate with Republican Brumbaugh, Concordia, Kansas | 1891 |
| IV. | Synopsis of Peace | 1893 |
| V.  | Quadrangular Debate, Salina, Kansas | 1894 |

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

| I. | Hearing before Judiciary Committee | 1898 |
| II. | Declaration of Principles | 1898 |
| III. | Appeal for Action | 1904 |
|     | The New Time | 1905 |
|     | Eulogy on Susan B. Anthony | 1909 |
|     | Statement at Senate Hearing | 1910 |
| IV. | Address at Senate Hearing | 1915 |
|     | Cost of Special Sessions | 1920 |
|     | Speech as President of International Woman's Alliance | 1920 |
| V.  | Only Yesterday | 1938 |
JANE ADDAMS

I. The Modern City and Municipal Franchise 1906
   Memorial Address to Canon A. Barnett

II. Speech at the Opening of J. T. Bowen
    Country Club
   Memorial to Gordon Deney
   Memorial to Sarah Rozet Smith

III. Memorial Speech to Mary Hawes Wilmerth
    Memorial Speech to Jenny Dow Harvey

IV. Speech for United Mine Workers of America
    to Henry Demarest Lloyd

V. Filial Relations

JUDGE FLORENCE E. ALLEN

I. Women and World Peace, delivered at
   Conference for Causes and Causes of
   War, Washington, D.C. 1923

II. The Living Power of Law, delivered
    before the Judicial Section of the
    Ohio State Bar Association at Annual
    Meeting, Cedar Point, Ohio July 6, 1928

III. Ten Years After (the nineteenth
     Amendment) 1929

IV. Reduction of Armaments,
    National Broadcasting Feb. 22, 1930

V. The State Shall Do No Wrong

1In 1934 appointed judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, by President Roosevelt.
The libraries in which these speeches were found deserve to be mentioned. They will be listed in the order of their resourcefulness for this material.

1. Historical Library of Kansas - Topeka, Kansas.
2. Congressional Library - Washington, D. C.
5. Baker University Library - Baldwin, Kansas.
7. University of Kansas Library - Lawrence, Kansas.
8. Kansas City Public Library, Kansas City, Missouri.

III. Procedure by which the speeches were analyzed.

In procedure of analysis of speeches, this study follows closely that of Dr. Borchers, who tested objectively ten of the eighteen characteristics of oral style compared with written style given by rhetoricians. Those points follow:

1. Sentences should be shorter.
2. Sentences should be more varied in construction and less involved.
3. Personal pronouns should be more numerous in oral style.
4. Fragmentary sentences may be used.
5. Slang may be used.
6. Abbreviations may be used.
7. Contractions may be used.
8. Oral style requires more careful adaptation to the particular speaker.
9. Oral style requires more careful adaptation to the particular occasion.
10. Oral style requires more careful adaptation to the particular audience.

The first of these points, stating that sentences in oral style should be shorter than in written style, necessitated the counting of the number of words per sentence. When the average sentence length for each woman was attained, comparison with Dr. Borchers' statistics for the average sentence length for each man was set up by statistical tables to find the reliability of the differences.

The second step in the procedure was classification of sentences. Here both the grammatical and rhetorical classifications were used. The grammatical classification divided the sentences according to use. This included the declarative, exclamatory, interrogative and imperative
sentences. The ordinary definitions were used for each of these, namely: a declarative sentence asserts something as a fact; an interrogative sentence asks a question; an imperative sentence commands; an exclamatory sentence utters a strong feeling.

Another grammatical classification divides sentences according to structure. The structural division gives: simple, complex, compound, and compound-complex. A simple sentence contains one subject and predicate; a complex sentence contains one principal clause and one or more subordinate clauses; a compound sentence contains two principal clauses; a compound-complex sentence has two principal clauses and one or more subordinate clauses. The rhetorical classification includes the loose, the periodic, and the balanced sentence, and a fourth division, which Dr. Borchers found convenient for classification purposes and which she has called "very simple".¹ This same classification was also used by Raymond H. Barnard in his dissertation.² Mr. Barnard defines these sentences. "A loose sentence may be stopped at one or more points before its close and still keep the intent and meaning. If it is grammatically complete before the end of the sentence and does not carry the speaker's main idea, it is not loose.

¹Gladys L. Borchers, A Study of Oral Style, p. 33
A periodic sentence, on the other hand, suspends the thought until the close, even though the sentence is grammatically complete at a point within the sentence. A balanced sentence is one that is made up of parts similar in construction, of about equal length and importance, and usually antithetical in meaning. A very simple sentence is one with a simple subject and predicate and few modifiers.

These classifications were compiled and statistical tables for reliabilities of differences with the findings of Dr. Borchers' study of the oral style of men were set up and conclusions evaluated.

Personal pronouns were next counted and classified. The pronoun "it" was not included in this study because of its indefiniteness and impersonality. This was the same procedure used by both Dr. Borchers and Dr. Barnard in their studies of oral style. The personal pronouns were classified as to person and number, and summaries, computations and statistical tables of reliability of differences were made.

Fragmentary sentences were counted. Any sentence which was actually unfinished intentionally was considered fragmentary. The analysis was made, though with very meager results.

Slang phrases were counted, but the same difficulty that other investigators have felt in a study of slang was met here. The first question that seemed unanswerable was
"What was slang a hundred years ago?" Nevertheless an attempt was made and interesting words (for the investigator, at least) were recorded.

Abbreviations and contractions were recorded. The unsatisfactory method of studying oral style from a written publication made the study of abbreviations and contractions almost impossible. Again, the effort was made with but meager results.

The references to the particular speaker, occasion and audience were counted according to Dr. Borchers' definition of such. "I counted that sentence a reference to the particular speaker which would be inappropriate if delivered by any other man. The same criterion was used for audience and occasion. Those sentences were considered particularly adapted to the audience or reader which fitted that group or individual and that group or individual, alone".¹

¹Gladys L. Borchers, A Study of Oral Style, p. 35.
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XV. Tabulation of data for Mrs. Devereux Blake.

XVI. Tabulation of data for Clara Barton.

XVII. Tabulation of data for Mary E. Lease.

XVIII. Tabulation of data for Mrs. Chapman Catt.

XIX. Tabulation of data for Jane Addams.

XX. Tabulation of data for Florence E. Allen.
I. LUCRETIA MOTT

Sermon to Medical Students, 1849

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 577 952 558 762

Grand Total - 2379

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 85; Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 8, Imperative 5.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 34; Complex 44; Compound 6; Compound-complex 6.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 16; Loose 49; Balanced 5; Periodic 30.

Personal Pronouns:

First person: Singular 25, plural 36.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 62.
Third person: Singular 20, plural 32.
II. LUCRETIA MOTT

Answer to Rev. Richard Dana, 1849.
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 662 549 491 743

Grand Total = 2445

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 78; Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 17; Imperative 4.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 40; Complex 53; Compound 7; Compound-Complex 13.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 21;
Loose 34; Balanced 9; Periodic 36.

Personal Pronouns:

First person: Singular 18, plural 14.

Second person: Singular 9, plural 9.

Third person: Singular 96, plural 17.
III. LUCRETIA MOTT

Discourse on Women, 1860
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 27 | 34 | 35 | 30 |
| 11 | 5  | 5  | 25 |
| 12 | 36 | 13 | 18 |
| 54 | 23 | 30 | 23 |
| 10 | 32 | 14 | 15 |
| 22 | 16 | 20 | 12 |
| 53 | 7  | 15 | 17 |
| 22 | 27 | 27 | 9  |
| 19 | 19 | 56 | 55 |
| 44 | 15 | 75 | 23 |
| 10 | 16 | 10 | 7  |
| 9  | 7  | 51 | 28 |
| 41 | 27 | 26 | 16 |
| 30 | 19 | 29 | 61 |
| 24 | 15 | 15 | 1  |
| 7  | 16 | 24 | 14 |
| 23 | 7  | 9  | 32 |
| 19 | 31 | 37 | 14 |
| 50 | 41 | 58 | 7  |
| 9  | 30 | 40 | 14 |
| 16 | 28 | 20 | 20 |
| 19 | 37 | 9  | 13 |
| 19 | 26 | 20 | 17 |
| 22 | 21 | 15 | 17 |
| 37 | 8  | 36 | 20 |

Totals 611 542 686 499

Grand Total - 2327

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 93; Exclamatory 3; Interrogative 1; Imperative 3.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 42; Complex 40; Compound 10; Compound-complex 8.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 16; Loose 37; Balanced 4; Periodic 43.
Personal Pronouns:

First person: Singular 3, plural 21.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 96.
Third person: Singular 84, plural 27.
IV. LUCRETIA MOTT

Sermon at Yardley, 1850
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

| 10 | 26 | 76 | 13 |
| 22 | 20 | 3 | 14 |
| 16 | 12 | 32 | 27 |
| 17 | 17 | 14 | 11 |
| 15 | 10 | 3 | 7 |
| 23 | 27 | 4 | 3 |
| 6 | 5 | 23 | 18 |
| 16 | 7 | 11 | 4 |
| 7 | 23 | 6 | 13 |
| 41 | 19 | 20 | 14 |
| 57 | 19 | 13 | 18 |
| 11 | 24 | 54 | 33 |
| 15 | 22 | 26 | 33 |
| 16 | 13 | 5 | 15 |
| 4 | 47 | 42 | 21 |
| 17 | 31 | 35 | 15 |
| 11 | 29 | 27 | 10 |
| 24 | 25 | 27 | 26 |
| 25 | 27 | 27 | 10 |
| 23 | 16 | 9 | 5 |
| 21 | 12 | 16 | 55 |
| 19 | 26 | 28 | 20 |
| 29 | 9 | 12 | 27 |
| 16 | 21 | 15 | 19 |
| 9 | 7 | 6 | 15 |

Totals 529 539 505 430

Grand Total - 2003

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 93;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 5; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 69;
Complex 33; Compound 4; Compound-complex 15.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very simple 31;
Loose 36; Balanced 4; Periodic 29.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 9, plural 40.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 21.
Third person: Singular 19, plural 31.
V. LUCRETIA MOTT

Sermon at Bristol, 1860
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 715 610 572 717

Grand Total 2812

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 94;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 3; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 24;
Complex 49; Compound 11; Compound-complex 17.
Sentences classified as to Artistry: Very simple 17;
Loose 39; Balanced 1; Periodic 44.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 14, plural 66.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 7.
Third person: Singular 21, plural 35.
Summary of Points studied in the Speeches of

LUCRETIA MOTT

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 15,266
   Average per sentence - 30.532

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 443, Exclamatory 9,
      Interrogative 34, Imperative 15.
   b. According to structure: Simple 181, Complex 205,
      Compound 54, Compound-complex 79.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 101, Loose 94,
      Balanced 28, Periodic 182.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 74, Plural 177.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 101.
   c. Third person: Singular 240, Plural 140.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 5.

9. References to the particular occasion 5.

10. References to the particular audience 10.
Short Speeches - Women Suffrage Conventions

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 958 947 936 925

Sentences classified as to use: Male vs. Female
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 37; Complex 40; Compound 8; Compound-complex 15.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27; Loose 25; Balanced 8; Periodic 40.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 9, plural 33.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 29.
Third person: Singular 15, plural 33.
## II. SUSAN B. ANTHONY

(a) **Women's National Loyal League, 1863**

(b) **Patriotic Resolutions, 1863**

(studied completely)

### Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 683 917 654 677

Grand Total - 2,931

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 84; Exclamatory 6; Interrogative 9; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 52;
Complex 43; Compound 5; Compound-complex 15.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25;
Loose 22; Balance 5; Periodic 40.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 14, plural 18.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 15.
Third person: Singular 33, plural 45.
III. SUSAN B. ANTHONY

The Court Trial Speech, "Constitutional Argument", 1872
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 29 | 35 | 26 | 45 |
| 47 | 32 | 5  | 55 |
| 20 | 13 | 12 | 15 |
| 19 | 17 | 22 | 32 |
| 13 | 28 | 30 | 40 |
| 21 | 54 | 40 | 29 |
| 59 | 54 | 34 | 45 |
| 19 | 54 | 44 | 19 |
| 29 | 19 | 16 | 29 |
| 35 | 47 | 80 | 28 |
| 8  | 65 | 66 | 32 |
| 14 | 52 | 28 | 20 |
| 10 | 27 | 28 | 14 |
| 16 | 63 | 29 | 35 |
| 20 | 12 | 11 | 39 |
| 25 | 24 | 15 | 22 |
| 30 | 15 | 42 | 21 |
| 1  | 23 | 50 | 43 |
| 35 | 29 | 16 | 30 |
| 49 | 94 | 24 | 68 |
| 50 | 8  | 18 | 75 |
| 107 | 3 | 41 | 8 |
| 24 | 5  | 59 | 12 |
| 22 | 4  | 12 | 22 |
| 32 | 21 | 50 | 19 |

Totals 717 801 796 636

Grand Total - 3,150

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 83;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 15; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 43;
Complex 32; Compound 7; Compound-complex 18.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 19;
Loose 19; Balanced 7; Periodic 85.

Personal Pronouns:

First person: Singular 18, plural 22.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 10.
Third person: Singular 35, plural 45.
IV. SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Woman Wants Bread; Not the Ballot! 1875
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 73 | 60 | 12 | 71 |
| 27 | 26 | 36 | 36 |
| 11 | 35 | 19 | 17 |
| 19 | 44 | 28 | 11 |
| 9  | 6  | 34 | 31 |
| 9  | 56 | 34 | 7  |
| 17 | 23 | 17 | 28 |
| 19 | 50 | 12 | 9  |
| 27 | 41 | 21 | 56 |
| 22 | 37 | 18 | 66 |
| 41 | 20 | 48 | 12 |
| 30 | 73 | 20 | 102 |
| 12 | 61 | 15 | 22 |
| 49 | 48 | 3  | 57 |
| 14 | 43 | 25 | 27 |
| 25 | 24 | 57 | 27 |
| 22 | 10 | 19 | 29 |
| 19 | 23 | 25 | 11 |
| 20 | 21 | 8  | 22 |
| 12 | 54 | 6  | 17 |
| 34 | 9  | 32 | 31 |
| 26 | 32 | 23 | 18 |
| 43 | 37 | 39 | 29 |
| 17 | 36 | 43 | 15 |
| 22 | 47 | 16 | 17 |

Totals 675 654 605 709

Grand Total - 2,621

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 92;
Exclamatory 5; Interrogative 5; Imperative 0.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 31;
Complex 43; Compound 10; Compound-complex 18.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27; Loose 19; Balanced 9; Periodic 45.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 9, plural 19.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 32.
Third person: Singular 24, plural 79.
Social Purity, 1875

Number of words per sentence:

| 34 | 41 | 40 | 23 |
| 21 | 14 | 38 | 39 |
| 19 | 23 | 22 | 2 |
| 22 | 28 | 41 | 25 |
| 33 | 9  | 69 | 25 |
| 30 | 11 | 44 | 18 |
| 44 | 10 | 12 | 37 |
| 14 | 10 | 23 | 17 |
| 51 | 14 | 22 | 6  |
| 29 | 49 | 29 | 19 |
| 7  | 15 | 34 | 87 |
| 22 | 7  | 10 | 49 |
| 33 | 41 | 22 | 47 |
| 25 | 30 | 21 | 19 |
| 21 | 36 | 20 | 47 |
| 21 | 9  | 13 | 30 |
| 35 | 52 | 29 | 44 |
| 47 | 45 | 5  | 28 |
| 41 | 57 | 24 | 34 |
| 55 | 11 | 40 | 13 |
| 13 | 40 | 35 | 28 |
| 49 | 6  | 50 | 52 |
| 27 | 48 | 31 | 10 |
| 44 | 30 | 26 | 13 |
| 25 | 100| 7  | 23 |

Totals 770 704 763 510

Grand Total = 3,367

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative, Exclamatory 6; Interrogative 6; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 35; Complex 43; Compound 4; Compound-complex 15.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27; Loose 23; Balanced 10; Periodic 40.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 10, plural 19.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 0.
Third person: Singular 78, plural 50.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 15,812
   Average number of words per sentence - 30.624

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 430; Exclamatory 19; Interrogative 47; Imperative 4.
   b. According to structure: Simple 101, Complex 206, Compound 34, Compound-complex 79.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 54, Plural 169.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 94.
   c. Third person: Singular 197, Plural 140.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 1.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 14.

9. References to the particular occasion 11.

10. References to the particular audience 15.
I. HISTORICAL SOURCES

(a) "Women's Rights, Duties and Relations"

given at Women's Rights Convention, Worcester, New York, 1850

(studied 100 sentences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 718  604  658  401

Grand Total = 2,471

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 52;
Exclamatory 8; Interrogative 29; Imperative 11.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 37;
Complex 33; Compound 15; Complex-compound 15.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 32;
Loose 52; Balanced 21, Periodic 15.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 9, plural 13.
Second person: Singular 1, plural 10.
Third person: Singular 114, plural 8.
II. ERNSTINE L. ROSE

Bible Argument

given at Women's Rights Convention, 1868
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 449 696 692 579

Grand Total - 2,466

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 72;
Exclamatory 5; Interrogative 20; Imperative 3.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 58;
Complex 33; Compound 14; Complex-compound 15.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 29;
Loose 48; Balanced 1; Periodic 52.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 24, plural 7.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 4.
Third person: Singular 71, plural 53.
(a) Speech at National Woman's Rights Convention, 1856.
(b) Speech at National Woman's Rights Convention, 1860.
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 656  
978  
324  
411

Grand Total - 2,369

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 83;
Exclamatory 10; Interrogative 6; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 31;
Complex 54; Compound 15; Complex-Compound 22.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 23;
Loose 44; Balanced 6; Periodic 22.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 12, plural 26.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 37.
Third person: Singular 60, plural 11.
"Question of Divorce Laws

given at Women's Rights Convention, 1860

(studied completely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 579 671 563 648

Grand Total = 2,455

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 77;
Exclamatory 8; Interrogative 16; Imperative 5.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 40;
Complex 32; Compound 19; Compound-Complex 9.
Sentences classified as to artistry:  Very Simple 36; Loose 42; Balanced 6; Periodic 17.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 1a, plural 14.
Second person: Singular 6, plural 9.
Third person: Singular 29, plural 14.
Speech at Woman's National Loyal League, 1863
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 408 488 512 545

Grand Total - 1,951

Sentences classified as to artistry: Declaratory 72;
Exclamatory 5; Interrogative 15; Imperative 10.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 39;
Complex 51; Compound 14; Complex-Compound 18.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 37;
Loose 30; Balanced 5; Periodic 28.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 43, plural 40.
Second person: Singular 6, plural 12.
Third person: Singular 53, plural 23.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

ESTHER L. ROSE

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences = 13,812
   Average number of words per sentence = 27.624

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 356; Exclamatory 29; Interrogative 86; Imperative 30.
   b. According to structure: Simple 163; Complex 163; Compound 75; Compound-complex 77.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 161; Loose 198; Balanced 59; Periodic 104.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 106, Plural 100.
   c. Third person: Singular 307, Plural 86.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 15.

9. References to the particular occasion 10.

10. References to the particular audience 0.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>507</th>
<th>617</th>
<th>966</th>
<th>996</th>
<th>700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of words per sentence:

(Revised 3/27/63)

Address of American Anti-Deficiency Convention, New York.

I. Lucy Stone
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 26; Loose 19; Balanced 18; Periodic 37.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 13, plural 36.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 21.
Third person: Singular 62, plural 72.
II. LUCY STONE

"Woman and Temperance" given at Whole World's Temperance Convention, New York, 1855.

(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>656</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 656  813  714  784

Grand Total - 2977

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 37; Exclamatory 7; Interrogative 6; Imperative 0.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 32; Complex 40; Compound 10; Compound-complex 18.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 31; Loose 28; Balanced 7; Periodic 34.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 21, plural 49.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 12.
Third person: Singular 80, plural 26.
Speech at New England Anti-Slavery Convention, Boston, 1853.

(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>136</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>111</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 1012 821 950 350

Grand Total = 3133.

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 81; Exclamatory 7; Interrogative 6; Imperative 6.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 30; Complex 44; Compound 8; Compound-complex 18.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very simple 27; loose 18; balanced 7; periodic 48.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 53, plural 36.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 16.
Third person: Singular 62, plural 42.
IV. LUCY STONE

Speech at Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Convention, West Chester, Pa., 1854.

(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 574 593 511 498

Grand Total = 2176.

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 88; Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 7; Imperative 3.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 54; Complex 42; Compound 13; Compound-complex 11.
Sentences classified as to artistry:  Very Simple 29;
Loose 18; Balanced 11; Periodic 43.

Personal pronouns:
First person:  Singular 27, plural 47.
Second person:  Singular 0, Plural 19.
Third person:  Singular 50, plural 56.
"Women Suffrage in New Jersey", address before New Jersey Legislature, 1867.

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 456 346 631 521

Grand Total - 1954.

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 86; Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 12; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 45; Complex 45; Compound 4; Compound-complex 6.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 46; Loose 17; Balanced 5; Periodic 32.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 2, plural 12.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 5.
Third person: Singular 36, plural 39.
Summary of Points studied in the Speeches of

LUCY STONE

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences = 13,109
   Average number of words per sentence 26.218

2. Classification of sentences
   a. According to use: Declarative 427, Exclamatory 21,
      Interrogative 40, Imperative 12.
   b. According to structure: Simple 170, Complex
      205, Compound 47, Compound-complex 72.
   c. According to artistry: Very simple 160, Loose
      100, Balanced 48, Periodic 192.

3. Enumeration of Personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 121, Plural 173.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 73.
   c. Third person: Singular 296, Plural 235.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 41.

9. References to the particular occasion 9.

10. References to the particular audience 26.
I. MRS. HILDA JOSLYN GAGE

Speech at Syracuse Convention, 1852.
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

| 21 | 52 | 25 | 20 |
| 30 | 9  | 7  | 31 |
| 31 | 34 | 20 | 9  |
| 58 | 16 | 9  | 30 |
| 32 | 31 | 13 | 20 |
| 34 | 14 | 31 | 16 |
| 26 | 5  | 36 | 30 |
| 12 | 16 | 43 | 41 |
| 42 | 26 | 43 | 33 |
| 27 | 36 | 59 | 11 |
| 14 | 27 | 18 | 40 |
| 20 | 4  | 7  | 13 |
| 16 | 2  | 29 | 24 |
| 29 | 49 | 22 | 30 |
| 7  | 27 | 15 | 14 |
| 10 | 23 | 18 | 3  |
| 46 | 16 | 11 | 30 |
| 48 | 12 | 9  | 67 |
| 24 | 27 | 52 | 41 |
| 10 | 16 | 23 | 15 |
| 12 | 39 | 14 | 29 |
| 29 | 2  | 29 | 19 |
| 44 | 33 | 15 | 57 |
| 8  | 8  | 11 | 33 |
| 21 | 24 | 27 | 32 |

Totals 649 578 586 685

Grand Total = 2498

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 82;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 14; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 25;
Complex 46; Compound 10; Compound-complex 16.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 16;
Loose 26; Balanced 11; Periodic 47.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 4, plural 8.
Second person: Singular 5, plural 1.
Third person: Singular 14, plural 16.
II. MRS. MATILDA JOSELYN CAGE

"Is United States a Nation", 1873

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 22 | 21 | 56 | 25 |
| 13 | 30 | 6  | 42 |
| 6  | 63 | 8  | 27 |
| 33 | 39 | 54 | 32 |
| 7  | 26 | 11 | 28 |
| 29 | 26 | 5  | 33 |
| 7  | 9  | 5  | 61 |
| 20 | 10 | 53 | 18 |
| 25 | 21 | 22 | 35 |
| 13 | 19 | 20 | 14 |
| 49 | 49 | 14 | 9  |
| 23 | 83 | 28 | 22 |
| 67 | 22 | 42 | 9  |
| 31 | 88 | 19 | 8  |
| 50 | 23 | 28 | 10 |
| 56 | 35 | 22 | 23 |
| 56 | 35 | 22 | 20 |
| 36 | 36 | 20 | 53 |
| 83 | 46 | 12 | 8  |
| 33 | 18 | 36 | 9  |
| 11 | 23 | 20 | 25 |
| 16 | 15 | 24 | 10 |
| 17 | 25 | 32 | 113|
| 40 | 42 | 18 | 6  |
| 52 | 52 | 30 | 10 |

Totals 727 872 604 667

Grand Total = 2930.

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 93;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 2; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 32;
Complex 34; Compound 11; Compound-complex 22.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 13;
Loose 49; Balanced 5; Periodic 33.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 3, plural 32.
Second person: Singular 9, plural 9.
Third person: Singular 17, plural 51.
III. MRS. MATILDA JOSYLN CAGE

(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 643 778 590 805

Grand Total = 3616

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 93; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 1; Imperative 6.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 32; Complex 39; Compound 6; Compound-complex 22.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 16;
Loose 39; Balanced 5; Periodic 40.

**Personal pronouns:**

First person: Singular 17, plural 6.
Second person: Singular 9, plural 4.
Third person: Singular 34; plural 14.
III. MRS MATILDA JOSYLN GAGE

(a) "No Title no So Proud as U.S. Citizen", 1878.

(b) Speech Before Committee of Senate, 1878.

(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 522 450 650 438

Grand Total - 2018

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 93;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 5; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 38;
Complex 32; Compound 17; Compound-complex 13.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very simple 18;
Loose 32; Balanced 6; Periodic 44.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 3, plural 37.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 28.
Third person: Singular 11, plural 84.
IV. MRS. MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE

(a) "The Decision of the Supreme Court", 1880.
(b) "Women in the Early Christian Church", 1898.

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 581 660 310 577

Grand Total: 2653.

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 99;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 0; imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 51;
Complex 44; Compound 18; Compound-complex 13.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 15;
Loose 30; Balanced 7; Periodic 48.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 16, plural 3.
Second person: Singular 0, plural 3.
Third person: Singular 22, plural 18.
Summary of points studied in the Speeches of

Mrs. Matilda Jocelyn Gage

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences = 12,895.
   Average number of words per sentence 25.79

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 463, Exclamatory 2,
      Interrogative 22, Imperative 13.
   b. According to structure: Simple 161, Complex 193,
      Compound 50, Compound-complex 88.
   c. According to artistry: Very simple 78, Loose 175,
      Balanced 54, Periodic 212.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 43, Plural 89.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 54.
   c. Third person: Singular 98, Plural 123.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 1.

7. Contractions 3.

8. References to the particular speaker 3.

9. References to the particular occasion 7.

10. References to the particular audience 5.
I. ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL

**Bible Argument**
given at Women's Rights Convention, 1852

(100 sentences studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27, 51, 12, 10, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 25, 11, 11, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 24, 11, 4, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 27, 59, 29, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 4, 47, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 9, 23, 12, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 9, 30, 5, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 25, 12, 10, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 17, 43, 5, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 29, 27, 29, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45, 27, 12, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 10, 7, 52, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 15, 20, 1, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 15, 15, 15, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 48, 48, 9, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 47, 46, 12, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 10, 15, 12, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 24, 33, 12, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 54, 9, 19, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 36, 10, 11, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 17, 41, 16, 350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total = 1,348**

Sentences classified according to use: Declarative 86; Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 9; Imperative 4.

Sentences classified according to structure: Simple 37; Complex 38; Compound 16; Complex-Compound 9.
Sentences classified according to artistry: Very Simple 37; Loose 38; Balanced 8; Periodic 17.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 19, Plural 19.
Second person: Singular 3, Plural 16.
Third person: Singular 21, Plural 27.
II. ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL

Speech at World's Temperance Convention, 1853
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 595 610 659 515

Grand Total = 2,377

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 96;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 2; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 35;
Complex 96; Compound 17; Complex-Compound 22.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 28;
Loose 46; Balanced 22; Periodic 4.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 74, Plural 19.
Second person: Singular 4, Plural 9.
Third person: Singular 26, Plural 35.
III. ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL

Speech at Tenth National Woman's Rights Convention

Cooper's Institute, New York, 1860
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 643 651 625 643

Grand Total = 2,788

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 763
Exclamatory 3; Interrogative 9; Imperative 14.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 28; Complex 30; Compound 19; Complex-Compound 23.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27; Loose 46; Balanced 5; Periodic 22.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 66, Plural 40.
Second person: Singular 12, Plural 6.
Third Person: Singular 75, Plural 27.
IV. ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL

Speech at Woman's National Loyal League, 1863
(studied completely)

Number of words per sentence:

| 14 | 22 | 14 | 25 |
| 16 | 6  | 6  | 14 |
| 9  | 17 | 27 | 41 |
| 43 | 17 | 26 | 28 |
| 11 | 13 | 8  | 26 |
| 16 | 20 | 23 | 23 |
| 21 | 12 | 10 | 22 |
| 15 | 19 | 15 | 9  |
| 26 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| 42 | 13 | 15 | 42 |
| 35 | 9  | 16 | 31 |
| 39 | 27 | 17 | 42 |
| 20 | 30 | 20 | 20 |
| 10 | 10 | 12 | 43 |
| 36 | 17 | 11 | 12 |
| 54 | 21 | 3  | 32 |
| 20 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| 27 | 11 | 12 | 42 |
| 32 | 14 | 14 | 15 |
| 20 | 21 | 45 | 12 |
| 30 | 7  | 16 | 44 |
| 20 | 19 | 16 | 20 |
| 77 | 61 | 33 | 17 |
| 10 | 15 | 56 | 14 |
| 25 | 66 | 21 | 9  |

Totals 680 523 434 690
Grand Total = 2,299

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 76; Exclamatory 7; Interrogative 10; Imperative 7.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 38; Complex 35; Compound 21; Complex-Compound 8.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 28; Loose 37; Balanced 9; Periodic 26.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 7, Plural 57.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 5.
Third person: Singular 14, Plural 32.
V. ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWILL

Landmarks, 1893

given at World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 640 565 571 757

Grand Total - 2,533

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 94;
Exclamatory 3; Interrogative 3; Imperative 0.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 36;
Complex 34; Compound 16; Compound-Complex 14.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27;
Loose 26; Balanced 15; Periodic 32.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 12, Plural 16.
Second person: Singular 9, Plural 7.
Third person: Singular 65, Plural 35.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

ANTOINETTE BROOK BLACKWELL

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 11,920
   Average number of words per sentence - 23.84

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 426, Exclamatory
      Interrogative 18, Imperative 26.
   b. According to structure: Simple 172, Complex 163,
      Compound 89, Compound-Complex 76.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 147, Loose 193,
      Balanced 59, Periodic 101.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 188, Plural 151.
   b. Second person: Singular 19, Plural 43.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 1.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 15.

9. References to the particular occasion 4.

10. References to the particular audience 2.
I. MRS. ELIZABETH Cady Stanton

Speech to the Legislature of New York, 1854
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 951 718 761 625

Grand Total - 3,055

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 59; Exclamatory 7; Interrogative 18; Imperative 16.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 32; Complex 48; Compound 9; Complex-Compound 17.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 20; Loose 34; Balanced 4; Periodic 40.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 4, Plural 48.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 34.
Third person: Singular 100, Plural 32.
II. MISS ELIZABETH Cady Stanton

Constitutional Convention of State of New York
New York Legislature, 1867
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 22 | 14 | 41 | 16 |
| 21 | 17 | 21 | 21 |
| 12 | 62 | 27 | 20 |
| 20 | 88 | 18 | 6 |
| 4  | 16 | 20 | 2 |
| 50 | 29 | 21 | 2 |
| 45 | 23 | 10 | 16 |
| 11 | 44 | 27 | 54 |
| 56 | 77 | 15 | 6 |
| 31 | 35 | 40 | 21 |
| 75 | 31 | 17 | 16 |
| 52 | 27 | 22 | 54 |
| 51 | 35 | 34 | 22 |
| 17 | 11 | 13 | 30 |
| 31 | 45 | 30 | 29 |
| 58 | 22 | 27 | 59 |
| 23 | 18 | 11 | 47 |
| 48 | 42 | 31 | 14 |
| 19 | 31 | 24 | 9 |
| 11 | 17 | 7 | 8 |
| 25 | 31 | 12 | 6 |
| 9  | 19 | 22 | 31 |
| 30 | 14 | 22 | 21 |
| 16 | 45 | 17 | 21 |
| 25 | 11 | 29 | 20 |

Totals 745 749 671 546

Grand Total = 2,709

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 77;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 17; Imperative 5.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 39; Complex 42; Compound 11; Complex-Compound 8.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 24; Loose 25; Balanced 4; Periodic 47.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 17, Plural 29.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 44.
Third person: Singular 23; Plural 12.
III. MRS. ELIZABETH CARY STANTON

Speech at the National Convention of Woman's Rights
in New York, 1867
(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>79</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 845 904 705 556

Grand Total - 2,998

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 76;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 17; Imperative 5.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 25; Complex 18; Compound 18; Compound-Complex 9.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 22; Loose 15; Balanced 15; Periodic 48.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 9, Plural 37.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 9.
Third person: Singular 17, Plural 37.
IV. MRS. ELIZABETH Cady Stanton

Speech at First Woman’s Suffrage Convention
in Washington, D. C., 1869
(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 67 | 11 | 25 | 30 |
| 50 | 23 | 44 | 37 |
| 31 | 51 | 24 | 25 |
| 18 | 12 | 29 | 52 |
| 42 | 13 | 38 | 62 |
| 19 | 23 | 19 | 42 |
| 34 | 23 | 15 | 50 |
| 43 | 27 | 34 | 35 |
| 61 | 19 | 36 | 63 |
| 16 | 17 | 46 | 54 |
| 47 | 61 | 26 | 18 |
| 24 | 11 | 37 | 58 |
| 29 | 19 | 29 | 64 |
| 72 | 65 | 28 | 46 |
| 50 | 126 | 60 | 20 |
| 26 | 45 | 59 | 25 |
| 57 | 21 | 18 | 66 |
| 41 | 17 | 46 | 17 |
| 22 | 30 | 41 | 57 |
| 33 | 28 | 42 | 48 |
| 37 | 56 | 25 | 35 |
| 19 | 27 | 30 | 27 |
| 14 | 41 | 37 | 18 |
| 51 | 37 | 25 | 28 |

Totals 1086 916 841 1024

Grand Total – 3,867

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 797;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 11; Imperative 9.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 26; Complex 45; Compound 13; Compound-complex 18.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 16; Loose 22; Balanced 17; Periodic 35.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 6, Plural 42.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 6.
Third person: Singular 20, Plural 48.
V. MRS. ELIZABETH Cady Stanton

Speeches at

(a) Thirtieth Anniversary of First Women's Rights Convention, 1878

(b) Senate Committee, 1888

(c) National United States Convention, 1890

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>112</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 646 565 639 956

Grand Total - 2,806
Sentences classified as to use:  Declarative 82;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 7; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 31;
Complex 58; Compound 19; Compound-complex 12.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 22;
Loose 11; Balanced 19; Periodic 42.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 18, Plural 66.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 85.
Third person: Singular 18, Plural 30.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

MRS. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 15,405
2. To average number of words per sentence - 30.81
2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 390, Exclamatory 13,
      Interrogative 70, Imperative 39.
   b. According to structure: Simple 153, Complex 213,
      Compound 70, Compound-complex 64.
   c. According to artistry: Very simple 116, Loose
      107, Balanced 62, Periodic 215.
3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 51, Plural 216.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 136.
   c. Third person: Singular 187, Plural 159.
4. Fragmentary sentences 0.
5. Slang 0.
6. Abbreviations 0.
7. Contractions 0.
8. References to the particular speaker 29.
9. References to the particular occasion 10.
10. References to the particular audience 40.
I. CAROLINE W. H. DALL

Women Do as Much as Men, 1859
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 509 497 413 449

Grand Total = 1,907

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 91;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 6; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 50;
Complex 23; Compound 12; Compound-complex 6.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 45; Loose 20; Balanced 9; Periodic 26.

Personal pronouns:

First person: Singular 25, Plural 10.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 12.
Third person: Singular 9, Plural 24.
## II. CAROLINE W. H. DALL

**The Opening of the Gates, 1859**

(100 sentences studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 688  665  658  678

**Grand Total** - 2,587

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 84; Exclamatory 8; Interrogative 7; Imperative 7.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 38; Complex 22; Compound 16; Compound-complex 24;
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 22; Loose 29; Balanced 14; Periodic 35.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 24, Plural 18.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 14.
Third person: Singular 17, Plural 29.
Verify Your Credentials, 1859

(100 sentences studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 656 695 533 595

Grand Total = 2,479

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 95;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 1; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 35;
Complex 27; Compound 15; Compound-complex 25.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 18; Loose 28; Balanced 15; Periodic 40.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 18, Plural 11.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 8.
Third person: Singular 43, Plural 28.
### Death or Dishonor, 1859

(100 sentences studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 625 720 403 610

**Grand Total:** 2,411

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 84;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 3; Imperative 11.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 29;
Complex 22; Compound 15; Compound-complex 18.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 18;
Loose 14; Balanced 10; Periodic 56.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 46, Plural 18.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 45.
## V. CAROLINE H. HALL

**Death and Dishonor**  
(20 sentences)

**Verify Your Credentials**  
(20 sentences)

### Number of words per sentence:

| 37 | 33 | 17 | 37 |
| 12 | 5  | 11 | 22 |
| 28 | 22 | 33 | 41 |
| 20 | 11 | 28 | 37 |
| 34 | 24 | 22 | 37 |
| 46 | 31 | 16 | 17 |
| 22 | 21 | 13 | 11 |
| 21 | 40 | 25 | 34 |
| 20 | 54 | 15 | 7 |
| 51 | 27 | 12 | 25 |
| 20 | 50 | 41 | 19 |
| 32 | 29 | 12 | 16 |
| 20 | 33 | 41 | 19 |
| 24 | 23 | 12 | 11 |
| 25 | 26 | 32 | 10 |
| 28 | 30 | 23 | 16 |
| 10 | 22 | 10 | 27 |
| 21 | 9  | 14 | 6 |
| 41 | 31 | 20 | 12 |
| 27 | 24 | 22 | 21 |
| 25 | 20 | 14 | 6 |
| 15 | 12 | 20 | 32 |
| 36 | 12 | 17 | 30 |
| 12 | 26 | 13 | 33 |

**Totals** 699 668 495 515

**Grand Total** - 2,347

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 82; Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 5; Imperative 7.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 35; Complex 35; Compound 17; Compound-complex 15.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25; Loose 26; Balanced 14; Periodic 35.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 10, Plural 5.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 15.
Third person: Singular 71, Plural 12.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

CAROLINE W. H. DALL

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 11,731.
   Average number of words per sentence - 23.462.

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 440, Exclamatory 0, Interrogative 22, Imperative 29.

3. Enumeration of Personal Pronouns:
   b. Second person: Singular 9, Plural 92.

4. Fragmentary sentences

5. Slang 1.

6. Abbreviations 5.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 18.

9. References to the particular occasion 2.

10. References to the particular audience 21.
Number of words per sentence:

| 45 | 40 | 27 | 25 |
| 35 | 30 | 26 | 26 |
| 26 | 14 | 21 | 17 |
| 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 |
| 37 | 37 | 21 | 17 |
| 50 | 50 | 25 | 17 |
| 36 | 36 | 11 | 10 |
| 16 | 16 | 5  | 10 |
| 9  | 9  | 16 | 12 |
| 11 | 11 | 25 | 56 |
| 17 | 17 | 10 | 15 |
| 18 | 18 | 20 | 15 |
| 18 | 18 | 18 | 15 |
| 12 | 12 | 10 | 14 |
| 41 | 41 | 14 | 9  |
| 54 | 54 | 6  | 11 |
| 36 | 36 | 13 | 17 |
| 35 | 35 | 5  | 15 |
| 26 | 26 | 21 | 21 |
| 24 | 24 | 22 | 22 |
| 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| 55 | 55 | 26 | 11 |
| 40 | 40 | 22 | 22 |
| 12 | 12 | 47 | 22 |
| 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |

Totals 550 640 546 540

Grand Total - 2,265

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 39;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 3; Imperative 7.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 30;
Complex 54; Compound 6; Compound-complex 10.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 23;
Loose 34; Balanced 6; Periodic 37.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 36, Plural 91.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 0.
Third person: Singular 7, Plural 21.
Speech at National Woman Suffrage Convention, 1890
(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 21 | 22 | 25 | 12 |
| 17 | 22 | 46 | 27 |
| 10 | 26 | 22 | 5  |
| 24 | 21 | 19 | 26 |
| 22 | 24 | 34 | 36 |
| 23 | 30 | 7  | 18 |
| 17 | 30 | 17 | 19 |
| 20 | 50 | 7  | 27 |
| 22 | 55 | 20 | 27 |
| 20 | 25 | 7  | 18 |
| 17 | 50 | 12 | 19 |
| 42 | 12 | 11 | 27 |
| 15 | 27 | 15 | 25 |
| 12 | 31 | 10 | 17 |
| 31 | 14 | 29 | 16 |
| 20 | 9  | 16 | 42 |
| 32 | 15 | 49 | 21 |
| 34 | 13 | 26 | 14 |
| 34 | 13 | 26 | 21 |
| 22 | 22 | 13 | 14 |
| 34 | 11 | 21 | 24 |
| 29 | 41 | 26 | 11 |
| 11 | 23 | 15 | 7  |
| 21 | 19 | 51 | 53 |

Totals: 621 567 556 552

Grand Total: 2,296

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 50;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 7; Imperative 4.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 50;
Complex 39; Compound 5; Compound-complex 6.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 33;
Loose 14; Balanced 6; Periodic 43.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 10, Plural 17.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 5.
Third person: Singular 37, Plural 21.
III. JULIA WARD HAWK

The Salon in America, 1893
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 341 535 608 730

Grand Total - 2,765

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 92;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 3; Imperative 5.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 26;
Complex 54; Compound 4; Compound-complex 16.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 18; Loose 24; Balanced 5; Periodic 55.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 26, Plural 59.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 4.
Third person: Singular 28, Plural 50.
IV. JULIA WARD WENDELL

(a) Let There Be Light, 1905
(b) The Patience of Faith, 1908
(c) Boston, A Little Island of Darkness, 1908

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| Number | 47 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 23 | 16 | 47 | 20 | 13 | 38 | 9 | 17 | 32 | 10 | 14 | 17 | 23 | 22 | 24 | 15 | 35 | 54 | 21 | 4 |
|--------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|        | 6  | 17 | 10 | 17 | 23 | 24 | 9  | 15 | 20 | 20 | 16 | 52 | 13 | 25 | 53 | 27 | 19 | 22 | 43 | 20 | 31 | 16 | 17 |
|        | 25 | 28 | 23 | 15 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 10 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 14 | 20 | 12 | 15 | 47 | 19 | 22 | 26 | 13 | 19 | 14 | 4 |
|        | 17 | 34 | 15 | 6  | 19 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8  | 14 | 23 | 14 | 10 | 32 | 33 | 27 | 12 | 19 | 30 | 33 | 17 |
| Totals | 557| 562| 488| 495|

Grand Total - 2,100

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 76;
Exclamatory 7; Interrogative 9; Imperative 9.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 40; Complex 41; Compound 10; Compound-complex 9.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 29; Loose 26; Balanced 10; Periodic 38.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 30, Plural 34.
Second person: Singular 1, Plural 7.
Third person: Singular 6, Plural 24.
V. JULIA HARD ROSE

The Position of Women in Plato's Republic

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| Number of words | 35 | 29 | 14 | 24 | 32 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 23 | 22 | 34 | 23 | 26 | 24 | 10 | 41 | 35 | 28 | 29 | 17 | 13 | 22 | 55 | 52 | 10 | 14 | 13 |
|----------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|                | 11 | 24 | 14 | 22 | 22 | 3  | 44 | 12 | 64 | 26 | 25 | 22 | 10 | 12 | 21 | 48 | 10 | 34 | 29 | 13 | 13 | 43 | 34 | 32 | 31 | 19 | 19 |
|                | 10 | 12 | 17 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 11 | 24 | 19 | 21 | 43 | 20 | 3  | 24 | 20 | 14 | 29 | 10 | 16 | 25 | 23 | 17 | 50 | 19 | 18 | 11 |

Totals 598 598 499 572

Grand Total = 2,567

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 67;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 2; Imperative 1.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 44; Complex 46; Compound 6; Compound-complex 4.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27; Loose 27; Balanced 5; Periodic 45.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 8, Plural 19.
Second person: Singular 9, Plural 1.
Third person: Singular 55, Plural 55.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

JULIA WARD HOWE

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 11,693
   Average number of words per sentence - 23.386

2. Classification of sentences:
   b. According to structure: Simple 190, Complex 234, Compound 31, Compound-complex 45.

3. Enumeration of Personal Pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 107, Plural 220.
   b. Second person: Singular 1, Plural 17.
   c. Third person: Singular 133, Plural 129.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 2.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 15.

9. References to the particular occasion 7.

10. References to the particular audience 9.
I. DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

(a) The Heavenly Vision, a sermon, 1887
(b) Speech at National Council of Women, 1891
(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 10 | 24 | 13 | 13 |
| 29 | 35 | 11 | 13 |
| 11 | 36 | 0  | 0  |
| 11 | 28 | 0  | 0  |
| 15 | 36 | 0  | 0  |
| 30 | 21 | 0  | 0  |
| 12 | 19 | 0  | 0  |
| 24 | 16 | 0  | 0  |
| 54 | 35 | 0  | 0  |
| 28 | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| 19 | 19 | 0  | 0  |
| 27 | 22 | 0  | 0  |
| 54 | 22 | 0  | 0  |
| 6  | 22 | 0  | 0  |
| 97 | 75 | 0  | 0  |
| 62 | 26 | 0  | 0  |
| 19 | 27 | 0  | 0  |
| 77 | 40 | 0  | 0  |
| 55 | 19 | 0  | 0  |
| 24 | 16 | 0  | 0  |
| 84 | 16 | 0  | 0  |
| 12 | 10 | 0  | 0  |
| 14 | 30 | 0  | 0  |

Totals: 799  722  662  784

Grand Total - 2,967

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 97;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 10; Imperative 5.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 19;
Complex 46; Compound 11; Compound-complex 24.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 14;
Loose 29; Balanced 9; Periodic 49.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 15, Plural 24.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 0.
Third person: Singular 61, Plural 23.
God's Women. 1891

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 23 | 132 | 39 | 20 |
| 25 | 55 | 47 | 29 |
| 100 | 13 | 32 | 13 |
| 3 | 13 | 19 | 14 |
| 15 | 14 | 17 | 17 |
| 75 | 13 | 7 | 46 |
| 59 | 14 | 20 | 11 |
| 5 | 11 | 17 | 17 |
| 100 | 13 | 15 | 56 |
| 10 | 24 | 39 | 43 |
| 61 | 29 | 52 | 39 |
| 16 | 15 | 37 | 20 |
| 11 | 23 | 4 | 43 |
| 36 | 5 | 3 | 21 |
| 11 | 50 | 55 | 6 |
| 4 | 8 | 23 | 12 |
| 11 | 9 | 15 | 9 |
| 14 | 50 | 48 | 29 |
| 31 | 7 | 59 | 19 |
| 23 | 33 | 33 | 9 |
| 13 | 10 | 15 | 16 |
| 3 | 11 | 20 | 10 |
| 14 | 25 | 14 | 23 |
| 37 | 9 | 19 | 37 |

Totals 259 503 624 627

Grand Total - 2,863

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 256;
Exclamatory 5; Interrogative 3; Imperative 0.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 26; Complex 36; Compound 13; Compound-complex 25.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 23; Loose 32; Balanced 4; Periodic 41.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 25, Plural 52.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 9.
Third person: Singular 96, Plural 46.
III. DR. ALVA HOWARD VAIL

The Fate of Republics, 1893

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 17 | 39 | 46 | 29 |
| 59 | 63 | 64 | 45 |
| 53 | 62 | 57 | 3 |
| 58 | 77 | 35 | 6 |
| 16 | 12 | 38 | 19 |
| 17 | 16 | 38 | 43 |
| 49 | 51 | 17 | 35 |
| 31 | 36 | 30 | 6 |
| 23 | 16 | 3 | 20 |
| 15 | 44 | 41 | 16 |
| 15 | 65 | 44 | 31 |
| 36 | 5 | 29 | 70 |
| 51 | 38 | 28 | 45 |
| 7 | 5 | 12 | 36 |
| 69 | 17 | 17 | 21 |
| 40 | 30 | 16 | 23 |
| 15 | 27 | 27 | 53 |
| 13 | 28 | 64 | 83 |
| 4 | 33 | 43 | 33 |
| 38 | 44 | 60 | 33 |
| 29 | 7 | 30 | 51 |
| 61 | 17 | 16 | 53 |
| 55 | 40 | 65 | 71 |
| 57 | 37 | 6 | 33 |
| 29 | 16 | 32 | 15 |

Totals 760 776 825 743

Grand Total - 3,307

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 95;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 4; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 16;
Complex 50; Compound 7; Compound-complex 27.
Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 3; Loose 24; Balanced 3; Periodic 65.

Personal Pronouns:

First person: Singular 2, Plural 32.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 2.
Third person: Singular 25, Plural 70.
IV. MT. ARAH ROGEN 1906

(a) Eulogy on Susan B. Anthony, 1906

(b) Speech on Sixtieth Birthday, 1907

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 33 | 7  | 23 | 17 |
| 23 | 13 | 17 | 14 |
| 9  | 10 | 7  | 20 |
| 7  | 13 | 10 | 10 |
| 9  | 31 | 25 | 20 |
| 14 | 23 | 13 | 70 |
| 21 | 59 | 25 | 11 |
| 12 | 44 | 21 | 23 |
| 33 | 57 | 27 | 15 |
| 27 | 14 | 25 | 43 |
| 5  | 16 | 10 | 10 |
| 11 | 12 | 42 | 13 |
| 33 | 26 | 24 | 24 |
| 22 | 13 | 3 | 107 |
| 13 | 18 | 3  | 13 |
| 10 | 7  | 6  | 33 |
| 23 | 23 | 6  | 37 |
| 43 | 3  | 39 | 49 |
| 8  | 13 | 63 | 43 |
| 23 | 17 | 7  | 37 |
| 19 | 6  | 13 | 35 |
| 15 | 22 | 3  | 31 |
| 11 | 41 | 23 | 13 |
| 28 | 18 | 5  | 30 |
| 8  | 13 | 10 | 10 |

Totals 450 528 472 849

Grand Total = 2,277

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 94;
Exclamatory 4; Interrogative 0; Imperative 2.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 58;
Complex 41; Compound 12; Compound-complex 12.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 57;
Loose 81; Balanced 3; Periodic 44.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 15, Plural 40.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 3.
Third person: Singular 106, Plural 8.
Speeches when President of Women's Suffrage Association, 1911-15

 completa speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total = 3,312

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 251;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 15; Imperative 0.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 14; Complex 61; Compound 17; Compound-complex 8.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 15; Loose 33; Balanced 7; Periodic 45.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 53, Plural 39.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 20.
Third person: Singular 26, Plural 56.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

DR. ANNA HOWARD CHAM

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 14,355.
   Average number of words per sentence - 28.71.

2. Classification of sentences:
   b. According to structure: Simple 110, Complex 234, Compound 60, Compound-complex 96.

3. Enumeration of Personal Pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 90, Plural 238.
   b. Second person: Singular 9, Plural 47.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 1.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contraction 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 23.

9. References to the particular occasion 15.

10. References to the particular audience 15.
I. FRANCES E. WILLARD

(a) My Own Call, National L.C.T.U., 1879
(b) Some Political Party Will Respond, 1884
(c) Our Temperance Round-Up, 1884

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>Sentence Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 619 1002 615 811

Grand Total - 5,047
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 13; Exclamatory 6; Interrogative 2; Imperative 9.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 38; Complex 44; Compound 16; compound-complex 8.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25; Loose 29; Balanced 9; Periodic 57.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 76, Plural 75.
Second person: Singular 3, Plural 20.
Third person: Singular 34, Plural 18.
II. FRANCES H. WARD

(a) Nomination Speech for Gov. St. John, 1864
(b) Address at U.C.C.U. Convention, New York, 1868
(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 745 846 1116 716

Grand Total - 3,421

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 561;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 6; Imperative 6.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 28;
Complex 42; Compound 14; Compound-complex 16.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 11;
Loose 34; Balanced 0; Periodic 66.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 31, Plural 64.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 1.
Third person: Singular 32, Plural 35.
III. FRANCES E. WILLARD

(a) The Greatest Party, Decoration Day, 1868

(b) Social Purity, International Council of Women,
Washington, D.C., 1868

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 578 768 1097 790

Grand Total - 3,255
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 81; Exclamatory 5; Interrogative 7; Imperative 7.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 41; Complex 27; Compound 11; Compound-complex 21.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 55; Loose 23; Balanced 12; Periodic 32.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 71, Plural 56.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 27.
Third person: Singular 22, Plural 34.
IV. FRANCES E. WILLARD

(a) National Council of Women, Washington, D.C., 1886

(b) International Council of Women, New York, 1888

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 709 657 698 962

Grand Total = 3,056

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 87; Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 6; Imperative 5.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 50;
Complex 59; Compound 25; Compound-complex 16.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 14;
Loose 56; Balanced 20; Periodic 30.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 85, Plural 61.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 63.
Third person: Singular 18, Plural 41.
V. FRANCES E. WILLARD

(a) *Women and Organization*, 1891

(b) *Gospel Politics*, 1892

Presentation Speech of Mrs. Hayes' Picture to
White House.

*(complete speeches studied)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**: 1045 1042 350 575

Grand Total = 3,550
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 39;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 8; Imperative 8.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 28;
Complex 41; Compound 9; Compound-complex 12.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 29;
Loose 28; Balanced 4; Periodic 59.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 21, Plural 37.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 1.
Third person: Singular 14, Plural 23.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

FRANCES E. WILLARD

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences = 16,837
   Average number of words per sentence = 33,674

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 426, Exclamatory 16, Interrogative 26, Imperative 32.
   b. According to structure: Simple 165, Complex 193, Compound 59, Compound-complex 73.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   b. Second person: Singular 3, Plural 112.
   c. Third person: Singular 110, Plural 151.

4. Fragmentary sentences

5. Slang 2.

6. Abbreviations 6.

7. Contractions

8. References to the particular speaker 26.

9. References to the particular occasion 5.

10. References to the particular audience 19.
Speech at First American Women Suffrage Convention
at Cleveland, 1869
(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 569 584 461 678

Grand Total - 2,372

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 849 Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 8; Imperative 7.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 35; Complex 38; Compound 9; Compound-complex 17.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 35; Loose 12; Balanced 17; Periodic 36.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 14, Plural 50.
Second person: Singular 1, Plural 5.
Third person: Singular 20, Plural 51.
What Shall We Do With Our Daughters?
Lyceum Lecture, 1870-80
(100 sentences studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 595 820 577 606

Grand Total - 2,996

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 95;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 2; Imperative 1.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 31;
Complex 33; Compound 9; Compound-complex 22.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 19;
Loose 21; Balanced 17; Periodic 43.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 11, Plural 24.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 1.
Third person: Singular 44, Plural 56.
III. MARY A. LIVERTMORE

Has the Night of Death No Morning?

Lyceum Lecture, 1870-80

Number of words per sentence:

| Number | 15 | 27 | 28 | 21 | 23 | 39 | 11 | 21 | 18 | 79 | 14 | 21 | 37 | 8 | 50 | 5 | 35 | 22 | 51 | 22 | 57 | 6 | 12 | 35 | 15 |
|--------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|        | 23 | 18 | 40 | 31 | 35 | 52 | 41 | 21 | 16 | 10 | 12 | 26 | 19 | 18 | 15 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 33 | 11 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
|        | 45 | 29 | 55 | 12 | 10 | 40 | 19 | 16 | 25 | 22 | 16 | 10 | 16 | 18 | 23 | 26 | 24 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 14 | 24 | 16 | 13 |
|        | 10 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 36 | 40 | 26 | 23 | 22 | 27 | 25 | 36 | 17 | 32 | 22 | 35 | 6 | 12 | 35 | 14 | 21 | 15 | 18 | 18 |

Totals 684  604  444  561

Grand Total - 2,383

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 619;
Exclamatory 3; Interrogative 15; Imperative 1.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 41; Complex 32; Compound 9; Compound-complex 18.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 30; Loose 10; Balanced 14; Periodic 45.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 17, Plural 69.
Second person: Singular 9, Plural 14.
Third person: Singular 74, Plural 45.
IV. MARY A. LIVENMORE

The Boy of To-Day. Lyceum Lecture, 1870-80
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 697 576 726 611

Grand Total = 2,610

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 94;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 4; Imperative 1.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 38; Complex 35; Compound 15; Compound-complex 12.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27; Loose 19; Balanced 18; Periodic 36.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 4, Plural 24.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 3.
Third person: Singular 33, Plural 44.
V. MARY A. LIVERMORE

The Battle of Life. Lyceum Lecture, 1870-30

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 26 | 23 | 51 | 18 |
| 22 | 21 | 42 | 17 |
| 21 | 14 | 45 | 41 |
| 29 | 29 | 19 | 12 |
| 22 | 75 | 38 | 26 |
| 34 | 53 | 99 | 18 |
| 25 | 15 | 12 | 5 |
| 56 | 31 | 14 | 7 |
| 15 | 20 | 13 | 27 |
| 8 | 23 | 21 | 14 |
| 27 | 55 | 9 | 26 |
| 24 | 17 | 16 | 39 |
| 30 | 36 | 7 | 18 |
| 33 | 4 | 28 | 20 |
| 11 | 15 | 6 | 36 |
| 32 | 14 | 15 | 10 |
| 22 | 22 | 28 | 37 |
| 29 | 27 | 13 | 23 |
| 51 | 12 | 26 | 25 |
| 32 | 26 | 41 | 28 |
| 28 | 25 | 67 | 31 |
| 28 | 16 | 28 | 23 |
| 25 | 56 | 9 | 27 |
| 25 | 50 | 19 | 182 |
| 25 | 19 | 90 | 37 |

Totals 613 650 704 687

Grand Total - 2,654

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 96;
Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 3; Imperative 0.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 24; Complex 44; Compound 19; Compound-complex 13.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 14; Loose 34; Balanced 14; Periodic 30.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 7, Plural 51.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 2.
Third person: Singular 52, Plural 30.
Summary of Points Studied in Speeches of

MARY ASHTON LIVERMORE

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 12,717.
   Average number of words per sentence = 25.434.

2. Classification of sentences:
   b. According to structure: Simple 170, Complex 187, Compound 61, Compound-complex 82.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 125, Loose 66, Balanced 80, Periodic 199.

3. Enumeration of Personal Pronouns:
   b. Second person: Singular 1, Plural 28.
   c. Third person: Singular 251, Plural 216.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 1.

6. Abbreviations 1.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 4.

9. References to the particular occasion 0.

10. References to the particular audience 2.
I. ISABELLA BLEACHER HOOKER

(a) Speech at Washington Convention, 1871

(b) Thanks to Judiciary Committee, 1871

(complete speeches studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 619 651 959 1057

Grand Total - 3,226

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 78;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 15; Imperative 7.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 23;
Complex 29; Compound 19; Compound-complex 24.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 24;
Loose 43; Balanced 4; Periodic 25.

Personal Pronouns:
First Person: Singular 31, Plural 80.
Second Person: Singular 15, Plural 62.
Third Person: Singular 57, Plural 36.
II. ISABELLA BEECHER HOOKER

Address to Senate Committee, Washington, D.C., 1872
(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>27</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 595 900 825 987

Grand Total - 3,205

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 91;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 5; Imperative 4.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 20; Complex 54; Compound 7; Compound-complex 19.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 12; Loose 34; Balanced 1; Periodic 43.

Personal Pronouns

First person: Singular 1, Plural 12.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 2.
Third person: Singular 1, Plural 13.
The Constitutional Rights of Women. 1868
(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

|    | 4   | 12  | 20  | 27  | 77  | 47  | 23  | 52  | 114 | 53  | 118 | 60  | 20  | 66  | 22  | 41  | 87  | 85  | 60  | 39  | 74  | 38  | 32  | 20  | 37  | 75  | 11  |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 25 | 41  | 55  | 65  | 293 | 32  | 101 | 19  | 49  | 70  | 55  | 12  | 33  | 25  | 18  | 45  | 17  | 17  | 7   | 24  | 29  | 31  | 10  | 24  | 56  | 58  |

Totals 1155  950  934  1191

Grand Total - 4,273

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 93;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 6; Imperative 1.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 19; Complex 38; Compound 7; Compound-complex 36.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 14; Loose 51; Balanced 4; Periodic 51.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 25, Plural 31.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 20.
Third person: Singular 30, Plural 64.
IV. ISABELLA BEZOIR HOOKER

Women in Politics and Jurisprudence, 1891

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 1067 961 610 536

Grand Total = 5,674

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 92; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 7; Imperative 1.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 80;
Complex 44; Compound 3; Compound-complex 33.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 6;
Loose 43; Balanced 0; Periodic 45.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 18, Plural 51.
Second person: Singular 6, Plural 13.
Third person: Singular 41, Plural 68.
V. ISABELLA BEECHER HOOKER

Memorial of the Connecticut Association, 1905
(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 916 786 939 989

Grand Total - 3,530

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 87;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 6; Imperative 7.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 25; Complex 43; Compound 17; Compound-complex 15.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 24; Loose 20; Balanced 2; Periodic 4.

Personal Pronouns
First person: Singular 56, Plural 48.
Second person: Singular 12, Plural 19.
Third person: Singular 38, Plural 32.
Summary of Points Studied in Speeches of

Isabella Bird Blackmore

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 17,898.
   Average number of words per sentence - 35.796.

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 461, Exclamatory 9,
      Interrogative 39, Imperative 50.
   b. According to structure: Simple 112, Complex 208,
      Compound 32, Compound-complex 127.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 90, Loose
      207, Balanced 11, Periodic 139.

3. Summary of Pronouns:
   c. Third person: Singular 170, Plural 211.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 3.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 21.

9. References to the particular occasion 4.

10. References to the particular audience 19.
I, VICTORIA C. WOODHILL (MARTIN)

Address to Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., 1871

(86 sentences from this speech and 44 sentences from following speech)

### Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>67</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 545 990 960 610

Grand Total - 3,020
Sentences classified as to use:  Declarative 89;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 2; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure:  Simple 37;
Complex 48; Compound 9; Compound-complex 9.

Sentences classified as to artistry:  Very Simple 14;
Loose 47; Balanced 4; Periodic 35.

Personal pronouns:
First person:  Singular 17, Plural 14.
Second person:  Singular 0, Plural 14.
Third person:  Singular 4, Plural 30.
II. VICTORIA C. WOODHULL (MARTIN)

Lecture on Constitutional Equality, 1871

delivered at Lincoln Hall, Washington, D. C., 1871

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 27 | 10 | 72 | 12 |
| 78 | 35 | 17 | 4  |
| 44 | 44 | 16 | 4  |
| 33 | 15 | 15 | 19 |
| 10 | 4  | 17 | 22 |
| 27 | 10 | 37 | 12 |
| 34 | 14 | 50 | 4  |
| 20 | 10 | 32 | 23 |
| 15 | 27 | 65 | 37 |
| 33 | 18 | 26 | 18 |
| 36 | 22 | 15 | 37 |
| 35 | 28 | 11 | 36 |
| 20 | 47 | 10 |
| 33 | 17 | 13 | 13 |
| 49 | 12 | 34 |
| 29 | 5  | 23 |
| 20 | 33 | 13 |
| 18 | 22 | 22 |
| 13 | 50 | 5  |
| 24 | 72 | 10 |

Totals 703 605 598 469

Grand Total - 2,373

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 75;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 26; Imperative 1.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 19;
Complex 56; Compound 5; Compound-complex 20.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 18;
Loose 33; Balanced 3; Periodic 46.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 54, Plural 25.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 3.
Third person: Singular 0, Plural 64.
### The New Rebellion, 1871

The Great Secession Speech given at National Woman's Suffrage Convention at Apollo Hall, May 11, 1871

(100 sentences studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>613</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total - 2,919
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 0; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 11; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 16; Complex 0; Compound 9; Compound-complex 13.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 11; Loose 38; Balanced 4; Periodic 47.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 50, Plural 31.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 5.
Third person: Singular 0, Plural 64.
IV. VICTORIA C. WOOLHULL (MARTIN)

(a) **Social Freedom**  (short speeches in her campaign
for the nomination as candidate for President
of the United States)

(b) **First Pronunciato**, revised for newspaper
(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 14 | 51 | 25 | 16 |
| 6  | 12 | 29 | 22 |
| 7  | 15 | 35 | 11 |
| 11 | 22 | 41 | 25 |
| 14 | 39 | 54 | 5  |
| 16 | 55 | 23 | 8  |
| 57 | 10 | 17 | 15 |
| 16 | 10 | 4  | 41 |
| 18 | 28 | 11 | 37 |
| 12 | 25 | 5  | 28 |
| 17 | 25 | 19 | 40 |
| 22 | 29 | 19 | 26 |
| 16 | 16 | 7  | 14 |
| 18 | 4  | 4  | 43 |
| 29 | 10 | 27 | 9  |
| 29 | 6  | 8  | 53 |
| 6  | 12 | 18 | 16 |
| 56 | 27 | 47 | 23 |
| 55 | 10 | 5  | 49 |
| 55 | 38 | 16 | 34 |
| 18 | 15 | 11 | 77 |
| 55 | 21 | 26 | 16 |
| 25 | 100| 10 | 47 |
| 82 | 42 | 10 | 20 |

**Totals**  591  626  473  673

Grand Total - 2,368
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 91; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 7; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 32; Complex 33; Compound 9; Compound-complex 26.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 85; Loose 30; Balanced 6; Periodic 59.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 83; Plural 11.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 23.
Third person: Singular 28, Plural 15.
Tendencies of Government, 1870

(Speech was prepared but never delivered)

(revised form from newspaper but had to be used for lack of material)

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 1103 1103 1058 701

Grand Total = 4,165
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 93; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 0; Imperative 0.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 14; Complex 62; Compound 1; Compound-complex 23.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 4; Loose 44; Balanced 0; Periodic 52.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 9, Plural 5.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 11.
Third person: Singular 26, Plural 30.
Summary of Points Studied in Speeches of

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 14,349.
   Average number of words per sentence - 28.698.

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 435, Exclamatory 3,
      Interrogative 60, Imperative 7.
   b. According to structure: Simple 118, Complex 259,
      Compound 32, Compound-complex 91.
   c. According to artiety: Very Simple 72, Loose 138,
      Balanced 17, Periodic 223.

3. Enumeration of Personal Pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 213, Plural 84.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 56.
   c. Third person: Singular 70, Plural 188.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 2.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 27.

9. References to the particular occasion 7.

10. References to the particular audience 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G65</th>
<th>749</th>
<th>G58</th>
<th>G60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of words per sentence:

(1) Congress Speeches studied
(2) Arguments of the Judiciary Committee, 1964
(3) Legislation, 1964
(4) Committee of the Committee of the Senate
(5) H.R. 9867
(6) Title Page

10
Sentences classified according to use:  Declarative 77; Exclamatory 9; Interrogative 10; Imperative 4.

Sentences classified as to structure:  Simple 36; Complex 26; Compound 15; Compound-complex 23.

Sentences classified as to artistry:  Very Simple 30; Loose 30; Balanced 5; Periodic 35.

Personal Pronouns:
First person:  Singular 12, Plural 39.
Second person:  Singular 0, Plural 9.
Third person:  Singular 46, Plural 34.
II. MRS. DEVEREUX LILLIE BLAKE

Home, 1883

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 654 | 954 | 911 | 1027

Grand Total = 3,548

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 82; Exclamatory 5; Interrogative 7; Imperative 6.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 36; Complex 34; Compound 13; Compound-complex 17.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 22; Loose 26; Balanced 6; Periodic 34.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 11, Plural 38.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 18.
Third person: Singular 60, Plural 14.
III. MRS. DEVEREUX LILIE BLAKE

The Unknown Quantity in Politics, 1884

at National Woman's Suffrage Association, 1884

(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 799 641 522 631

Grand Total = 2,595

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 70;
Exclamatory 9; Interrogative 19; Imperative 2.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 27;
Complex 44; Compound 10; Compound-complex 19.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 24;
Loose 23; Balanced 11; Periodic 37.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 3, Plural 52.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 11.
Third person: Singular 77, Plural 30.
IV. MRS. DEVEREUX LILLY BLAKE

A Clever Satire on the Rights of Men

given at National Convention, 1887
(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 26 | 18 | 54 | 9 |
| 11 | 19 | 23 | 64 |
| 8  | 13 | 21 | 52 |
| 32 | 27 | 42 | 32 |
| 65 | 5  | 65 | 40 |
| 16 | 24 | 47 | 9 |
| 9  | 14 | 21 | 56 |
| 16 | 24 | 17 | 22 |
| 16 | 10 | 25 | 55 |
| 22 | 25 | 9  | 9 |
| 14 | 47 | 30 | 3 |
| 15 | 21 | 49 | 3 |
| 19 | 23 | 25 | 58 |
| 18 | 27 | 108 | 10 |
| 13 | 26 | 48 | 31 |
| 49 | 54 | 19 | 15 |
| 12 | 16 | 19 | 15 |
| 8  | 29 | 46 | 38 |
| 19 | 14 | 42 | 50 |
| 39 | 55 | 20 | 34 |
| 9  | 49 | 3  | 38 |
| 19 | 50 | 31 | 28 |
| 6  | 23 | 19 | 47 |
| 31 | 47 | 15 | 28 |
| 49 | 28 | 46 | 25 |

Totals 539 700 641 599

Grand Total = 2,669

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 71;
Exclamatory 16; Interrogative 10; Imperative 1.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 30;
Complex 43; Compound 7; Compound-complex 20.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 31;
Loose 48; Balanced 1; Periodic 30.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 9, Plural 12.
Second person: Singular 9, Plural 8.
Third person: Singular 64, Plural 65.
V. MRS. SEVERUS LILLIE BLAIR

(a) *Women as Police Matrons*, 1891

(b) *Our Forgotten Foremothers*, 1893

given at *World's Columbian Exposition*, Chicago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>540</th>
<th>742</th>
<th>558</th>
<th>579</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 89; Exclamatory 9; Interrogative 1; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 39; Complex 28; Compound 13; Compound–complex 21.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25; Loose 32; Balanced 7; Periodic 36.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 16, Plural 40.
Second person: Singular 9, Plural 7.
Third person: Singular 48, Plural 50.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

MRS. BEVERUX LILLIE BLAKE

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 13,968.
   Average number of words per sentence - 27.936.

2. Classification of sentences:
   b. According to structure: Simple 167, Complex 177, Compound 56, Compound-complex 100.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 56, Plural 181.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 50.
   c. Third person: Singular 315, Plural 183.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.


6. Abbreviations 1.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 10.

9. References to the particular occasion 6.

10. References to the particular audience 5.
I. CLARA BARTON

(a) Talks to Soldiers, Grand Army of Republic

(b) The Founding of the Red Cross, 1892

(complete extracts studied)

| Number of words per sentence: |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 45 | 54 | 15 |
| 12 | 19 | 26 | 7 |
| 28 | 19 | 24 | 3 |
| 25 | 57 | 34 | 25 |
| 15 | 79 | 31 | 72 |
| 22 | 14 | 43 | 20 |
| 47 | 0 | 51 | 19 |
| 25 | 27 | 23 | 21 |
| 18 | 32 | 22 | 10 |
| 44 | 27 | 37 | 8 |
| 8 | 10 | 16 | 17 |
| 52 | 28 | 15 | 45 |
| 27 | 51 | 7 | 16 |
| 30 | 32 | 7 | 24 |
| 43 | 9 | 20 | 17 |
| 28 | 20 | 3 | 13 |
| 59 | 13 | 9 | 21 |
| 35 | 44 | 9 | 27 |
| 25 | 99 | 20 | 4 |
| 16 | 7 | 48 | 24 |
| 5 | 5 | 57 | 29 |
| 24 | 6 | 29 | 18 |
| 19 | 15 | 14 | 30 |
| 4 | 22 | 14 | 50 |
| 13 | 15 | 6 | 39 |

Totals 678 740 578 577

Grand Total = 2,573
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Tense/Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Person</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Person</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Tense/Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He talks</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She writes</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It consists</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Tense/Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am going</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Tense/Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will go</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will write</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They will be</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Tense/Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was going</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You were</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Tense/Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am going</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Tense/Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was going</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You were</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. CLARA BARTON

Address to the Congress of the United States, 1862

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 64 | 52 | 25 | 29 |
| 59 | 27 | 22 | 27 |
| 22 | 26 | 20 | 51 |
| 6  | 40 | 5  | 40 |
| 51 | 28 | 54 | 6  |
| 31 | 41 | 12 | 49 |
| 22 | 22 | 13 | 32 |
| 75 | 34 | 53 | 47 |
| 58 | 47 | 31 | 12 |
| 16 | 30 | 12 | 9  |
| 54 | 54 | 56 | 42 |
| 25 | 72 | 50 | 23 |
| 17 | 12 | 5  | 14 |
| 4  | 7  | 21 | 7  |
| 11 | 26 | 3  | 8  |
| 19 | 7  | 17 | 23 |
| 24 | 7  | 56 | 22 |
| 19 | 7  | 4  | 24 |
| 54 | 11 | 19 | 49 |
| 55 | 15 | 51 | 51 |
| 49 | 9  | 55 | 6  |
| 20 | 15 | 10 | 15 |
| 20 | 12 | 6  | 15 |
| 50 | 16 | 24 | 19 |
| 21 | 19 | 16 | 54 |

Totals 746 613 625 613

Grand Total - 2,597

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 87;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 15; Imperative 0.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 47; Complex 34; Compound 9; Compound-complex 10.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 33; Loose 30; Balanced 4; Periodic 35.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 14, Plural 16.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 5.
Third person: Singular 5, Plural 5.
III. CLARA BARTON

The Red Cross at the International Council of Women.

Washington, D.C., 1889

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 59 | 15 | 63 | 48 |
| 20 | 65 | 35 | 10 |
| 70 | 17 | 41 | 7 |
| 20 | 7  | 31 | 15 |
| 20 | 16 | 44 | 6 |
| 63 | 39 | 31 | 19 |
| 59 | 17 | 8  | 50 |
| 17 | 37 | 23 | 80 |
| 16 | 11 | 16 | 44 |
| 27 | 28 | 28 | 35 |
| 58 | 12 | 7  | 15 |
| 24 | 17 | 10 | 13 |
| 36 | 26 | 30 | 48 |
| 29 | 19 | 34 | 66 |
| 109| 13 | 13 | 64 |
| 55 | 29 | 39 | 6 |
| 58 | 33 | 9  | 5 |
| 14 | 14 | 34 | 6 |
| 6  | 16 | 101| 30 |
| 39 | 11 | 54 | 50 |
| 142| 8  | 21 | 7 |
| 34 | 17 | 17 | 31 |
| 22 | 30 | 9  | 37 |
| 8  | 24 | 58 | 54 |
| 10 | 43 | 24 | 15 |

Totals 955 525 367 649

Grand Total = 2,947
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 93; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 5; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 43; Complex 24; Compound 10; Compound-complex 16.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 31; Loose 23; Balanced 9; Periodic 37.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 11, Plural 14.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 4.
Third person: Singular 9, Plural 29.
### What is the Significance of the Red Cross in its Relation to Philanthropy, 1895

*(100 sentences studied)*

#### Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total -</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sentences classified as to use:

- **Declarative**: 94
- **Exclamatory**: 0
- **Interrogative**: 4
- **Imperative**: 2
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 44;
Complex 30; Compound 15; Compound-complex 11.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27;
Loose 31; Balanced 14; Periodic 28.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 14, Plural 7.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 6.
Third person: Singular 9, Plural 28.
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Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 49;
Complex 23; Compound 11; Compound-complex 20.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 29;
Loose 20; Balanced 5; Periodic 27.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 48, Plural 9.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 4.
Third person: Singular 7, Plural 35.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

CLAURA BARTON

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 13,475.
   Average number of words per sentence - 26.955.

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 456, Exclamatory 0,
      Interrogative 40, Imperative 4.
   b. According to structure: Simple 231, Complex 146,
      Compound 55, Compound-complex 69.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 155,
      Loose 151, Balanced 35, Periodic 161.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 115, Plural 85.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 45.
   c. Third person: Singular 65, Plural 118.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 5.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 18.

9. References to the particular occasion 5.

10. References to the particular audience 11.
Number of words per sentence:

| 6  | 16 | 12 | 14 | 9  | 22 | 9  | 14 | 12 | 17 | 46 | 9  | 80 | 24 | 25 | 19 | 18 | 14 | 17 | 13 | 13 | 4  | 6  | 9  |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 34 | 14 | 14 | 22 | 14 | 12 | 17 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 17 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 8  | 12 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

Totals 392 565 336 558
Grand Total = 1,785

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 92;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 5; Imperative 5.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 45; Complex 30; Compound 14; Compound-complex 6.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 57; Loose 26; Balanced 4; Periodic 35.

Personal Pronouns:

First person: Singular 6, plural 35.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 14.
Third person: Singular 5, Plural 24.
II. MARY ELIZABETH LEAHE

(a) Women in Farmers' Alliance, 1891
(b) The Alliance League, 1891

(whole speeches studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 697 923 697 554

Grand Total = 5,261
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 67; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 15; Imperative 5.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 35; Complex 34; Compound 17; Compound-complex 14.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 27; Loose 24; Balanced 10; Periodic 39.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 39, Plural 42.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 14.
Third person: Singular 25, Plural 42.
### III, MARY ELIZABETH LLACE

Debate with Brumbaugh, Concordia, Kansas, 1891

(whole speech studied)

#### Number of words per sentence:

| Word Count | 7  | 17 | 27 | 19 | 11 | 13 | 18 | 16 | 14 | 10 | 13 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 25 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 37 | 6 | 25 | 22 | 74 |
|------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|
| Sentences |  55|  27|  19|  11|  13|  18|  16|  14|  10|  13|  42|  43|  44|  45|  25|  17|  16|  15|  14|  37|  6| 25|  22| 74 |

#### Totals

| 665 | 720 | 754 | 651 |

**Grand Total - 2,770**

**Sentences classified as to use:** Declarative 87;

Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 8; Imperative 6.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 32; Complex 52; Compound 8; Compound-complex 10.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 29; Loose 20; Balanced 1; Periodic 49.

Personal Pronoun:
First person: Singular 29, Plural 39.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 14.
Third person: Singular 15, Plural 25.
IV. MARY ELIZABETH LEACH

Synopsis of Speech, 1893

(whole speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 67 | 51 | 6 | 11 |
| 20 | 73 | 37 | 31 |
| 43 | 34 | 41 | 31 |
| 65 | 33 | 4 | 22 |
| 66 | 50 | 18 | 12 |
| 22 | 13 | 23 | 4 |
| 76 | 9 | 14 | 6 |
| 23 | 83 | 23 | 14 |
| 9 | 83 | 20 | 23 |
| 13 | 54 | 15 | 17 |
| 18 | 57 | 12 | 8 |
| 15 | 70 | 5 | 40 |
| 10 | 56 | 35 | 33 |
| 28 | 6 | 18 | 41 |
| 27 | 19 | 18 | 17 |
| 59 | 54 | 9 | 7 |
| 28 | 10 | 9 | 45 |
| 61 | 15 | 19 | 63 |
| 27 | 20 | 25 | 20 |
| 18 | 39 | 22 | 24 |
| 48 | 14 | 34 | 59 |
| 19 | 29 | 15 | 18 |
| 30 | 44 | 10 | 51 |
| 30 | 24 | 18 | 25 |

Totals 799 730 528 676

Grand Total - 2,784

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 94;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 0; Imperative 5.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 39;
Complex 30; Compound 12; Compound-complex 10.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25;
Loose 35; Balanced 9; Periodic 31.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 0, Plural 20.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 12.
Third person: Singular 10, Plural 34.
V. MARY ELIZABETH LEASE

Quadrangular Debates, Saline, Kansas, 1894

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 551 627 900 587

Grand Total - 2,565

Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 94; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 5; Imperative 3.
Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 48; Complex 57; Compound 9; Compound-complex 6.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25; Loose 43; Balanced 1; Periodic 31.

Personal Pronouns:

First person: Singular 0, Plural 45.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 3.
Third person: Singular 10, Plural 32.
Summary of Points Studied in Speeches of

MARY ELIZABETH DICK

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences = 13,675.
   Average number of words per sentence = 27.35.

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 469, Exclamatory 0,
      Interrogative 29, Imperative 0.
   b. According to structure: Simple 199, Complex 197,
      Compound 23, Compound-complex 46.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 137, Loose
      156, Balanced 23, Periodic 185.

3. Enumeration of Personal Pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 73, Plural 179.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 61.
   c. Third person: Singular 65, Plural 177.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contractions 2.

8. References to the particular speaker 11.

9. References to the particular occasion 7.

10. References to the particular audience 9.
### Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 485 603 627 741

**Grand Total:** 2,481
Sentences classified as to use:  Declarative 23;  Exclamatory 0;  Interrogative 5;  Imperative 0.

Sentences classified as to structure:  Simple 29;  Complex 47;  Compound 0;  Compound-complex 16.

Sentences classified as to artistry:  Very Simple 23;  Loose 17;  Balanced 7;  Periodic 56.

Personal Pronouns:
First person:  Singular 18, Plural 42.
Second person:  Singular 0, Plural 15.
Third person:  Singular 2, Plural 57.
II. Mrs. CARRIE CHAPLAIN CATT

(a) Hearing by House Judiciary committee, 1892.

(b) Declaration of Principles,
given at National Woman Suffrage Association
1904

(whole speeches studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 759 899 582 532

Grand Total - 2,712
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 97;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 2; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 34;
Complex 22; Compound 14; Compound-complex 30.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 50;
Loose 56; Balanced 5; Periodic 51.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 10, Plural 32.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 51.
Third person: Singular 0, Plural 50.
### III. MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

(a) **Appeal for Action, 1904**

(b) **The New Time, 1906**

(c) **Eulogy on Susan B. Anthony, 1908**

(d) **Statement at Senate Hearing, 1910**

#### Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Totals

- **724**
- **624**
- **526**
- **706**

**Grand Total - 2,520**
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 92; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 5; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 54; Complex 36; Compound 12; Compound-complex 16.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25; Loose 25; Balanced 5; Periodic 42.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 9, Plural 44.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 6.
Third person: Singular 51, Plural 12.
IV. MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

(a) Address at Senate Hearing, 1915

(b) Cost of Sessions (U.S. Congress), 1920.

(c) Speech as President of International Woman's Alliance, 1916

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 28 | 15 | 19 | 10 |
| 51 | 14 | 26 | 59 |
| 52 | 14 | 10 | 21 |
| 57 | 16 | 27 |
| 11 | 18 | 8 |
| 39 | 44 | 29 |
| 39 | 9 | 4 | 12 |
| 39 | 49 | 18 |
| 17 | 49 | 39 |
| 42 | 11 | 28 |
| 57 | 4 | 18 |
| 17 | 27 | 18 |
| 25 | 22 | 50 |
| 15 | 15 | 17 |
| 24 | 19 | 24 |
| 12 | 57 | 25 |
| 24 | 12 | 23 |
| 57 | 26 | 38 |
| 35 | 26 | 41 |
| 55 | 11 | 19 |
| 21 | 37 | 37 |
| 21 | 16 | 45 |
| 15 | 57 | 42 |
| 16 | 50 | 28 |
| 25 | 25 | 76 |

Totals 611 604 595 699

Grand Total = 2,469
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 83; Exclamatory 1; Interrogative 6; Imperative 0.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 55; Complex 51; Compound 14; Compound-complex 20.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25; Loose 42; Balanced 1; Periodic 32.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 14, Plural 29.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 5.
Third person: Singular 10, Plural 21.
V. MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

Only Yesterday, 1933

given at International Congress of Women, Chicago

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 205 502 201 535

Grand Total = 2,345
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 89; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 10; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 25; Complex 42; Compound 12; Compound-complex 25.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 20; Loose 39; Balanced 3; Periodic 35.

Personal pronouns:
First person: Singular 33, Plural 16.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 24.
Third person: Singular 15, Plural 61.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 18,500.
   Average number of words per sentence - 36.01.

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 466, Exclamatory 1,
      Interrogative 29, Imperative 4.
   b. According to structure: Simple 155, Complex 178,
      Compound 60, Compound-complex 107.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 135, Loose
      159, Balanced 24, Periodic 192.

3. Enumeration of Personal Pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 34, Plural 165.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 72.
   c. Third person: Singular 84, Plural 191.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 1.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 8.

9. References to the particular occasion 9.

10. References to the particular audience 7.
I. JANE ADDAMS

(a) The Modern City and Municipal Franchise

(b) Memorial Address to Canon A. Barnett

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 983 880 1030 986

Grand Total - 5,879
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 95;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 3; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 19;
Complex 52; Compound 8; Compound-complex 21.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 5;
Loose 48; Balanced 6; Periodic 44.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 21, Plural 9.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 0.
Third person: Singular 75, Plural 39.
II. JANE ADDAMS

Opening of J. T. Bowen Country Club

Memorial to Gordon Davy

Memorial to Sarah Rozet Smith

(complete speeches studied)

Number of words per sentence:

| 21 | 5  | 57 | 39 |
| 45 | 59 | 31 | 57 |
| 57 | 20 | 69 | 70 |
| 14 | 32 | 47 | 49 |
| 51 | 35 | 91 | 59 |
| 70 | 28 | 87 | 95 |
| 33 | 20 | 66 | 24 |
| 22 | 57 | 9  | 43 |
| 15 | 49 | 37 | 45 |
| 59 | 39 | 10 | 55 |
| 36 | 25 | 12 | 37 |
| 27 | 45 | 42 | 32 |
| 26 | 57 | 32 | 24 |
| 19 | 18 | 35 | 25 |
| 20 | 55 | 59 | 14 |
| 40 | 20 | 24 | 31 |
| 8  | 30 | 55 | 39 |
| 24 | 49 | 41 | 10 |
| 19 | 31 | 21 | 47 |
| 26 | 44 | 41 | 30 |
| 20 | 27 | 13 | 13 |
| 55 | 79 | 51 | 47 |
| 19 | 63 | 45 | 14 |
| 45 | 54 | 50 | 45 |
| 60 | 55 | 55 | 45 |

Totals 824 959 956 980

Grand Total - 3,699
Sentences classified as to use:  Declarative 96;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 5; Imperative 1

Sentences classified as to structure:  Simple 22;
Complex 47; Compound 11; Compound-complex 19.

Sentences classified as to artistry:  Very Simple 10;
Loose 37; Balanced 4; Periodic 49.

Personal Pronouns:
First person:  Singular 25, Plural 71.
Second person:  Singular 0, Plural 5.
Third person:  Singular 121, Plural 32.
## Memorial Speeches to Mary Hawes Wilmarth and Jenny Dow Harvey

(complete speeches studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 949 | 643 | 903 | 358

Grand Total = 3,368
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 99; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 1; Imperative 0.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 18; Complex 59; Compound 6; Compound-complex 17.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 9; Loose 42; Balanced 5; Periodic 44.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 37, Plural 31.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 5.
Third person: Singular 130, Plural 17.
### IV. JANE ADDAMS

Speech for United Mine Workers of America to

**Henry Demarest Lloyd**

(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 1002 849 771 666

Grand Total - 5,890
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 98; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 1; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 20; Complex 50; Compound 16; Compound-complex 14.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 10; Loose 44; Balanced 13; Periodic 33.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 2, Plural 33.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 0.
Third person: Singular 119, Plural 14.
Filial Relations

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total - 3,035
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 98; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 2; Imperative 0.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 26; Complex 57; Compound 7; Compound-complex 10.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 16; Loose 44; Balanced 3; Periodic 37.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 0, Plural 22.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 0.
Third person: Singular 80, Plural 22.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

JANE ADDAMS

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences - 17,859.
   Average number of words per sentence - 34,518.

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 484; Exclamatory 0;
      Interrogative 12; Imperative 4.
   b. According to structure: Simple 106; Complex 265;
      Compound 43; Compound-complex 51.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 50; Loose 218;
      Balanced 31; Periodic 207.

3. Enumeration of Personal Pronouns:
   a. First person: Singular 63, Plural 181.
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 6.
   c. Third person: Singular 583, Plural 124.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 2.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 18.

9. References to the particular occasion 14.

10. References to the particular audience 6.
I. JUDGE FLORENCE E. ALLEN

Women and World Peace,
delivered at Conference for Causes and Cures of
War, Washington, D. C., 1925
(100 sentences studied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 1025  635  696  661

Grand Total - 3,017
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 90; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 4; Imperative 6.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 17; Complex 47; Compound 10; Compound-complex 26.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 12; Loose 27; Balanced 10; Periodic 51.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 52, Plural 60.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 11.
The Living Power of Law

delivered before the Judicial Section of the Ohio State Bar Association, Cedar Point, Ohio, July 6, 1928

(Number of words per sentence:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words per sentence</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total - 2,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sentences classified as to use:  Declarative 95; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 4; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure:  Simple 25; Complex 54; Compound 7; Compound-complex 14.

Sentences classified as to artistry:  Very Simple 15; Loose 28; Balanced 5; Periodic 52.

Personal Pronouns:
First person:  Singular 59, Plural 62.
Second person:  Singular 0, Plural 9.
Third person:  Singular 18, Plural 16.
III. JUDGE FLORENCE E. ALLEN

Ten Years After, 1929

(Speech on the Nineteenth Amendment)

(100 sentences studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 568 629 749 715

Grand Total - 2,656
Sentences classified as to use:  Declarative 95;
Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 6; Imperative 1.

Sentences classified as to structure:  Simple 33;
Complex 53; Compound 5; Compound-complex 12.

Sentences classified as to artistry:  Very Simple 14;
Loose 27; Balanced 1; Periodic 50.

Personal Pronouns:
First person:  Singular 16, Plural 34.
Second person:  Singular 0, Plural 0.
Third person:  Singular 14, Plural 27.
### IV. JUDGE FLORENCE E. ALLEN

**Reduction and Armaments**

National Broadcasting, Feb. 28, 1930

*(complete speech studied)*

**Number of words per sentence:**

| 32 | 58 | 35 | 35 |
| 11 | 71 | 50 | 17 |
| 27 | 26 | 16 | 38 |
| 24 | 23 | 54 | 14 |
| 22 | 54 | 29 | 10 |
| 17 | 12 | 16 | 25 |
| 11 | 30 | 8  | 50 |
| 22 | 74 | 16 | 34 |
| 21 | 43 | 16 | 16 |
| 20 | 11 | 38 | 16 |
| 42 | 72 | 16 | 27 |
| 31 | 100| 28 | 18 |
| 19 | 21 | 17 | 14 |
| 7  | 42 | 54 | 15 |
| 61 | 7  | 41 | 15 |
| 17 | 15 | 100| 10 |
| 32 | 10 | 57 | 14 |
| 14 | 7  | 28 | 12 |
| 7  | 24 | 14 | 15 |
| 77 | 33 | 46 | 17 |
| 18 | 42 | 21 | 9 |
| 55 | 42 | 20 | 18 |
| 15 | 10 | 16 | 38 |
| 18 | 19 | 52 | 22 |
| 17 | 20 | 27 | 10 |

**Totals** 645 915 785 527

**Grand Total** - 2,870
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 97; Exclamatory 0; Interrogative 1; Imperative 2.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 32; Complex 55; Compound 1; Compound-complex 12.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 10; Loose 26; Balanced 3; Periodic 61.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 2, Plural 33.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 20.
Third person: Singular 18, Plural 16.
V. JUDGE FLORENCE E. ALLEN

The State Shall Do No Wrong
(complete speech studied)

Number of words per sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>428</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total - 2,203
Sentences classified as to use: Declarative 87;
Exclamatory 2; Interrogative 8; Imperative 3.

Sentences classified as to structure: Simple 88;
Complex 41; Compound 11; Compound-complex 10.

Sentences classified as to artistry: Very Simple 25;
Loose 54; Balanced 109; Periodic 41.

Personal Pronouns:
First person: Singular 13, Plural 31.
Second person: Singular 0, Plural 5.
Third person: Singular 29, Plural 44.
Summary of Points Studied in the Speeches of

FLORENCE E. ALLEN

1. Total number of words in 500 sentences = 13,642.
   Average number of words per sentence = 27.284.

2. Classification of sentences:
   a. According to use: Declarative 461, Exclamatory 210, Interrogative 750, Imperative 328.
   b. According to structure: Simple 144, Complex 250, Compound 02, Compoundcomplex 74.
   c. According to artistry: Very Simple 76, Loose 132, Balanced 29, Periodic 263.

3. Enumeration of personal pronouns:
   b. Second person: Singular 0, Plural 4.5.

4. Fragmentary sentences 0.

5. Slang 0.

6. Abbreviations 0.

7. Contractions 0.

8. References to the particular speaker 7.

9. References to the particular occasion 6.

10. References to the particular audience 7.
CHAPTER III

Summaries of Original Data

I. Average words per sentence.

II. Classifications of sentences according to use.

III. Classifications of sentences according to structure.

IV. Classifications of sentences according to artistry.

V. Summary of personal pronouns.
   A. By individual women.
   B. Averages per 1,000 words.

VI. Summary of fragmentary sentences, abbreviations, contractions and slang.

VII. Summary of references to the particular speaker, occasion, and audience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Speaker</th>
<th>Total Number of Words</th>
<th>Average for 500 sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucretia Mott</td>
<td>12,866</td>
<td>24.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan B. Anthony</td>
<td>15,312</td>
<td>30.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernestine L. Rose</td>
<td>13,012</td>
<td>27.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette B. Blackwell</td>
<td>11,920</td>
<td>25.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Joslyn Gage</td>
<td>12,895</td>
<td>26.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Stone</td>
<td>13,109</td>
<td>26.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. E.C. Stanton</td>
<td>15,405</td>
<td>30.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline W.H. Dall</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>23.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Ward Howe</td>
<td>11,695</td>
<td>23.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anna H. Shaw</td>
<td>14,355</td>
<td>23.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances E. Willard</td>
<td>16,287</td>
<td>25.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E. Livermore</td>
<td>12,717</td>
<td>25.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Beecher Hooker</td>
<td>17,638</td>
<td>35.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Woodhull</td>
<td>14,949</td>
<td>29.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Devereaux Blake</td>
<td>15,068</td>
<td>27.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Barton</td>
<td>15,478</td>
<td>25.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E. Lease</td>
<td>13,675</td>
<td>27.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. C. Catt</td>
<td>12,565</td>
<td>25.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Adams</td>
<td>17,259</td>
<td>34.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Florence K. Allen</td>
<td>13,642</td>
<td>27.234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Sentences Classified as to Use:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lucretia Mott</th>
<th>1,100 sentences</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan B. Anthony</th>
<th>1,100 sentences</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ernestine L. Rose</th>
<th>1,100 sentences</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO USE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antoinette Brown</strong>&lt;br&gt;Elekrolit&lt;br&gt;1,100 sentences</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Mrs. Matilda Joslyn**<br>Case<br>1,100 sentences | 82          | 2           | 14            | 2          |
| II.       | 93          | 0           | 2             | 2          |
| III.      | 95          | 0           | 1             | 6          |
| IV.       | 95          | 0           | 5             | 2          |
| V.        | 92          | 0           | 0             | 1          |
| Totals    | 463         | 2           | 22            | 13         |

| **Inez Stone**<br>1,100 sentences | 85          | 4           | 9             | 2          |
| II.       | 85          | 7           | 6             | 0          |
| III.      | 81          | 7           | 6             | 6          |
| IV.       | 86          | 2           | 7             | 5          |
| V.        | 86          | 1           | 12            | 1          |
| Totals    | 457         | 21          | 49            | 13         |
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO USE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mrs. Elizabeth / Lady Stanton</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caroline Wells / Soley Hall</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julia Ward Howe</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO USE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Anna Howard Shaw</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>447</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frances E. Willard</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>436</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mary Ashton Livermore</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>430</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Barrington Classification**

- Rate: Frequency of occurrence
- Percent: Proportion of total
- Total: Sum of rates or percentages for each country
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO USE:

#### Clara Barton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>455</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mary Elizabeth Lease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>449</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mrs. Champenett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>486</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO USE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge Address</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>494</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge Florence E. Allen</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>462</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10S</td>
<td>10E</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>5E</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>5E</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>5E</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>5E</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>5E</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table represents a sample of sentence classifications.*
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO STRUCTURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antoinette Brown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mrs. Cage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lucy Stone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO STRUCTURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mrs. Stanton</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caroline W.H. Dall</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julia Ward Howe</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Sentence Complexity: See note at bottom.
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO STRUCTURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isabella Beecher Hooker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria Woodhull</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mrs. Davenport Blake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO STRUCTURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clara Barton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               |        |         |          |                  |
| **Mary Elizabeth Lease** |        |         |          |                  |
| I. 100 sentences | 45     | 35      | 14       | 6                |
| II.           | 55     | 34      | 17       | 14               |
| III.          | 32     | 52      | 6        | 10               |
| IV.           | 39     | 38      | 12       | 12               |
| V.            | 48     | 37      | 9        | 9                |
| Totals        | 199    | 197     | 58       | 46               |

|               |        |         |          |                  |
| **Mrs. Catt** |        |         |          |                  |
| I. 100 sentences | 29     | 47      | 8        | 16               |
| II.           | 54     | 22      | 14       | 30               |
| III.          | 34     | 36      | 12       | 18               |
| IV.           | 35     | 31      | 14       | 30               |
| V.            | 53     | 42      | 12       | 23               |
| Totals        | 155    | 173     | 60       | 107              |
SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO STRUCTURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jane Addams</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>265</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge Florence Allen</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Sentences Classified as to Structure:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Compound-Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total      | 5,379  | 4,019   | 1,099    | 1,603           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lucretia Mott</th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan R. Anthony</th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ernestine L. Rose</th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO ARTISTRY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antoinette E. Blackwell</th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mrs. Cage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lucy Stone</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 100 sentences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO ARTISTRY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isabella Beecher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Victoria Woodhull** |             |       |          |          |
| I. 100 sentences     | 14          | 44    | 4        | 39       |
| II.                  | 18          | 33    | 3        | 46       |
| III.                 | 11          | 58    | 4        | 47       |
| IV.                  | 25          | 30    | 6        | 39       |
| V.                   | 4           | 44    | 0        | 52       |
| **Totals**           | 72          | 188   | 17       | 225      |

| **Mrs. D. L. Blake** |             |       |          |          |
| I. 100 sentences    | 30          | 30    | 5        | 55       |
| II.                 | 32          | 28    | 6        | 34       |
| III.                | 24          | 28    | 11       | 57       |
| IV.                 | 51          | 48    | 1        | 50       |
| V.                  | 25          | 32    | 7        | 54       |
| **Totals**          | 158         | 166   | 30       | 178      |
### SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO ARTISTRY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clara Barton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elizabeth Lease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Champman Catt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 100 sentences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judge Florence Allen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very Adequate

Summary of Strengths: Class I 0% to Artistry.
## SUMMARY OF SENTENCES CLASSIFIED AS TO ARTISTRY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Very Simple</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>5,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - 10,000
SUMMARY OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS BY
INDIVIDUAL WOMEN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lucretia Mott</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Person</td>
<td>Second Person</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Susan B. Anthony</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Person</td>
<td>Second Person</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>166</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Personal Pronouns by Individual Women:

#### Ernestine L. Ross

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Person</th>
<th></th>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th></th>
<th>Third Person</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular--Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td>Singular--Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td>Singular--Plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Antoinette Brown Blackwell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mrs. Matilda Joslyn Gage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS BY INDIVIDUAL WOMEN:

#### Lucy Stone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person Singular-Plural</th>
<th>Second Person Singular-Plural</th>
<th>Third Person Singular-Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 121 175 0 75 296 235

#### Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton

| I 4                          | 45                             | 100                        |
| II 17                        | 39                             | 25                         |
| III 9                       | 37                             | 17                         |
| IV 6                        | 42                             | 29                         |
| V 15                       | 66                             | 18                         |

Total: 51 216 0 158 187 159

#### Caroline W. H. Dell

| I 25                        | 10                             | 9                          |
| II 24                       | 18                             | 17                         |
| III 18                     | 11                             | 43                         |
| IV 46                       | 13                             | 56                         |
| V 10                       | 5                              | 71                         |

Total: 125 62 0 92 176 118
### SUMMARY OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS BY INDIVIDUAL WOMEN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th>Third Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Julia Ward Howe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>36 91</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>7 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10 17</td>
<td>0 5</td>
<td>37 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>26 39</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>28 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>30 54</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td>6 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5 19</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>55 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107 220</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>135 120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th>Third Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr. Anna Howard Shaw</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15 24</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>61 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>25 62</td>
<td>0 9</td>
<td>96 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2 33</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>25 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>15 40</td>
<td>0 6</td>
<td>106 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>55 68</td>
<td>0 20</td>
<td>26 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90 258</td>
<td>9 47</td>
<td>358 210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th>Third Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frances E. Willard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>26 78</td>
<td>5 20</td>
<td>14 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>31 64</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>42 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>71 56</td>
<td>0 27</td>
<td>22 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>83 61</td>
<td>0 63</td>
<td>16 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>51 57</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>14 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232 291</td>
<td>5 112</td>
<td>110 151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS BY INDIVIDUAL WOMEN:

**Mary Ashton Livermore**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th>Third Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular-Plural</td>
<td>Singular-Plural</td>
<td>Singular-Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Isabella Beecher Hooker**

| I | 31 | 80 | 15 | 82 | 57 | 36 |
| II | 1 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 13 |
| III | 25 | 21 | 0 | 20 | 35 | 44 |
| IV | 18 | 51 | 6 | 13 | 41 | 60 |
| V | 56 | 46 | 12 | 19 | 34 | 38 |
| Total | 189 | 210 | 55 | 114 | 170 | 211 |

**Victoria C. Woodhull Martin**

| I | 17 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 30 |
| II | 54 | 25 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 49 |
| III | 50 | 31 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 64 |
| IV | 85 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 28 | 15 |
| V | 0 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 26 | 38 |
| Total | 213 | 84 | 0 | 53 | 70 | 188 |
SUMMARY OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS BY INDIVIDUAL WOMEN:

Mrs. Devereux Lillie Blake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person Singular--Plural</th>
<th>Second Person Singular--Plural</th>
<th>Third Person Singular--Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12 39</td>
<td>0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>11 38</td>
<td>0 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>8 32</td>
<td>0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>9 12</td>
<td>0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>16 49</td>
<td>0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 181</td>
<td>0 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clara Barton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person Singular--Plural</th>
<th>Second Person Singular--Plural</th>
<th>Third Person Singular--Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>28 36</td>
<td>0 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>24 16</td>
<td>0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>11 14</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>14 7</td>
<td>0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>48 9</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115 32</td>
<td>0 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mary Elizabeth Leese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person Singular--Plural</th>
<th>Second Person Singular--Plural</th>
<th>Third Person Singular--Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6 36</td>
<td>0 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>39 42</td>
<td>0 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>28 39</td>
<td>0 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0 20</td>
<td>0 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0 45</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73 179</td>
<td>0 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noted</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seen</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where a person's name appears*
### Total Summary of Personal Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th>Third Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular--Plural</td>
<td>Singular--Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total first person = 6,535
Total second person = 1,281
Total third person = 6,280
Total of all = 14,180
Averages of Personal Pronouns per 1,000 Words

Method: To find number of personal pronouns in 1,000 words, divide number of personal pronouns in 500 sentences by the number of thousand words in the 500 sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Total Pronouns</th>
<th>Average 1,000 Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>12,266</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>15,312</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>15,612</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>11,930</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>12,898</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>15,109</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>15,405</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dali</td>
<td>11,751</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>11,605</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>14,355</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>16,237</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>12,717</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>17,898</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrell</td>
<td>14,849</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>15,968</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>13,476</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leane</td>
<td>15,678</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>12,505</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>17,229</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>13,642</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Total} = \frac{1,187}{3,596}
\]
## Averages for Personal Pronouns Per 1,000 Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Total Pronouns Singular--Plural</th>
<th>Aver. per 1,000 Words Singular--Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>12,266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>15,512</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>15,512</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwall</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>12,695</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>15,109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>15,405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>11,693</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>14,355</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>16,267</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>22,717</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>17,923</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>14,349</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>15,969</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>13,478</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>13,478</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>12,606</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>17,269</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>15,662</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,502</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Averages for Personal Pronouns per 1,000 Words

#### Third Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Total Pronouns</th>
<th>Average per 1,000 Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Singular—Plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>12,266</td>
<td>240—140</td>
<td>20.2—11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>12,512</td>
<td>197—240</td>
<td>13.1—16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>13,512</td>
<td>207—66</td>
<td>21.9—6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>11,920</td>
<td>201—157</td>
<td>16.7—15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>12,896</td>
<td>98—123</td>
<td>7.4—9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>15,109</td>
<td>236—255</td>
<td>22.7—12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>15,405</td>
<td>187—159</td>
<td>13.4—10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>176—116</td>
<td>16.0—10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howa</td>
<td>11,673</td>
<td>133—123</td>
<td>12.9—11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>14,385</td>
<td>332—210</td>
<td>25.7—15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>16,287</td>
<td>110—151</td>
<td>6.8—9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>12,717</td>
<td>231—216</td>
<td>19.3—16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>17,898</td>
<td>170—211</td>
<td>9.4—11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>14,849</td>
<td>70—188</td>
<td>4.6—12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>13,988</td>
<td>318—185</td>
<td>22.3—15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>13,479</td>
<td>65—112</td>
<td>5.7—9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leese</td>
<td>15,675</td>
<td>65—177</td>
<td>5.0—15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>12,508</td>
<td>34—191</td>
<td>7.0—15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>523—124</td>
<td>30.7—7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>15,842</td>
<td>153—153</td>
<td>9.3—16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Pronouns | 2,929 | 3,285 |
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY OF FRAGMENTARY SENTENCES

ABBREVIATIONS, CONTRACTIONS AND SLANG

Fragmentary Sentences

No fragmentary sentences were found in the study of 10,000 sentences of women speeches. One difficulty in consideration of this phase of the study was that revised speeches had to be used in many cases. Consequently, any fragmentary sentence that might have been used in the oral style was perhaps completed for the publication in print. Two references in the debates of Mary E. Lease showed incomplete sentences because the last part of the sentence was lost in the applause and the stenographer recorded it as such. However, such references could not be considered fragmentary for this study.

Abbreviations

Most of the abbreviations that were found could not have been used in oral style. Consequently it is fair to assume that there were practically no abbreviations used. The abbreviations that were symbols of written style only were: Rev., Dr., Mr., Ill., Pa., Lieut., Aug., and figures written with "th". The only possible oral abbreviations were: U.S., W.C.T.U., etc.
Contractions

The contractions found in this study were so few in number that tables of compilation could not be set up. There were only five contractions in the complete study of 10,000 sentences: Mrs. Joseina Cage used three, and Mary E. Lese used two. Again the revision of the speeches handicaps this phase of the study so much that it is very difficult to consider any analysis on this point.

Slang

The number of references for words that might be classified as slang were not enough to warrant tables of computation, but the study itself proved to be interesting. Occasionally words that seem new to the modern world or considered slang in popular conception proved to be very old. For example, the word "lollipop" was used by Antoinette Brown Blackwell in 1850. Other words whose date seem early were:

"ism" in 1850
"gumption" in 1870
"unhappy man" in 1880
"lot of money" in 1880

The slang references were:

Susan B. Anthony — "gave fits"
Antoinette Blackwell — "mud mills" for a class of people
Caroline Dall - "rotting cocoons and furrowing cards"
Julie Ward Howe - "speachify", "seesiety" for society
Dr. Anna H. Shaw - "gumption" (listed as colloquial)
Frances E. Willard - "lot of goods"
Mary E. Livermore - "chink" for money
Mrs. D. Blake - "unhappy mess" (listed as colloquial)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>335</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

I. Tables for the comparative study of the oral style of men and women. Tables I - XXII.

II. Tables for the comparative study of early and late women speakers. Tables XXII - XLIV.
TABLE I

Average Sentence Length

Table showing the average of words per sentence for each of the ten men and twenty women with computations showing the reliability of the differences in the averages of each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Av. Sentence Length</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfour</td>
<td>33.446</td>
<td>2.3196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>25.858</td>
<td>4.2884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>27.171</td>
<td>2.9554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>28.653</td>
<td>1.4734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>32.254</td>
<td>2.1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>31.966</td>
<td>1.8396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>33.548</td>
<td>3.4156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>36.943</td>
<td>3.6160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>26.704</td>
<td>3.4224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>25.727</td>
<td>6.3994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mean 301.864 Mean 30.1224
Total Variation 3.70
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Avg. Sentence Length</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>25.532</td>
<td>5.3436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>30.624</td>
<td>2.7464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>25.624</td>
<td>.2536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>23.840</td>
<td>4.0376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogle</td>
<td>25.790</td>
<td>2.0876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>26.218</td>
<td>1.6596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>30.610</td>
<td>2.9384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll</td>
<td>25.462</td>
<td>4.4153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>23.386</td>
<td>4.4916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>28.710</td>
<td>.8324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>32.574</td>
<td>4.6964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>25.434</td>
<td>2.4433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>35.796</td>
<td>7.9184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td>29.698</td>
<td>1.8204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>27.936</td>
<td>.0584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>26.956</td>
<td>.9216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>27.250</td>
<td>.5274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>25.010</td>
<td>2.8676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>34.518</td>
<td>6.6404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>27.234</td>
<td>.5936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mean 57.552
Mean 27.8776

Variation 2.76452
The following is the formula:

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{.8455 \times M.V_1}{\sqrt{n}}
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{.8455 \times M.V_2}{\sqrt{n}}
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{P.E.M_1^2 + P.E.M_2^2}
\]

\[
D = \frac{(\text{Difference of two average means})}{P.E.D.}
\]

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{.8455 \times 5.7}{\sqrt{10}} = 3.12761 = .9387
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{.8455 \times 2.76452}{\sqrt{20}} = 2.336946 = .622
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(.9387)^2 + (4.472)^2}
\]

\[
D = 2.2468 = 2.01 = 4.113
\]

According to Thorndike's table of the normal probability integral, 2.01 = 4.113, which means that there are 9113 chances in 10,000 that the average sentence length for men is greater than the average sentence length for women.1

---

1 Thorndike, R. L. "An Introduction to the Theory of Mental and Social Measurements", 200.
TABLE II

Table to find the reliability of the difference in the number of declarative sentences in oral style of men and women speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfour 908</td>
<td>Mott 443</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson 936</td>
<td>Anthony 450</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 694</td>
<td>Rose 356</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 926</td>
<td>Blackwell 426</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt 940</td>
<td>Gage 465</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce 830</td>
<td>Stone 427</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone 917</td>
<td>Stanton 580</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley 871</td>
<td>Dall 440</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley 935</td>
<td>Howe 445</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips 917</td>
<td>Shaw 447</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 9,124</td>
<td>Millerd 426</td>
<td>Total 193.2</td>
<td>Mean 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 612.4</td>
<td>Livermore 450</td>
<td>Variation 19.32</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake 389</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton 458</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease 449</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt 460</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams 464</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen 462</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 8,711</td>
<td>Total 461.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 435.6</td>
<td>Mean 22.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation 22.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To compare with 1,000 sentences for each of the men the 10,000 sentences for women must likewise be divided by 10. Consequently mean for women = $371.1$ and mean variation = $44.14$

\[
P.E.M. = \frac{0.5453 \times 19.32}{\sqrt{10}} = 15.33192 = 5.164
\]

\[
P.E.M. = \frac{0.5453 \times 44.14}{\sqrt{20}} = 37.311542 = 6.343
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(5.164)^2 + (6.343)^2} = \sqrt{26.66639 + 69.69784} = 82.27483 = 9.012
\]

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{4.12}{9.012} = 0.459 = 4.977
\]

Therefore, there are 9,977 chances in 10,000 that women used fewer declarative sentences than men. This figure is well within the limits of reliability.
Table to find the reliability of the differences in the number of exclamatory sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rowe</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3935</td>
<td>3935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 21.1 - Mean variation = 17.9

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{.9453 \times 7.64}{\sqrt{10}} = 6.82715 = 2.0957
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{.9453 \times 17.9}{\sqrt{20}} = 15.15007 = 3.38
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(2.0957)^2 + (3.38)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{4.368 + 11.3444}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{15.7924} = 3.976
\]

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{11.5}{3.976} = 2.88 = 4.727
\]

Therefore, 9,748 chances in 10,000 that women used more exclamatory sentences than women. This fact is not statistically reliable.
## TABLE IV

Table showing the reliability of the difference in the average number of interrogative sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Total 43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mean 43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Total 43.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Variation 14.32</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Total 256.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>Mean 12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation 12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 75. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 25.8

\[ P.E.M_1 = \frac{.6455 \times 14.32}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{12.10469}{3.1622} = 3.828 \]

\[ P.E.M_2 = \frac{.6455 \times 25.8}{\sqrt{20}} = \frac{21.868}{4.472} = 4.92 \]

\[ P.E.D. = \sqrt{(3.828)^2 + (4.92)^2} \]

\[ = \sqrt{14.6535 + 23.821} = 6.97 \]

\[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{30.2}{6.97} = 4.36 \]

Therefore 9,968 chances in 10,000 that women used more interrogative sentences than men. Statistically this fact is very reliable.
TABLE V

Table showing the reliability of the difference in average number of imperative sentences in oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Mean Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>Rowe</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Total 92.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Livemore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Variation 5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>Mean 15.4</td>
<td>Total 171.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 32.6 Mean variation per 1,000 = 17.16

\[
P.E.M. = \frac{.8453 \times 9.86}{\sqrt{10}} = 8.0134 - 2.534
\]

\[
P.E.M. = \frac{.8453 \times 17.16}{\sqrt{20}} = 14.50548 - 3.243
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(3.534)^2 + (3.243)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{5.6898 + 10.517649}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{17.207599} = 4.181
\]

\[
\frac{P.E.D.}{4.181} = .095
\]

This figure is too low according to Thorndike's table. Therefore, the fact that women use a fewer number of imperative sentences than men is not statistically reliable.
TABLE VI

Table to find the reliability of the difference in average number of simple sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2493</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>249.3</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>509.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>509.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women 327.9. Mean variation per 1,000 = 50.90

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{8453 \times 41.86 \times 53.1306}{\sqrt{10}} = 11.1095
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{8453 \times 50.90 \times 43.023}{\sqrt{20}} = 9.62
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(11.1095)^2 + (9.62)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{123.4209 + 92.5444}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{216.9653} = 14.706
\]

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{78.6}{14.706} = 5.340 = 4998.2
\]

Therefore 9,998 chances in 10,000 that women use a greater number of simple sentences than men. This is statistically very reliable.
**TABLE VII**

Table to find the reliability of the difference in the average number of complex sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Mean Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Mean Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horley</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Total 441.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>472.2</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Mean 441.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>401.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation 25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 401.9. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 51.4

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{.3453 \times 44.10}{\sqrt{10}} = 37.3294 = 11.804 \\
\sqrt{10} \\
3.1822
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{.3453 \times 51.4}{\sqrt{20}} = 43.443 = 9.80 \\
\sqrt{20} \\
4.472
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(11.804)^2 + (9.80)^2} \\
\sqrt{139.384 + 96.04} \\
\sqrt{235.374} = 15.34
\]

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{70.3}{15.34} = 4.5 = 4983
\]

Therefore there are 9,983 chances in 10,000 that there are a greater number of complex sentences in the oral style of men than women. That women use a fewer number of complex sentences than men is statistically very reliable.
### TABLE VIII

Table to find the reliability of the difference in the average number of compound sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour 42</td>
<td>Mott 34</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson 42</td>
<td>Anthony 39</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>16.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 92</td>
<td>Rose 79</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>20.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 49</td>
<td>Blackwell 89</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>34.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt 42</td>
<td>Gage 56</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce 86</td>
<td>Stone 47</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone 54</td>
<td>Stanton 70</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley 127</td>
<td>Dell 72</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>20.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley 85</td>
<td>Howe 31</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>23.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips 55</td>
<td>Shaw 60</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total: 674 | Willard 69 | Total: 245.8 | Mean: 24.08 | Variation: 6.05
- Mean: 67.4 | Livermore 61 | |
- Hooker 53 | Woodhull 32 | 1.95 |
- Blake 56 | Barton 55 | 18.95 |
- Lease 88 | Catt 60 | 1.05 |
- Catt 60 | Addams 48 | .05 |
- Allen 32 | | 6.95 |

- Total: 1,099 | Total: 250.80 |
- Mean: 54.95 | Mean: |
- Variation: 12.51 |
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 109.9. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 25.02

\[ P.E.M_1 = \frac{3453 \times 24.06}{\sqrt{10}} = 6.4369 \]

\[ \quad = 3.1622 \]

\[ P.E.M_2 = \frac{3453 \times 25.02}{\sqrt{20}} = 4.73 \]

\[ \quad = 4.472 \]

\[ D = \sqrt{(6.4369)^2 + (4.73)^2} \]

\[ \quad = \sqrt{41.43369 + 22.3789} \]

\[ \quad = \sqrt{63.8125} \quad = 7.98 \]

\[ F.E.D. = 42.5 = 5.32 = 4998.2 \]

Therefore there are 9,998 chances in 10,000 that women use a greater number of compound sentences than men.

This is statistically very reliable.
TABLE IX

Table to find the reliability of the difference in the average number of compound-complex sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzley</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>15.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>811.1</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 160.5. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 27.33

\[ \text{P.E.M}_1 = \frac{3453 \times 29.94}{\sqrt{10}} = 35.5084 = 3.1622 \]

\[ \text{P.E.M}_2 = \frac{3453 \times 27.53}{\sqrt{20}} = 33.192 = 5.16 \]

\[ \text{P.E.D.} = \sqrt{(3.1622^2) + (5.16)^2} \]

\[ = \sqrt{34.048 + 26.3256} \]

\[ = \sqrt{60.373} = 7.76 \]

\[ \frac{\text{D}}{\text{P.E.D.}} = \frac{5.33}{7.76} = 0.6982 \]

Therefore there are 9,398 chances in 10,000 that

men use a greater number of compound-complex sentences than

women. In other words, the fact that women use a fewer number

of compound-complex sentences than men is statistically reliable.
TABLE X

Table to find the reliability of the differences in the average number of very simple sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>142.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merley</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>725.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>249.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>513.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 330.8. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 51.56.

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{0.9453 \times 73.36}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{68.021208}{3.1622} = 19.6101 \\
P.E.M_2 = \frac{0.9453 \times 51.36}{\sqrt{20}} = \frac{43.416608}{4.472} = 9.708 \\
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(19.6101)^2 + (9.708)^2} = \sqrt{384.556 + 94.246} = 21.88 \\
D = 19.1 = 0.872 = 21.68
\]

Therefore there are 7,168 chances in 10,000 that men use more very simple sentences than women. This is not statistically reliable.
TABLE XI

Table to show the reliability of the differences in the average number of loose sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxlay</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mean 3,227 Willard 150 Total 351.00 Mean Variation 35.1 57.4

Livermore 96 Hooker 207 Woodhull 183 Blake 166 Barton 151 Lease 156 Catt 159 Addams 212 Allen 132

Total Mean 5,068 Total Mean Variation 31.35
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 306.8. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 62.7

\[ P.E.M_1 = \frac{.8455 \times 35.1}{\sqrt{10}} = 29.670 = 9.385 \]
\[ P.E.M_2 = \frac{.8455 \times 62.70}{\sqrt{20}} = 53.000310 = 11.851 \]
\[ P.E.D. = \sqrt{(9.385)^2 + (11.851)^2} \]
\[ = \sqrt{88.078 + 140.4662} \]
\[ = \sqrt{228.5442} = 15.11 \]
\[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{15.9}{15.11} = 1.0522 = 2606 \]

Therefore there are 7,606 chances in 10,000 that men use a greater number of loose sentences than women, or the fact that women use a fewer number of loose sentences than men is not statistically reliable.
Table to show the reliability of the differences in the average number of balanced sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morey</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>41.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>276.00</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XII
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 76.5. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 27.6

\[ P.E.M_1 = \frac{6453 \times 29.48}{\sqrt{10}} = 24.91944 = 7.6804 \]
\[ P.E.M_2 = \frac{6453 \times 27.6}{\sqrt{30}} = 33.530280 = 7.483 \]
\[ P.E.D. = \sqrt{(7.6804)^2 + (7.483)^2} = \sqrt{62.09 + 55.5472} = \sqrt{117.637} = 10.84 \]
\[ \frac{10.84}{P.E.D.} = 1.46 = 3.360 \]

Therefore there are 3,360 chances in 10,000 that men use a greater number of balanced sentences than women, or the fact that women use a fewer number of balanced sentences than men is statistically not reliable.
Table to find the reliability of the differences in the average number of periodic sentences in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muxley</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>535.6</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td></td>
<td>193.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 386.6. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 54.5

\[ \text{P.E.}_1 = \frac{.6455 \times 67.4}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{56.9732}{3.1623} = 19.0169 \]

\[ \text{P.E.}_2 = \frac{.6455 \times 54.30}{\sqrt{20}} = \frac{45.899790}{4.472} = 10.263 \]

\[ \text{P.E.}_D. = \sqrt{(19.0169)^2 + (10.263)^2} \]

\[ = \sqrt{324.909 + 106.329169} \]

\[ = \sqrt{431.238169} = 20.7 \]

\[ \frac{D}{\text{P.E.}_D.} = \frac{50.9}{20.7} = 2.45 = 4508 \]

Therefore there are 9,508 chances in 10,000 that women use a greater number of periodic sentences than men.

This number is not great enough to make the fact statistically reliable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Pronouns per 1000 words</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Pronouns per 1000 words</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>Nott</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.174</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.166</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.826</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>6.674</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.374</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.286</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.174</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxley</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.926</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.726</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154.26</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Mean 50.792</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE XIV**

Table to find the reliability of the differences in the average number of first person, singular pronouns per 1,000 words in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Pronouns per 1000 words</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Pronouns per 1000 words</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Variation 4.279</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 59.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation 2.979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore are more than 10,000 chances in 10,000 that men use a greater number of first person, singular pronouns than women. In other words, the fact that women use a fewer number of first person, singular pronouns than men is statistically very reliable.
To find the reliability of the differences in the average number of first person, plural pronouns per 1,000 words in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men No. per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Women No. per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3.436</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.154</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.004</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.854</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.954</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryce</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.546</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119.54</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.954</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>241.8</td>
<td>Total 36.948</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>Mean 16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation 3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P.E.M₁ = \frac{.6455 \times 3.69}{\sqrt{10}} \approx 3.112 \approx .906

P.E.M₂ = \frac{.6455 \times 3.482}{\sqrt{90}} \approx 3.7433242 \approx .837

P.E.D. = \sqrt{(.906)^2 + (.837)^2}
= \sqrt{.81219 + .7035392}
= \sqrt{1.515729} = 1.21

D₂ = \frac{1.11}{1.21} = .91

Therefore, in 5269 chances out of 10,000, that women use a greater number of first person, plural pronouns than men. This is far from being statistically reliable.
TABLE XVI

Table to find reliability of the differences in the average number of second person singular pronouns per 1,000 words in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>No. per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>No. per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Men Variations from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.7375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1.2575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>Tage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.3375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>Total 21.56</td>
<td>.0825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>Variation 2.156</td>
<td>.1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 7.6920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.2625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation .366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This figure is too small according to Thorndike's tables to have any reliability. The fact that women use a greater number of second person, singular pronouns is not statistically reliable.
**TABLE XVII**

Table to find reliability of the differences in the average number of second person, plural pronouns per 1,000 words in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>No. Pronouns per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>No. Pronouns per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>From Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.325</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.803</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.827</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.227</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.073</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.073</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.527</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.27</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Total 19.070</td>
<td>Total 19.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.9 27</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Mean 19.070</td>
<td>Mean 19.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Total 39.32</td>
<td>Total 39.32</td>
<td>Mean 4.71</td>
<td>Mean 4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation 1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation 1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact that women use a fewer number of second person, plural pronouns is not statistically reliable.
### TABLE XVIII

Table to find the reliability of the differences in the average number of third person singular pronouns per 1,000 words in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men No. pronouns per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Women No. pronouns per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>4.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>10.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>3.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Ball</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>2.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133.42</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Total 45.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.342</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Mean Variation 4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 127.73</td>
<td>6.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Variation 6.399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This figure 0.52 is too small according to Thorndike's table for any reliability. Therefore, the fact that women used a greater number of third person, singular pronouns than men is statistically not reliable.
### TABLE XIX

Table to find the reliability of the differences in the average number of third person, plural pronouns in 1,000 words in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>No. pronouns per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>No. pronouns per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Men Mean Variation from Mean</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Women Mean Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.666</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.902</td>
<td>3.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>6.295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.502</td>
<td>2.995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>6.998</td>
<td>6.295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85.02</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.995</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.502</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leese</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 22.364</td>
<td>2.995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation 2.2564</td>
<td>5.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\[ \begin{align*}
\text{P.E.M}_1 &= \frac{.9455 \times 2.8364}{\sqrt{10}} = 1.590 = .597 \\
\text{P.E.M}_2 &= \frac{.9455 \times 2.9945}{\sqrt{20}} = 2.732 \approx .622 \\
\text{P.E.D.} &= \sqrt{(.597)^2 + (.622)^2} \\
&= \sqrt{.358409 + .385984} \\
&= \sqrt{.744393} = .862 \\
\frac{D}{\text{P.E.D.}} &= \frac{3.283}{.862} = .49 < 1.21
\end{align*} \]

Therefore only 6.321 chances in 10,000 that women use more third person plural pronouns than men. This is not statistically reliable.
TABLE XX

Table to find the reliability of the differences in the number of references to the speaker in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variations per Mean</th>
<th>Women Variations per Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour 37</td>
<td>Mott 5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson 27</td>
<td>Anthony 14</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 23</td>
<td>Rose 15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 40</td>
<td>Blackwell 15</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt 40</td>
<td>Gage 5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce 119</td>
<td>Stone 41</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone 38</td>
<td>Stanton 29</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley 46</td>
<td>Dall 21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley 63</td>
<td>Howe 15</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips 135</td>
<td>Shaw 23</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 571</td>
<td>Willard 26</td>
<td>Total 297.4</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 57.1</td>
<td>Livermore 4</td>
<td>Variation 29.74</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker 21</td>
<td>Woodhull 27</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake 16</td>
<td>Barton 18</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease 11</td>
<td>Catt 8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams 16</td>
<td>Allen 7</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 336</td>
<td>Total 146.50</td>
<td>Mean 16.75</td>
<td>Mean Variation 7.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 35.5. Mean Variation
per 1,000 = 11.65

\[
P.E.M. = \frac{9453 \times 29.74}{\sqrt{10}} = 85.13222 = 7.9499
\]

\[
P.E.M. = \frac{9453 \times 14.65}{\sqrt{20}} = 12.895645 = 2.769
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(7.9499)^2 + (2.769)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{63.2668271 - 7.607361}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{55.659461} - 8.35
\]

Therefore, there are 9,705 chances in 10,000 that men
use more references to the speaker than women. The fact that
women use a fewer number of references to the speaker than men
is not statistically reliable.
TABLE XXI

Table to find the reliability of the differences in the number of references to the particular audience in the oral style of men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour 95</td>
<td>Mott 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson 30</td>
<td>Anthony 15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 25</td>
<td>Rose 6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 44</td>
<td>Blackwell 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt 11</td>
<td>Gage 5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce 103</td>
<td>Stone 26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone 91</td>
<td>Stanton 40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley 59</td>
<td>Dall 16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley 48</td>
<td>Howe 9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips 168</td>
<td>Shaw 10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 680</td>
<td>Mean 65</td>
<td>Total 350</td>
<td>Total Variation 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard 19</td>
<td>Livermore 2</td>
<td>Mean 85</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker 19</td>
<td>Woodhull 5</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake 3</td>
<td>Barton 11</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease 9</td>
<td>Catt 7</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams 6</td>
<td>Allen 7</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 227</td>
<td>Mean 11.35</td>
<td>Total 106.80</td>
<td>Mean Variation 6.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 22.7, Mean Variation per 1,000 = 10.66.

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{8455 \times 55}{\sqrt{10}} = 9.356
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{8455 \times 10.66}{\sqrt{20}} = 2.014
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(9.356)^2 + (2.014)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{87.5347 + 4.056196}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{91.590396} = 9.57
\]

\[
D = 42.3 = 4.42 = 4.985
\]

Therefore 9,985 chances in 10,000 that men use more references to the audience than women. In other words, the fact that women use a fewer number of references to the audience than men is statistically very reliable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Women Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuxley</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean 45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 2.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean for 1,000 sentences for women = 14.10. Mean Variation per 1,000 = 5.73

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{0.9455 \times 45.5}{\sqrt{10}} = 36.60142 = 11.574
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{0.9455 \times 5.73}{\sqrt{20}} = 4.043569 = 1.063
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(11.574)^2 - (1.063)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{135.0369 - 1.129969}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{135.036989} = 11.622
\]

\[
D = \frac{44.9}{11.622} = 3.86 = 4953
\]

Therefore there are 9,963 chances in 10,000 that men use more references to occasion than women. In other words, the fact that women use a fewer number of references to the occasion than men is statistically not reliable. There is, however, a tendency toward reliability.
TABLE XXIII

Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to the Average Sentence Length.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Woman</th>
<th>Av. Sent. Length</th>
<th>Variations from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>24.532</td>
<td>1.9676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>20.624</td>
<td>4.1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>27.624</td>
<td>1.1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>23.840</td>
<td>2.8596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cady</td>
<td>25.790</td>
<td>0.7096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>26.218</td>
<td>0.2816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>30.510</td>
<td>4.5104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>23.462</td>
<td>3.0376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>23.326</td>
<td>3.1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>28.710</td>
<td>3.1104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mean 26.4998  Total Mean 23.5592

Variation 2.35392
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Av. Sent. Length</th>
<th>Variations from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>32.574</td>
<td>3.3184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>25.434</td>
<td>3.6216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>25.796</td>
<td>6.5404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>29.698</td>
<td>.4424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>27.938</td>
<td>1.5196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>26.955</td>
<td>2.2996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>27.350</td>
<td>1.9056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>28.010</td>
<td>3.2456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>34.518</td>
<td>5.2824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>27.234</td>
<td>1.9716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 292.556  **Mean** 29.2556  **Total** 31.1272  **Mean** Variation 5.11272

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{.6453 \times 2.35395}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{1.5207669976}{3.1622} = .62923
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{.6453 \times 3.11272}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{2.621163216}{3.1722} = .83207
\]

\[
P.E.D = \sqrt{(1.62923^2 + .83207^2)} = \sqrt{(1.39592303929 + .6923404849)} = 1.0432
\]

\[
P.E.D = 2.7560 - 2.622 = 4.602
\]

Therefore there are 9,602 chances in 10,000 that last half of the woman use an average sentence which is longer than that of the first half.
### TABLE XXIV

Comparison of first ten women with last ten women as to use of Declarative Sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>4,255</th>
<th>Total 191.0</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>4,456</th>
<th>Total 186.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>425.5</td>
<td>Mean 191.0</td>
<td>Mean 445.6</td>
<td>Mean 186.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation 18.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{445.6 \times 19.1}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{8,463.72}{\sqrt{10}} = 846.372 = 6.105
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{445.6 \times 18.68}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{8,361.195}{\sqrt{10}} = 836.1195 = 4.993
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(6.105)^2 + (4.993)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{36.766 + 24.960069} = \sqrt{61.726069} = 7.868
\]

\[
D = \frac{20.1}{7.868} = 2.516 = 4705
\]

Therefore there are 9,705 chances in 10,000 that these late women used a greater number of declarative sentences than the early.
### Comparison of first ten women with last ten women as to use of Exclamatory Sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 134  **Total:** 53.8  **Total:** 77  **Total:** 65.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ P.E.M_1 = \frac{.9465 \times .86}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{.8270384}{3.1622} = 1.571 \]

\[ P.E.M_2 = \frac{.9465 \times .86}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{.8270384}{3.1622} = 1.692 \]

\[ P.E.D. = \sqrt{(1.571)^2 + (1.692)^2} \]

\[ = \sqrt{2.469041 + 2.862284} \]

\[ = \sqrt{5.331325} = 2.308 \]

\[ P.E.D. = \frac{.7 - 8.4}{2.38} = 4.472 \]

Therefore 9,472 chances in 10,000 that early women used a greater number of Exclamatory Sentences than the late women.
### Table XXVI

Comparison of first ten women with last ten women as to use of Interrogative Sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nott</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Millard</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>413</th>
<th>Total 115.2</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>337</th>
<th>Total 101.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{6483 \times 11.82}{\sqrt{10}} = 9971.448 = 3.159 \\
3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{6483 \times 10.14}{\sqrt{10}} = 9971.342 = 2.715 \\
3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(3.159)^2 - (2.715)^2} \\
= \sqrt{(9.999281) - (7.376856)} \\
= \sqrt{2.622425} = 1.620
\]

Therefore there are 8,886 chances in 10,000 that the early women used a greater number of interrogative sentences than the late women.
### TABLE XXVII

Comparison of the first ten women with last ten women as to use of imperative sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Total 98.0</td>
<td>Total 120</td>
<td>Mean 79</td>
<td>Variation 9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Variation 9.9

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{\sum (x - \bar{x})^2}{10} = 3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{\sum (x - \bar{x})^2}{10} = 3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(2.619)^2 - (3.1622)} = 3.384
\]

\[
D = 6.6 - 2.021 = 4.179
\]

There are 9,113 chances in 10,000 that the early women used a greater number of imperative sentences than late women.
TABLE XXVIII

Comparison of first ten women with last ten women as to use of simple sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women Sentence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women Sentence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>Leake</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,712          Total 200.2       Total 1,567          Total 897.0
Mean 171.2           Mean 156.7        Mean 156.7          Mean 89.7
Variation 20.92      Variation 20.92      Variation 20.92      Variation 20.92

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{8455 \times 20.92}{10} = \frac{176835.72}{5.592} = 3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{8455 \times 20.7}{10} = \frac{176800.11}{7.675} = 3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(3.1622)^2 + (7.675)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{(31.270484) + (57.905585)}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{89.176029} = 9.4481
\]

Therefore there are 3,441 chances in 10,000 that the early women used a greater number of simple sentences than the late woman.
TABLE XXIX

Comparison of the first ten women with last ten women as to use of Complex Sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,959
Mean 195.9
Variation 21.52

Mean 206.0
Variation 51.6

\[ P.E.M_1 = \frac{(21.52)^2 - 10.559}{3.162} \]

\[ P.E.M_2 = \frac{(31.8)^2 - 9.501}{3.162} \]

\[ P.E.D. = \sqrt{(5.759)^2 + (8.501)^2} \]

\[ = \sqrt{(33.16081) + (72.28700)} \]

\[ = \sqrt{105.43089} = 10.268 \]

\[ D = \frac{10.268}{10.268} = 1.000 \]

Therefore there are 7,398 chances in 10,000 that the late women used a greater number of complex sentences than the early women.
TABLE XXX

Comparison of the first ten women with last ten women as to use of Compound Sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total 575   | Total 163.0     | Total 524           | Total 90.4 |               |
| Mean 57.5   | Mean 32.4       | Mean 52.4           | Mean 90.4  |               |
|             | Variation 18.3  |                     | Variation 9.04 |

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{8453 \times 16.3}{\sqrt{10}} - 12,77932 = 4.357
\]
\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{8453 \times 9.04}{\sqrt{10}} - 7,041512 = 2.416
\]
\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(4.357)^2 + (2.416)^2}
\]
\[
= \sqrt{(18.985419) + (5.837056)}
\]
\[
= \sqrt{24.825075} = 4.982
\]
\[
D = \frac{5.1}{4.982} = 1.023 = 2908
\]

Therefore there are 7,908 chances in 10,000 that the early women use a greater number of compound sentences than the late.
### TABLE XXXI

Comparison of the first ten women with last ten women as to use of Compound-Complex Sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>Total 100.0</td>
<td>Total 849</td>
<td>Total 170.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>Mean 84.9</td>
<td>Mean 170.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Variation 17.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{9455 \times 10}{\sqrt{10}} = 9455 = 2.575 < \frac{10}{3.1622}
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{8455 \times 17.08}{\sqrt{10}} = 14,437.724 = 4.563 < \frac{17.08}{3.1622}
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(2.575)^2 + (4.563)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{(7.144929) + (20.820969)}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{27.965998} = 5.298
\]

\[
P.E.D. = 5.298
\]

Therefore there are 8,896 chances in 10,000 that the late women used a greater number of compound-complex sentences than the early women.
TABLE XXXII

Comparison of the first ten women with last ten women as to use of Very Simple Sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woodhall</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,230 Total 214  Total 1,072 Total 2392
Mean 123. Mean 107. Mean

Variation 21.4  Variation 20.2

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{(3453)(21.4)}{\sqrt{10}} = 19,03942 = 5.720 \\
P.E.M_2 = \frac{(3453)(20.2)}{\sqrt{10}} = 22,95746 = 7.539 \\
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(5.720)^2 + (7.539)^2} \\
\sqrt{(32.7154) + (55.32144)} \\
\sqrt{88.036844} = 9.409 \\
P.E.D. = \frac{16}{9.409} = 1.69 = 3.742
\]

Therefore there are 3,742 chances in 10,000 that the early women used a greater number of very simple sentences than the late women.
TABLE XXXIII

Comparison of the first ten women with last ten women as to use of Loose Sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockwell</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>Horton</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howse</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,461 Total 257.2 Total 1,617 Total 252.6

Mean 145.1 Mean 25.72 Mean 161.7 Mean 25.36
Variation 35.72 Variation 25.36

\[
P.E.M_1 = \sqrt{\frac{2453 \times 55.72}{10}} = \frac{30.130016}{3.1622} = 9.543
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2453 \times 25.26}{10}} = \frac{31.338279}{3.1622} = 6.782
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(9.543)^2 - (6.782)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{(87.708949) - (45.666536)}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{132.042413} = 11.517
\]

\[
D = \frac{16.6}{1.09} = 15.1 = 27.09
\]

Therefore 7,709 chances in 10,000 that the late women used a greater number of loose sentences than the early women.
TABLE XXXIV

Comparison of the first ten women with last ten women as to use of Balanced Sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 429
Mean 42.9
Variation 12.08

Mean 336
Mean 33.6
Variation 14.36

\[ P.E.M_1 = \frac{6453 \times 12.08}{\sqrt{10}} = 2211.224 = 3.155 \]
\[ P.E.M_2 = \frac{6453 \times 14.36}{\sqrt{10}} = 18135.508 = 3.636 \]
\[ P.E.D. = \left(\frac{3.155}{1.345}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{3.636}{1.345}\right)^2 \]
\[ = \sqrt{9.941409} - (14.730244) \]
\[ = \sqrt{4.691665} = 4.967 \]
\[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{9.3}{4.967} = 1.856 \]

Therefore there are 8,086 chances in 10,000 that the early women used a greater number of balances sentences than the late women.
TABLE XXXV

Comparison of the first ten women with last ten women as to use of periodic sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,890  Total 359  Total 1,975  Total 194.0
Mean 189.0  Mean 35.9  Mean 197.5  Mean Variation 19.40

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{(9.896^2) \cdot (5.596)}{\sqrt{10}} = 30.54327 = 3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{(9.896^2) \cdot (5.596)}{\sqrt{10}} = 30.54327 = 5.217
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(3.1622) + (5.217)^2} = \sqrt{(102.069316) + (27.219089)}
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(129.288395)} = 11.371
\]

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{3.5}{11.371} = 0.74 = 1.816
\]

Therefore there are 6,816 chances in 10,000 that the late women used a greater number of periodic sentences than the early women.
### TABLE XXIVI

Comparison of the first ten women, with last ten women as to use of personal pronouns, first person, singular number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagé</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 75.0  Total 28.0  Total 78.3  Total 31.36
Mean 7.5  Mean 7.85  Mean 7.85  Mean 3.156

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation 2.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{0.0463 \times 2.8}{10} = \frac{2.36884}{10} = .748 \quad 3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{0.0463 \times 2.156}{10} = \frac{2.667668}{10} = .64 \quad 3.1622
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(.748)^2 + (.64)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{(1.550604) + (0.7056)}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{2.256104} = 1.124.
\]

\[
\frac{25}{1.124} = .029 \quad 135
\]

Therefore there are only 5,135 chances in 10,000 that the late women used a greater number of first person singular pronouns than the early women.
### TABLE XXXVII

Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to the use of personal pronouns, first person, plural number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Woman</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Woman</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>11.63</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>12.55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Variation</td>
<td>44.24</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>51.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{8453 \times 4.424}{10} - \frac{2.7526072}{10} = 1.182 = 3.1882
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{8453 \times 3.14}{10} - \frac{2.656248}{10} = .536 = 3.1882
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(1.182)^2 + (.536)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{(1.397124) + (.702244)}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{2.099368} = 1.448
\]

\[
\frac{P.E.D.}{1.448} = .92 = .63 = 1.571
\]

Therefore there are only 1.571 chances in 10,000 that the late woman use a greater number of first person, plural pronouns than the early women.
TABLE XXXVIII

Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to the use of personal pronoun, second person, singular number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mean: 3.19
Variance: .1372

Total Mean: 2.06
Variance: .1746

P.E.M = \( \frac{3.19 - 2.06}{\sqrt{1.372}} = \frac{1.1597516}{3.1622} = .366 \)

P.E.D. = \( \sqrt{0.0366^2 + 0.0466^2} = \sqrt{0.02031112} = .0592 \)

Therefore only 0.571 chances in 10,000 that the early women use a greater number of second person singular pronouns than the late women.
TABLE XXXIX

Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to the use of personal pronouns, second person, plural number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Woman</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Woman</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>Berton</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 53.7  Total 21.70  Total 40.6  Total 15.60
Mean 5.37  Mean 4.06  Mean 4.06  Mean 1.56

Variation 8.17

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{.0453 \times 2.17}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{1.0134501}{5.1622} = .58
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{.0453 \times 1.56}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{.68288}{5.1622} = .42
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(0.58)^2 + (0.42)^2} = \sqrt{0.3324 + 0.1764} = \sqrt{0.5088} = .718
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \frac{1.81}{.718} = 3.896
\]

Therefore there 3.896 chances in 10,000 that the early women used a greater number of second person plural pronouns than the late women.
**TABLE LX**

Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to the use of personal pronouns, third person, singular number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>Livemore</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 165.9 Total: 44.10  Mean: 16.59  Mean: 11.00  Variation: 4.41  Variation: 6.4

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{8453 \times 4.41}{\sqrt{10}} = 5.727773 = 1.17
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{38453 \times 5.484}{\sqrt{10}} = 5.4809252 = 1.73
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(1.17)^2 + (1.73)^2} = \sqrt{4.3316} = 2.08
\]

\[
D = \frac{5.59}{2.08} = 2.68 = 4.631
\]

Therefore there are 9,631 chances in 10,000 that the early women use more third person, singular pronouns than the late women.
Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to the use of personal pronouns, third person, plural number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 121.9 Total 25.48 Total 126.0 Total 27.2
Mean 12.19 Mean 12.60 Mean

Variation 2.048

\[ P.E.M_1 = \frac{.8455 \times 2.648}{\sqrt{10}} = 2.3333333 = .7078 \]

\[ P.E.M_2 = \frac{.8455 \times 2.78}{\sqrt{10}} = 2.299210 = .72 \]

\[ P.E.D. = \sqrt{(.7078)^2 + (.72)^2} \]

\[ = \sqrt{.50098064 + .5184} \]

\[ = \sqrt{1.01938324} = 1.009 \]

\[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{.43}{1.009} = 1.195 \]

Therefore 6, 195 chances in 10,000 that the late woman use a greater number of third person, plural pronouns than the early.
TABLE LXII
Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to references to the particular speaker in oral style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Cott</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 179 Mean 17.9 Total 84.3 Mean 15.6 Total 74.8 Mean Variation 8.48

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{6453 \times 8.48}{\sqrt{10}} = 7.168144 = 2.666 \\
5.1622
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{6453 \times 7.46}{\sqrt{10}} = 6.322044 = 1.999 \\
5.1622
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(2.666)^2 + (1.999)^2} \\
= \sqrt{6.514986 + 3.998001} \\
= \sqrt{10.512987} = 3.216
\]

\[
P.E.D. = 2.3 = 0.061 = 2.168 \\
5.021
\]

Therefore there are 7.168 chances in 10,000 that the early women used a greater number of references to the particular speaker than the late women.
TABLE LXIII

Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to references to the particular occasion in oral style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number Sentence</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood hull</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 80  Total 30  Total 41  Total 84 0
Mean 8.0  Mean 6.0  Mean 6.1  Mean Variation 2.6

\[
P.E.M_1 = \frac{84.55 \times 6.0}{10} = 5.019 \approx 3.1822
\]

\[
P.E.M_2 = \frac{84.55 \times 6.1}{10} = 5.15632 \approx 3.1822
\]

\[
P.E.D. = \sqrt{(3.019)2 + (3.63)2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{8.4904361 + 2.6569}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{11.147438} \approx 3.343
\]

\[
P.E.D. = 3.343
\]

Therefore there are 9,340 chances in 10,000 that the early women add more references to the particular occasion than the late women.
### TABLE LXIV

Comparison of the first ten women with the last ten women as to references to particular audience in oral style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
<th>Late Women</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variation from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mott</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>Woodhull</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Catt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 139  Total 69.6  Total 88  Total 47.2
Mean 13.9  Mean 6.96  Mean 8.8  Mean 4.78

\[ P.E.M. = \frac{0.6458 \times 6.96}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{5.0032}{3.1622} = 1.59 \]

\[ P.E.W. = \frac{0.6458 \times 8.8}{\sqrt{10}} = \frac{7.4304}{3.1622} = 2.35 \]

\[ P.E.D. = \sqrt{(1.59)^2 + (2.35)^2} = \sqrt{8.9521 + 5.5225} = \sqrt{14.4746} = 3.80 \]

\[ \frac{P.E.D.}{E.99} = 3.80 \]

There are 8,811 chances in 10,000 that the early women used a greater number of references to the particular audience than the late women.
CHAPTER V

I. Summary of the characteristics of oral style, as found in speeches of American women.

II. Summary and conclusions on the comparative study of the oral style of men and women speakers.

III. Summary and conclusions on the comparative study of the oral style of the earlier and later women speakers.

IV. Subjective Analysis.
Summary of the Characteristics of Oral Style, as Found in the Speeches of American Women

1. The analysis of sentence length shows that women speakers use great variety in sentence length. The shortest sentence is one word and the longest sentence is one hundred and eighty-one words. Moreover the average sentence lengths shows a spread from twenty-three words to thirty-five words. The average sentence length for all, twenty-seven words, is less than the average sentence length found in any of the earlier objective studies that have been mentioned.

2. The analysis of sentences reveals that the American women speakers use a great many interrogative sentences, many imperative sentences and a considerable number of exclamatory sentences. There is great variety in sentence structure and sentence artistry. The simple sentence predominates in sentences according to structure and the periodic sentence predominates in the analysis according to artistry.
3. The classification of personal pronouns shows many first and second person pronouns with an exceedingly large number of first person, plural pronouns.

4. There is a small number of references to the speaker but not many references to the audience and the occasion.

5. Fragmentary sentences, slang phrases, contractions, and abbreviations are not found to exist in these speeches.

Therefore, the characteristics of oral style that are frequently found in the speeches of American women were: (1) variety in sentence length; (2) variety in sentence type, structure and artistry; (3) frequent use of the first and second personal pronouns.

The characteristics of oral style that are not frequently found are (1) references to the audience, occasion, and speaker; (2) use of fragmentary sentences, slang, abbreviations and contractions.
SUMMARY OF THE COMPARISON OF THE ORAL STYLE OF
MEN AND WOMEN

1. Average sentence length: Men 30.1264 Women 27.8776

\[ D = 2.01 = 9,113 \text{ chances in 10,000 that the} \]
\[ \text{sentence length for women speakers} \]
\[ \text{is less than the average sentence length for men speakers.} \]
However, this difference is not great enough to be statistically reliable.

2. Declarative sentences: Men 912.4 in 1,000 sentences

Women 871.1 in 1,000 sentences

\[ D = 4.209 = 9,977 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women} \]
\[ \text{speakers use a smaller number of} \]
\[ \text{declarative sentences than men speakers.} \]
This is statistically very reliable.

3. Exclamatory sentences: Men 9.6 in 1,000 sentences

Women 21.1 in 1,000 sentences

\[ D = 2.39 = 9,748 \text{ chances in 10,000 that the women} \]
\[ \text{speakers use a greater number of} \]
exclamatory sentences than the men speakers. There is a
tendency toward reliability.

4. Interrogative sentences: Men 44.8 in 1,000 sentences

Women 75. in 1,000 sentences

\[ D = 4.04 = 9,968 \text{ chances in 10,000 that the women} \]
\[ \text{speakers use a greater number of} \]
interrogative sentences than the men speakers. This is
statistically very reliable.
5. Imperative sentences: Men 33.2 in 1,000 sentences
   Women 32.6 in 1,000 sentences

   \[ \frac{D}{\text{P.E.D.}} = .095 \text{ chances in 10,000 that the women} \]
   \[ \text{speakers use a fewer number of} \]
   \[ \text{imperative sentences than the men speakers. The} \]
   \[ \text{difference is not great enough to be statistically} \]
   \[ \text{reliable.} \]
6. Simple sentences: Men 249.3 in 1,000 sentences
   Women 327.9 in 1,000 sentences
   \[ D = \frac{5.348}{\text{F.E.D.}} = 9,998 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women} \]
   speakers use a greater number of
   simple sentences than men speakers. This is statistically very reliable.

7. Complex sentences: Men 472.2 in 1,000 sentences
   Women 401.9 in 1,000 sentences
   \[ D = \frac{4.5}{\text{F.E.D.}} = 9,998 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women speakers} \]
   use a smaller number of complex
   sentences than men speakers. This is statistically very reliable.

8. Compound sentences: Men 67.4 in 1,000 sentences
   Women 109.9 in 1,000 sentences
   \[ D = \frac{5.32}{\text{F.E.D.}} = 9,998 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women} \]
   speakers use a greater number
   of compound sentences than men speakers. This is statistically very reliable.

9. Compound-Complex sentences: Men 211.1 in 1,000 sentences
   Women 160.8 in 1,000 sentences
   \[ D = \frac{5.34}{\text{F.E.D.}} = 9,998.2 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women} \]
   speakers use a smaller
   number of compound-complex sentences than men speakers.
   This is statistically very reliable.
10. Very Simple sentences: Men 249.3 in 1,000 sentences
   Women 230.2 in 1,000 sentences
\[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 0.872 = 7,168 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women} \]
   speakers use a greater number of very simple sentences than men speakers. This difference is not great enough to be statistically reliable.

11. Loose sentences: Men 322.7 in 1,000 sentences
    Women 306.8 in 1,000 sentences
\[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 1.0522 = 7,006 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women} \]
   speakers use a smaller number of loose sentences than men speakers. The difference, however, is not great enough to be statistically reliable.

12. Balanced sentences: Men 92.4 in 1,000 sentences
    Women 76.5 in 1,000 sentences
\[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 1.46 = 8,360 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women} \]
   speakers use a smaller number of balanced sentences than men speakers. Again the difference is not statistically reliable.

13. Periodic sentences: Men 335.6 in 1,000 sentences
    Women 386.5 in 1,000 sentences
\[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 2.45 = 9,508 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women} \]
   speakers use a greater number of periodic sentences than men speakers. There is a tendency toward reliability.
14. First person, singular: Men 15.426 average for 1,000 words 
   Women 7.67 average for 1,000 words 
   \[
   D = 6.0 \quad \text{greater than Thorndike's tables. Therefore,}
   \]
   there are more than 10,000 
   chances in 10,000 that women speakers use a smaller number 
   of first person, singular pronouns than men speakers. This 
   is statistically very reliable.

15. First person, plural: Men 11.954 average for 1,000 words 
   Women 12.09 average for 1,000 words 
   \[
   D = .11 = 5,269 \quad \text{chances in 10,000 that women speakers}
   \]
   use a greater number of first 
   person, plural pronouns than men speakers. This fact is not 
   statistically reliable.

16. Second person, singular: Men .288 in 1,000 words 
   Women .2625 in 1,000 words 
   \[
   D = .04 \quad \text{This figure is too small for Thorndike's}
   \]
   table of the normal probability 
   integral. There is no reliability in the difference.

17. Second person, plural: Men 5.927 in 1,000 words 
   Women 4.71 in 1,000 words 
   \[
   D = .19 = 5,403 \quad \text{chances in 10,000 that women}
   \]
   speakers use a smaller number 
   of second person, plural pronouns than men speakers. This 
   is not statistically reliable.
18. Third person, singular: Men 12.342 in 1,000 words
   Women 14.24 in 1,000 words
   \[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 0.052 \] This figure is too small for Thorndike's table of the normal probability integral. There is no reliability in the difference.

19. Third person, Plural: Men 8.502 in 1,000 words
   Women 12.385 in 1,000 words
   \[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 0.49 = 6.221 \text{ chances in 10,000 that women speakers use a greater number of third person, plural pronouns than men speakers. This is not statistically reliable.} \]

20. Reference to particular speaker: Men 57.1 in 10,000 sentences
    Women 38.5 in 10,000 sentences
    \[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 2.82 = 9.705 \text{ chances in 10,000 that the women speakers use a smaller number of references to the particular speaker than the men speakers. There is a tendency toward reliability.} \]

21. Reference to particular occasion: Men 59 in 10,000 sentences
    Women 14.10 in 10,000 sentences
    \[ \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 3.86 = 9.953 \text{ chances in 10,000 that the women speakers use a smaller number of references to the particular occasion than men speakers. There is a tendency toward reliability.} \]
22. Reference to particular audience: Men 65 in 10,000 sentences
Women 22.7 in 10,000 sentences

\[ \frac{D}{\text{P.S.D.}} = 4.42 = 0.005 \text{ chances in 10,000} \]

that the women speakers use a smaller number of references to the audience than the men speakers. This is statistically very reliable.
CONCLUSIONS TO COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ORAL
STYLE OF MEN AND WOMEN.

From the statistical data on the comparison of the oral
style of men and women, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Men use an average sentence length that is greater
   than that of women. Reliability of difference was 2.01.

2. Men use more declarative sentences than women.
   There is a completed reliability of difference 4.202.

3. Women use more exclamatory sentences. Reliability
   of difference was 2.85.

4. Women use more interrogative sentences. There is
   a complete reliability of difference 4.04.

5. There is no reliability in the differences in the
   number of imperative sentences - .095.

Therefore from the study of the classification of
sentences as to use, it was found that men use more declarative
sentences and women use more exclamatory and interrogative
sentences. The only real difference was in declarative
and interrogative sentences whose reliability of differences
in average number was over 4. \[ \frac{D}{\sqrt{n}} \] must be at least 6 in
order to insure complete reliability.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Garrett, Henry E. "Statistics in Psychology and
6. Women use a greater number of simple sentences. There is complete reliability of 5.527.9.

7. Men use a greater number of complex sentences. There is complete reliability of 4.8.

8. Women use a greater number of compound sentences. There is complete reliability of 5.32.

9. Men use a greater number of compound complex sentences. There is complete reliability of 5.36.

Therefore in the study of the classification of sentences as to structure, it was found that there were four real differences. The women use a greater number of simple and compound sentences; the men use a greater number of complex and compound complex sentences.

10. The reliability of the differences in the average number of very simple sentences was not great enough to make any statement as to differences. It was .872.

11. Men and women use about the same number of loose sentences. Reliability of difference was 1.0522.

12. Men and women use about the same number of balanced sentences with a small margin of tendency for a greater number for the men. Reliability of was 1.46.

13. Women use a greater number of periodic sentences. This reliability of difference 2.45 was not great enough to make complete reliability.

Therefore men and women use about the same number of
very simple, loose and balanced sentences, with a slight tendency for a greater number for men in the last, and women have a tendency to use a greater number of peripdic sentences.

14. Men use a greater number of the first person, singular pronoun than women. There is complete reliability in the difference 6.0.

15. Men and women use about the same number of first person, plural pronouns. There was little reliability of difference .11.

16. Men and women use about the same number of second person, singular pronouns. There was very little difference reliability .04.

17. Men and women use about the same number of second person, plural pronouns. There was little reliability of difference .19.

18. Men and women use the same number of third person, singular pronouns. Reliability of difference was only .093.

19. Men and women use about the same number of third person, plural pronouns. Reliability of difference was .49.

Therefore, with the exception of the first person, singular pronouns where men use a greater number than women, men and women use about the same number of each kind of personal pronoun.

There were not enough instances of fragmentary sentences, slang phrases, abbreviations or contractions to set up any
tables for reliability of differences. This was also true in the study of Dr. Borchers except for contractions. A table to find the reliability of the differences in the average number of contractions for each individual was set up for Dr. Borchers but the ratio of reliability of differences in oral and written style was not great enough to draw any positive conclusions. It is fair to assume one of the two conclusions: that, because of editing, these points cannot be studied from the printed form of oral style, or that these points are not characteristics of oral style.
CONCLUSIONS TO THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE
ORAL STYLE OF MEN AND WOMEN

The complete reliabilities that were found in the tables to find the reliability of differences were:

1. Men use a greater number of declarative sentences.
2. Women use a greater number of simple sentences.
3. Women use a greater number of interrogative sentences.
4. Men use a greater number of complex sentences.
5. Women use a greater number of compound sentences.
6. Men use a greater number of compound-complex sentences.
7. Men use a greater number of first person, singular pronouns.

In summary then, it is seen that women speakers use a greater number of interrogative, simple and compound sentences than men speakers. Since rhetoricians have stressed the need for the use of the above-named types of sentences in oral style, it is possible to draw the conclusion that women speakers have followed the characteristics of oral style, in this respect, even more faithfully than men speakers.
It is also interesting to note that there is no difference between the men and women speakers in the use of the first person, plural and second person, plural pronouns. However, since Dr. Borchers had found that speakers use these pronouns more than writers, it is possible to assume that women, too, use more of these pronouns when they speak than when they write. However, this is simply an assumption which is interesting from the point of view of oral style.
COMPARISON OF THE ORAL STYLE OF
EARLIER AND LATER WOMEN SPEAKERS

1. Average sentence length: Early 28.4996
   Late 29.2556

$$\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 2.622 = 9,602 \text{ chances in 10,000 that later}
\text{women speakers use longer average sentences than the earlier women speakers.}$$

2. Declarative sentences: Early 425.5 in 500 sentences
   Late 445.6 in 500 sentences

$$\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 2.815 = 9,705 \text{ chances in 10,000 that later women speakers use more than earlier women speakers.}$$

3. Exclamatory sentences: Early 13.4 in 500 sentences
   Late 7.7 in 500 sentences

$$\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 2.4 = 9,472 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier women speakers use more than later women speakers.}$$

4. Interrogative sentences: Early 41.3 in 500 sentences
   Late 33.7 in 500 sentences

$$\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 1.824 = 8,896 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier women speakers use more than later women speakers.}$$

5. Imperative sentences: Early 19.8 in 500 sentences
   Late 13. in 500 sentences

$$\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 2.021 = 9,113 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier women speakers use more than later women speakers.}$$
COMPARISON OF EARLY AND LATE WOMEN AS TO
SENTENCE STRUCTURE

   Late 156.7 in 500 sentences.
   \[
   \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 1.527 = 8,441 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier}
   \]
   \[
   \text{women speakers use more than later}
   \]
   \[
   \text{women speakers.}
   \]

7. Complex sentences: Early 195.9 in 500 sentences
   Late 206 in 500 sentences.
   \[
   \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = .983 = 7,392 \text{ chances in 10,000 that later}
   \]
   \[
   \text{women speakers use more than earlier}
   \]
   \[
   \text{women speakers.}
   \]

8. Compound sentences: Early 57.5 in 500 sentences.
   Late 52.5 in 500 sentences.
   \[
   \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 1.023 = 7,308 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier}
   \]
   \[
   \text{women speakers use more than later}
   \]
   \[
   \text{women speakers.}
   \]

9. Compound–Complex sentences: Early 75.4 in 500 sentences
   Late 84.9 in 500 sentences.
   \[
   \frac{D}{P.E.D.} = 1.79 = 8,898 \text{ chances in 10,000 that later}
   \]
   \[
   \text{women speakers use}
   \]
   \[
   \text{more than earlier women speakers.}
   \]
COMPARISON OF EARLY AND LATE WOMEN AS TO SENTENCE ARTISTRY

10. Very Simple sentences: Early 123 in 500 sentences
    Late 107 in 500 sentences
    \[ \frac{D}{\text{P.E.D.}} = 1.69 = 8,742 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier women speakers use more than later women speakers.} \]

11. Loose sentences: Early 145.1 in 500 sentences
    Late 161.7 in 500 sentences.
    \[ \frac{D}{\text{P.E.D.}} = 1.09 = 7,709 \text{ chances in 10,000 that later women speakers use more than earlier women speakers.} \]

12. Balanced sentences: Early 42.9 in 500 sentences
    Late 33.6 in 500 sentences
    \[ \frac{D}{\text{P.E.D.}} = 1.8 = 8,896 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier women speakers use more than later women speakers.} \]

13. Periodic sentences: Early 189 in 500 sentences
    Late 197.5 in 500 sentences
    \[ \frac{D}{\text{P.E.D.}} = .74 = 6,616 \text{ chances in 10,000 that later women speakers use more than earlier women speakers.} \]
COMPARISON OF EARLY AND LATE WOMEN AS TO
PERSONAL PRONOUNS

14. First person, singular: Early 7.5 in 1,000 words
    Late 7.83 in 1,000 words

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{0.029}{6.185} = 5.155 \text{ chances in 10,000 late women}
\]

speakers use more than earlier.

15. First person, plural: Early 11.63 in 1,000 words.
    Late 12.55 in 1,000 words

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{0.63}{6.571} = 9.371 \text{ chances in 10,000 late women}
\]

speakers use more than earlier.

16. Second person, singular: Early 0.319 in 1,000 words
    Late 0.206 in 1,000 words

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{0.6317}{6.571} = 9.696 \text{ chances in 10,000 early women}
\]

speakers use more than later.

17. Second person, plural: Early 5.37 in 1,000 words
    Late 4.06 in 1,000 words

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{1.61}{8.696} = 18.686 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier}
\]

women speakers use more than later.

18. Third person, singular: Early 16.59 in 1,000 words
    Late 11.00 in 1,000 words

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{2.68}{9.631} = 9.681 \text{ chances in 10,000 that earlier}
\]

women speakers use more than later.

19. Third person, plural: Early 12.19 in 1,000 words
    Late 12.60 in 1,000 words

\[
\frac{D}{P.E.D.} = \frac{0.406}{6.193} = 6.193 \text{ chances in 10,000 late women speakers}
\]

use more than earlier.
COMPARISON OF THE EARLY AND LATE WOMEN AS TO:

20. References to the particular speaker: Early 17.9 in 500 sentences
    Late 15.6 in 500 sentences

\[ D = \frac{8.61}{P.E.D.} = 7168 \text{ chances in 10,000 early women speakers use more than late women speakers.} \]

21. References to the particular occasion: Early 8 in 500 sentences
    Late 6.1 in 500 sentences

\[ D = \frac{1.045}{P.E.D.} = 8360 \text{ chances in 10,000 early women speakers use more than late women speakers.} \]

22. References to the particular audience: Early 13.9 in 500 sentences
    Late 8.8 in 500 sentences

\[ D = \frac{1.705}{P.E.D.} = 8811 \text{ chances in 10,000 that early women speakers use more than later women speakers.} \]
CONCLUSION TO THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE
ORAL STYLE OF EARLIER AND LATER WOMEN SPEAKERS

In the complete study of the earlier and later women speakers there was not a reliability of difference, among the twenty tables, that was great enough to establish a complete reliability of difference. The suggestion for a real difference came in the classification of sentences according to use. Here there was a tendency for the later women speakers to use a greater number of declarative sentences and the earlier women speakers to use a greater number of exclamatory, interrogative and imperative sentences. However, since the reliability of difference was not great enough to be completely reliable, it is impossible to draw any definite conclusions from this analysis.
IV. Subjective Analysis

In an analysis of style there are many characteristics that cannot be objectively analyzed or measured. Nevertheless, such characteristics are often very interesting and contribute to the appreciation of style. It is my purpose in the present discussion, therefore, to present a subjective analysis of the speeches of the American women speakers treated in this study. The ideas that I shall present are my own personal observations; the illustrations have not been completely assembled nor statistically treated. For the most part the material does not lend itself to statistical analysis.

I believe the success of the speeches of the American women can be attributed to certain very definite characteristics of speaking. These characteristics are:

1. Sincerity of purpose.
2. A method of gaining attention through the use of familiar and vital material.
3. A special technique of using words in trilogies.

In all the speeches of American women, sincerity of purpose is a very outstanding and predominant characteristic. The American women seldom speak just to make a speech, but instead they generally speak for a
cause. Most of the time the women have a definite message; they have something to say and they say it.

There have been many subjects for the American woman speaker because she has followed the cause of the downtrodden and has spoken for them. Her subjects deal with freedom for all those who are oppressed. She speaks for the freedom of her own sex, freedom for the slave, freedom in religious thought, freedom in franchise, freedom for the laborer, freedom of speech, freedom in education, freedom in love, and freedom from suffering, disease, and poverty. Her voice is the voice of freedom; her words are those for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The American women speakers have fervor of conviction to help the downtrodden. They speak for a purpose, and that purpose is often persuasion to action in a cause in which they heartily believe. They are vitally interested in the subjects of their speeches; they are enthusiastic, earnest and sincere, because they believe what they are saying.

Besides sincerity of purpose, the women speakers have a very definite choice in techniques of gaining attention. Instead of using the striking, concrete, and varied as a means of gaining attention,
the women speakers use the familiar and the vital. Their use of the familiar can be seen in their figures of speech. For example, the women use many similes and metaphors that have reference to one of three familiar subjects: home life, nature and religion. These are three subjects that the women speakers know, and they are subjects with which the audiences have had experience. A glance at these figures of speech will reveal the use of the familiar to gain the attention of the audience.

Figures of Speech that have References to home life:
1. If these passions could like some modern chimneys, be consumers of their own smoke, a better atmosphere would prevail.
2. The bread and the fish of these are stone and scorpion to those.
3. Diamond cement, applied on both sides of a fractured vase, reunites the parts and keeps them from falling asunder.
4. Women in particular have pinned their faith in their ministers' sleeves.
5. Is the United States a nation with full and complete national powers, or is it a mere thread upon which states are strung as the beads upon a necklace?
6. Those who laid the knife at the throat of the nation.
7. Gather around the widow's hearthstone.
8. When you tie up your arm, it will become weak and helpless; and when you tie up woman, she will become weak and helpless.
9. If it be true, this truth shall steal into our minds like accents of childhood.

Figures of Speech that show references to nature:
1. The reapers of the harvest have replaced the ploughman and seed sower.
2. Oaks that turn out to be cornstalks
3. Pillar of cloud, pillar of fire, where dost thou lead?
4. Women come forth in public work like singing birds after a thunder-storm.
5. The river sponge is forever saturated with the passing streams of other people's woes.
6. Black waters of dissipation and rocks of dissolute life
7. They live in place and plenty, happy in the hope that they may dwell securely under their own vine and fig-tree.
8. One must admire the instinct of the grub worm which leads it to weave its own winding sheet, and lie down fearlessly in its sepulcher, preparatory to its resurrection as a butterfly.
9. We can keep ice and water upon the same plane but we cannot keep them close together.

10. A hunting ground for slave-holder

11. If you allow one single seed of slavery to remain in the soil of America, that germ will come up, that germ will thrive, and again stifle the growth, wither the leaves, blast the flowers and poison the fair fruits of freedom.

12. Water is the very symbol of democracy!

13. See success bloom out like flowers after a summer rain.

14. They spring like a root out of dry ground.

15. Divine truth oversweeps the earth like an army of grasshoppers.

16. The faith and the work of true human life is like mustard seed in comparison with the wild elements that surround it.

17. There are great things which swallow up our lives like a drop in the ocean.

18. The black mud at its root nourishes the pure white water lily.

19. We are still in the juicy state of the young twig, easily bent away and made to grow into deformity.

20. The more he gives of his vision to men, the richer it becomes, the brighter it grows until it illuminates the pathway.
Figures of Speech that have references to the Bible and religion:

1. A breath of God shall clear the atmosphere.
2. It was a whirlwind of the Lord.
3. They were psalms of happiness.
4. Every earnest purpose must have its own baptism of blessings.
5. Men and women creep cowardly over God's footstool.
6. The dried husks of Orthodoxy.
7. Hungering and thirsting after the bread and water of life.
8. The human soul is a holy thing; it is the temple of living joy or sorrow. It is freighted with vital realities. It can outlengthen Heaven itself.
9. The lordly heel of the government trampling upon the children of men.
10. Lives have been psalms in minor keys.
11. Modern society was crowned with thorns, life is flesh and fluent.
12. Seeds of prophetic words spring up.
13. The divine mandate of illumination.
14. Anointed him with myrrh and set a garland of wool upon his head.
15. If the sunshine of faith and the serene heaven of resolution meet the ripe hour, all is well, but if you faint, repel, delay, they wither at the core and your crown is stolen from you, your privilege is set aside. Esau has sold his birthright and the pottage has lost its flavor.

16. The world never welcomes its deliverer save with the dungeon, the fagot or the cross.

17. The voice of God shall be crystallized.

18. The swaddling clothes of error.

19. The world turns from this life, giving a power and asks instead of bread a stone.

The use of the familiar can also be seen in the choice of words. Many of the words of the American women speakers reveal the life and thoughts of the speakers themselves. Sometimes the words suggest the inferior positions that women have felt themselves to have held in the world. For example, retiring, subjection, submission, modesty, protection, slander, and humble are words used often, showing the sense of inferiority. Other words suggest the struggle for freedom in which women have participated. The familiar words for freedom are generally
either on the slavery question or the woman suffrage question. The slavery question is revealed through such words as bound, wrongs, fetters, pity, broken, humanity, prostrata, obey, liberty, destruction; the woman suffrage question is revealed in such words as education, citizenship, duty, equality, dignity, redress, laws, life, and pride. There is also an interest in a conventional, moral standard of living that can be seen in the frequent use of words as truth, love, pure, sin, moral, blessing, mission, reforming, sacrifice, and benevolence.

The use of the vital to gain attention is seen in the use of slogans. These slogans use many loaded words already discussed in the use of the familiar, but the words are arranged in catchy sentences. The slogans are vital because they appeal to the most important drives in life. The impelling motives that are exemplified in the slogans are those of self-preservation, power, reputation, sentiment and affection; there is very little appeal to the impelling motives of property or taste.

Examples of slogans are:
1. Give us a living principle to die for!
2. Make this a war for emancipation.
3. No title so proud as that of a United States citizen.
4. The desire for freedom lives in every heart.
5. Return the panting fugitive.
6. Aid it, paper, aid it pen,
   Aid it minds of noble men.
7. Republicanism is a failure.
8. Women have been the mere echoes of men.
9. Gather freedom, each man for himself.
10. Spurn the bond of servitude.
11. The world needed a woman.
12. It is the negro's hour. Women must wait.
13. Poor human nature wants something to look down on.
14. Borrowed plumes are always dangerous.
15. In our hearts we feel that there is a word sweeter
   than mother, home or heaven. That word is liberty.
16. Proclaim liberty to the captive, the opening of
    the prison to them that are bound.
17. Emancipate women from enslavement.
18. Whoever controls work and wages, controls morals.
19. Independence is happiness.
20. A gold band is more efficacious than an iron law.
21. A union of interests helps to preserve a union of
    hearts.
22. Emancipate slaves with the pen.
23. Slavery and freedom cannot exist together.
24. Let the past be the past! Let the dead bury its dead.
Besides the sincerity of purpose and the use of the familiar and the vital to gain attention, women speakers have contributed a characteristic of speaking that has seldom been mentioned by rhetoricians. This characteristic is the use of a combination of three words, either adjectives or nouns, in a very unique and effective way. Sometimes the words are synonyms and sometimes they are antonyms. Still other times the words are used in a climactic effect. Occasionally the trilogy of words has alliteration, which gives a very pleasing effect. Examples of trilogies are:

- noble, virtuous, well educated
- angular, old, wrinkled
- hard, selfish, brutal
- wan, weary, torn
- stern, selfish, aggrandizing
- bound, bruised, beaten
- quiet, differential, submissive
- patient, persuasive, womanly
- ridiculed, ostracized, persecuted
- clear, succinct, intelligent
- criminal, misdirected, incendiary
- dilatory, expensive, and needless
- sick, wounded, and disabled
loving, loyal and devoted
consecrated, persistent and systematic
dark, damaging and unclean
higher, purer, truer
courageous, earnest, unaltering
ignorant, debased and downtrodden

serfdom, peasantry, slavery
rights, privileges, immunities
purity, virtue, morality
poverty, ignorance, vice
intrigue, bribery, corruption
pride, dignity, character
pride, selfishness, complacency
peace, harmony, beauty
poets, philosophers, statesmen
wealth, family, education
passion, bribery, fraud
codes, creeds, customs
traditions, usages, customs
heart, hope, ambition
bitterness, hatred and malice
weaving, knitting and serving
discontent, resentment and bitterness
pain, loss and disaster
eyes, hearts and hopes
paupers, outcasts, and wanderers
pain, poverty and want
courtesy, hospitality, and comliness
life, liberty, and property
abstinence, anti-tobacco, and social purity
vigor, freshness, enthusiasm
coachmen, gardeners, waiters
bench, bar, jury
sympathy, enjoyment, and good
vice, intemperance, indecency
peace, harmony, beauty
poets, philosophers, statesmen
wealth, family, education
passion, bribery, fraud
codes, creeds, customs
savagery, darkness, and crime
cellar, sideboard and table
manner, word, and deed

Alliterated Trilogies:

serene soul soars
codes, creeds, and customs
bound, bruised, beaten
unwashed, unmended, and unlearned (woman)
outwitted, outmatched, outvoted
potting, pickling, preserving
exaltation, execration, and exclusion
clean, constructive, conscientious

life is flesh and fluent
cool and calm
first pure, then peaceable
sublime strength
sway the spirit
sin and suffering
sires and sons

Many other characteristics of the oral style of American women speakers might be discussed in a subjective analysis. These traits, however, sincerity of purpose, a method of gaining attention through the use of the familiar and the vital, and a special technique of using words in trilogies, are the most outstanding in my opinion.

This subjective analysis has been made as a contribution to stylistic interest and it is not submitted as having any statistical value.
BRIEF

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

with Special Reference

to Public Speaking Experience
LUCRETIA MOTT - 1793-1880
Philanthropist

Mrs. Lucretia Mott was born on the island of Nantucket, January 3, 1793, and died near Philadelphia, November 11, 1880. She attended Friends Boarding School and, at the age of fifteen, became an instructor there. James Mott, who became her husband, was also an instructor in this school.

From childhood she was an active worker in the movement against slavery, and she kept her interest in that cause until the slaves had been freed. When the convention at Philadelphia for Anti-Slavery was held in 1833 she was one of the four women who dared to face criticism by speaking in public. "Her discourses were noted for clearness, refinement and eloquence." In 1840, she and her husband attended the Anti-Slavery Convention in London as delegates from America. "It was decided not to admit women delegates but she was cordially received, and made many telling addresses."2

This exclusion of women from the convention in London led to the establishment of the women's rights movement in America. In 1848 she was one of the four women to call the first meeting for Women's Rights at

---

1 F. E. Willard and M. A. Livermore, A Woman of the Century, p. 526.
2 Ibid., 526
Seneca Falls, New York. In those days woman suffrage was looked down upon, but Lucretia Mott's gentle wit and humor were always ready to win over much of the opposition.

Her speaking is described as beautiful and strong. "She spoke with singular beauty in feature and expression; she spoke with simplicity and earnestness; her words rolling out logical, strong and full of conviction of her heart." Another writer describes her speaking as magnetic.

Lucretia Mott was a pioneer in the cause of woman and remained one of the most powerful advocates of the cause until her death. Her last address for the cause is remembered with great affection. "In her eightieth year she made her last appearance in public at the convention held in New York, 1878. In her earnestness, she continued speaking as she descended the steps of the platform, and went down the aisle, while the audience rose and tearfully bid her goodbye."2

Her speeches can be found in the following:

   New York: Fowler and Wells, 1881.

2 Amelia Borch, Who's Who in Woman Oration, M.701
   Thesis (University of Wisconsin, 1932) p. 77. A.
   Thesis (University of Wisconsin, 1932) p. 77.
Susan B. Anthony was born in South Adams, Massachusetts, February 15, 1820. She was educated in a small select school in her father's house until she was seventeen, when she was sent to a boarding school in Philadelphia. She gave her first speech at a banquet of the Daughters of Temperance on March 1, 1849. She was the first woman to appear before a legislature, where she spoke on the married woman's property law in New York. In 1850 she entered public life and was supported by her father, who desired that she become a lecturer on reforms for the day. She became an ardent worker for suffrage and anti-slavery, speaking on the public lecture platform for fifty seven years.

She had many interesting experiences in gaining rights for women. In 1853 she attended the New York State Teachers' Convention, two-thirds of which was women. After sitting in the convention for two hours,
listening to the men speaking, Miss Anthony asked to speak. The men debated the question an hour before she was allowed to speak. In 1852, at a Sons of Temperance Convention, she was refused permission to speak; as a result, she and three other women left the convention and formed the Woman's State Temperance Convention.

One of the most important events of her life was her arrest for voting at the Presidential election in 1872 as a test of the validity of the fourteenth amendment. She was arrested and fined one hundred dollars for illegal voting, but said, "Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God." And she never paid any of the fine and was not imprisoned for disobedience of the court ruling.

Descriptions of her public speaking activities give her excellent commendations. "Miss Anthony has always been in great demand on the platform and has lectured in almost every city and hamlet in the North. She has made constitutional arguments before congressional committees and spoken impromptu to assemblies in all sorts of places. Whether it be a good word in introducing a speaker, the short speech to awaken a convention, the closing appeal to set people to work, the full hour address of argument or the helpful talk at suffrage meetings,"
she always says the right thing and never wears her audience. There is no hurry, no superfluity in her discourse, no sentiment, no poetry, save that of self-forgetfulness in devotion to the noblest principles that can actuate human motives. A fine sense of humor pervades her arguments and by the *reductio ad absurdum* she disarms and wins her opponent.¹

Susan B. Anthony's speeches can be found in:


ERNESTINE L. ROSE - 1810-18
Lecturer and Woman Suffragist

Ernestine L. Rose was born in Peterloff, Trebienalski, Poland, in January 13, 1810. Her father was a Jewish Rabbi, and because he wished her to marry some one she did not love, she went to court and won her case about the matter. Her travels then took her to Prussia, where she sold perfumes of her own invention; then to England where she became a teacher of foreign languages; then to America with an English husband. In America, in Boston, she began

lecturing on freedom of speech and rights for women. She also went back to England to give speeches and lecturers. "She was an impassioned orator and legislative worker. She had a slight lisp and foreign accent, yet she possessed all the fire and eloquence of a great orator." ¹

Her speeches can be found in the following:


ANTOINETTE LOUISA (BROWN) BLACKWELL - 1825-1921
Author and Minister

Antoinette Brown was born at Henrietta, New York, May 20, 1825. She taught in public schools and private seminaries to make enough money to go to college. She was graduated from Oberline College, Ohio, from the Literary Course in 1847, and from the Theological Course in 1850. She was the first woman to be ordained a minister, but there was a great dissension of opinion when she was to be ordained. At the National Woman's Convention in 1853, Lucy Stone said of her, "It is said that women could not be ministers of religion. Last

Sunday at the Metropolitan Hall, Antoinette Brown conducted services and was joined in it by the largest congregation assembled within the walls of any building of this city. Some of the men hissed but many have called her to be their pastor and she is to be ordained this month.¹

She married Samuel Blackwell in 1856, but she kept on lecturing and preaching. In 1897 she gave an impressive address at the fiftieth anniversary of the organized Woman's Rights Convention. "A very effective speaker, although far from emotional, her appeal was mainly to reason."²

Mrs. Blackwell is remembered both for her speaking and writing. Her life as a preacher, lecturer and writer has been a very useful one for humanity. "She has been actively interested in reformatory subjects and has spoken in behalf of the temperance cause."³

Her public speaking work was considered successful because of her strong, positive personality. "Obstacles melted away under the powerful personality of such a speaker as Antoinette Brown and in spite of the objections to women preachers as a class, she finally became ordained."⁴

¹ A. S. Blackwell, Lucy Stone, p. 120.
³ F. E. Willard and M. A. Livermore, A Woman of the Century, p. 98.
⁴ Ibid., 91.
Her speeches will be found in:


**MRS. MATILDA JOSYLN GAGE - 1826-1898**

*Woman Suffragist*

Matilda Joslyn was born March 24, 1826, in Cicero, New York. With no college open for girls in that day, she was educated at home. Her father was a physician and was anxious to bestow opportunities of education upon his only child. "It was the pride and delight of Dr. Joslyn that his daughter should pursue branches of learning rarely studied by girls, he himself teaching her Greek and mathematics, giving her practical instruction in physiology, and even considering the idea of a full medical course for her." Although she was not sent to a medical school, she was sent to the Clinton, New York, Liberal Institute.

Her public speaking experiences came early in life, for, at the age of seventeen, she gave her first lecture to a literary society of her own town. Her subject was astronomy. Moreover, her interest in public participation for reform did not cease after her marriage to Henry M. Gage, a young merchant of her town. In 1852 she participated.

---

in the Syracuse Convention for Woman's Rights, the
youngest speaker present. She was asked to speak
for many occasions during the Civil War and she
declared that no permanent peace could be secured
without the overthrow of slavery. When the right to
vote upon school questions came to the women of New
York, she conducted energetic campaigns to remove
incompetent male officials and to place in office
capable women.

The work of Mrs. Gage in the National Woman
Suffrage Association is well known. She made some of
the best speeches and addresses for that organization.
She appeared before national and state groups in behalf
of woman's right to vote. Some of her best speeches are:
"United States Voters," "Women in the Early Christian
Church," and "Centralization."

Her speeches will be found in:

1. History of Woman Suffrage, Vols. I, II, and III,
Stanton, Anthony and Gage, New York: Fowler
and Wells, 1881.

2. International Council of Women, Washington,

LUCY STONE - 1818-1893
Reformer

Lucy Stone was born near West Brookfield, Massachusetts,
August 13, 1818. She attended Oberlin College, the only
college then open to women, and was graduated from that college in 1847. Because the president of the college did not believe it proper for women to speak in public, he suggested reading her speech for her but Lucy Stone refused to have it read unless she could deliver it herself. William Lloyd Garrison wrote home from his college days, among others with whom I have become acquainted is Miss Lucy Stone, who was graduated yesterday and left for her home in Brookfield, Massachusetts. She is a very superior young woman and has a soul as free as the air and is preparing to go forth as a lecturer, particularly in vindication of women's rights. Her course here has been very firm and independent, and she has caused no small uneasiness to the spirit of sectarianism in the institution. However, Lucy Stone was reconciled to Oberlin College, in spite of such narrow and strict conservatism during her college days, when she was asked to return thirty-six years later, at Oberlin's semi-centennial, to become one of the speakers, the only woman speaker, on the program.

The obstacles that Lucy Stone had to overcome to obtain her college education were many. In the first place, her father believed her crazy when she asked for financial help for an education. He was a prosperous

1 Alice Stone Blackwell, Lucy Stone, p. 74.
father, who might have helped her, but he believed in the right of men to rule and in the privilege of women to obey. Consequently she had to earn her own way through college. She taught school until she was twenty-five years old just to make enough money to carry her to Oberlin. At college she had to earn all her own money by teaching during vacant periods and by "doing housework in the Ladies' Boarding Hall" at three cents an hour. She had only one new dress during her college course, a cheap print, and she did not go home once during the four years.¹

While in school at Oberlin, Lucy Stone had the pleasure of becoming a very good friend of Antoinette Brown. "Although Antoinette Brown was warned to beware of Lucy Stone, the two became bosom friends. Antoinette Brown wished to become a minister and Lucy Stone wished to become a public speaker and yet there was no opportunity for practice in elocution. Lucy Stone managed to hold a debate but the Ladies Board declared it was 'unladylike and unscriptural'. Lucy declared, 'We shall leave college with the reputation of a thorough collegiate course, yet not one of us has achieved any rhetorical or elocutionary training. Not one of us could state a question or argue

¹ F. E. Willard and M. A. Livermore, A Woman of the Century, p. 688
it in successful debate. For this reason I have proposed the formation of this secret debating society. ¹

Lucy Stone made her first public speech for woman's rights from the pulpit of her brother's church at Gardner, Massachusetts, shortly after her graduation. Abbey Kelley Foster influenced her to continue her speaking for the anti-slavery cause. Consequently, Lucy Stone spent years traveling for the anti-slavery organization, but she found that woman's rights subject still closer to her heart. She began speaking for woman's rights before an organization was formed. She married Henry Blackwell in 1855, but refused to change her name.

Lucy Stone made many excellent speeches. Her address before the New Jersey Legislature, March 6, 1867, was a good appeal for justice. She took part in campaigns in behalf of Woman Suffrage in Kansas in 1867, in Vermont in 1870, in Colorado in 1877, and in Nebraska in 1882. She and Stephen Foster spoke amidst the throwing of stones, but Lucy Stone persuaded one of the objectors to the speech to protect her, and Stephen Foster managed to make his own escape. "She was the first speaker who really stirred the nation's heart on the subject of women's rights.

Young, eloquent, her soul filled with the new idea, she drew immense audiences, and was eulogized everywhere. She had great power as a speaker. A little country girl who had no tricks of oratory; but who spoke with a fervor of conviction, a complete forgetfulness of self and an extraordinary natural eloquence that swayed great audiences as the wind sways a field of grain. Mobs would sometimes listen to her when they howled down other speakers.

Speeches can be found in the following sources:


MRS. ELIZABETH CODY STANTON - 1815-1902
Reformer and Philanthropist

Elizabeth Cady was born November 12, 1815, at Johnstown, New York. She was a child of marked intelligence and her parents gave her an education that was as thorough as any girl could get. She took the course in the academy in Johnstown, and then went to Mrs. Emma Willard's seminary in Troy, New York, where she was graduated in 1832. "Her life in Mrs. Willard's seminary

2 A. S. Blackwell, Lucy Stone, p. 76.
for two years was made dreary through her disappointment and sorrow over not being a boy.¹ She wished to attend Union College, where her brother was graduated just before his death, but she was not permitted to do so. Finally she studied and practised law although she was never admitted to the bar.

Elizabeth Cady married Henry Brewster Stanton, the anti-slavery orator, journalist and author. Together in 1840 they attended the World's Anti-Slavery Convention in London, where they met Lucretia Mott. It was the rejection of women as delegates at this convention that led to the formation of a Woman's Rights Association in America. The first convention for this association was the memorable one at Seneca Falls, New York, 1848. Mrs. Stanton was the chief agent in calling and organizing this meeting.

"Since that meeting she has been one of the leaders of the women of the United States. In 1854 she addressed the New York Legislature on the rights of married women, and in 1860 in advocacy of divorce for drunkenness. In 1867 she spoke before the legislature and the constitutional convention of New York. In Kansas in 1867 and Michigan in 1874, when those states were submitting the woman-suffrage question to the people, she canvassed the States

and did heroic work in the cause.¹

"As an orator, she is forceful, witty, sarcastic and eloquent. She has the mental force of a giant. In public debates she has shown herself the potemik equal of the most brilliant men of her time."²

Her speeches will be founded in:


CAROLINE WELLS DALL - 1822-1886
Author and Lecturer
on Labor Reform

Caroline Wells was born at Boston, Massachusetts, on June 22, 1822. She was educated thoroughly in private schools and academies, and she became a teacher. In 1840 she was vice-principal in Miss English's school for young ladies. In 1844 she married the Reverend Mr. Charles Henry Appleton Dall and kept up her literary work in both speaking and writing. "Her early literary productions were principally on reform subjects and the opening of new spheres of occupation to women; her later productions have been purely literary and critical."³

---

¹ F. E. Willard and M. A. Livermore, A Woman of the Century, p. 577.
² Ibid., p. 678.
³ Ibid., p. 226.
The variety of subjects on which she wrote and spoke is astounding. Some of her published works include:

- Woman's Rights Under the Law
- The College, the Market, and the Court
- Egypt's Place in History
- What We Really Know about Shakespeare

"She has been an active member of the Social Science Association and has read many papers for that body. Her lectures were scholarly and profound."¹

Mrs. Dall's lectures can be found in:


JULIA WARD HOW - 1819-1910
Poet, author, and lecturer.

Julia Ward was born May 27, 1819, in New York City. She was given every advantage of education. Her training included music and foreign languages. She married Dr. Samuel G. Howe in 1843 and the two traveled in Europe for a year.

¹ F. E. Willard and M. A. Livermore, A Woman of the Century, p. 226.
Julia Ward Howe became famous for her poetry before she ventured into the public speaking world. Three volumes of her poetry had been published before she began speaking in public. Her third volume of *Later Lyrics* included "Battle Hymn of Republic," which established her fame as a poet.

After her husband's death she took an interest in woman's rights. She lectured, preached, wrote, and traveled much in all parts of the country. Then she went to England, where she lectured on arbitration as a means of settling international disputes. In London she held a series of meetings on the subject "The Mission of Christianity in Relation to the Pacification of the World."

Later she gave addresses in Paris and Athens on the work of women's associations in America. "In Florence, Italy, she spoke in public in French on the education of women in America. During her last visit to Rome, she preached two sermons in Lent. When eighty years old, she was still available for Lyceum lectures."

---

Julia Ward Howe's speeches can be found in


DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW - 1847-1919
Preacher and Lecturer

Anna Howard Shaw was born at Newcastle on Tyne, England, February 14, 1847. The family came to this country and settled first in Massachusetts and then in Michigan. She educated herself so that at fifteen she became a teacher. She taught for five years and then turned to preaching in the Methodist Church. In 1873 she was granted a local preacher's license because of her unusual speaking ability. She preached on this license for eight years and then went to Albion College; later she was graduated from Boston Theological Department. At first she was refused ordination because she was a woman, but was finally granted ordination in 1880. She was the first woman to be ordained in the Methodist Church. Later she supplemented her theological study with a medical course at Boston, and was the first woman to have both the titles Reverend and M. D.
She practised among the poor people of Boston, while acquiring her medical course. Three years later, study and contact developed her into a rare degree of the greatest natural gift, oratory. A burning conviction of the injustice of present social conditions made her exchange her little Cape Cod parish for a much larger one, so that for many years, nearly every Sunday and often three times a week, a crowded audience would listen to her inspiring words. She became a lecturer for the Massachusetts Woman's Suffrage Association, afterwards entering the lecture field and becoming widely and favorably known as a speaker on reform topics. Later she became a national lecturer for the Woman Suffrage Association. Possessed of great personal magnetism, a fine voice, and power of logical argument, she was one of the most popular speakers in the lecture field.¹

In leaving the pulpit for the lecture platform, she was given the opportunity to speak two or three times a day. This amount of speaking made her one of the best lecturers of her time. "She is one of the most eloquent, witty and popular speakers in the lecture field. She is possessed of the most remarkable personal

¹ F. E. Willard and M. A. Livermore, A Woman of the Century, p. 648.
magnetism, a fine voice and power of pointed argument. Much of her strength and force of thought and expression are believed to result from the experience of her pioneer life in Michigan, and her power of moving audiences from the touch with humanity which came to her while practising medicine in the city of Boston, during her studies to be a physician.¹

Again it is said of her speaking ability, "Dr. Shaw has spoken before many state legislatures and several times before committees of congress in both houses. Among her most popular characteristics as a speaker are her keen sense of humor and ready wit, often enabling her to carry her points where logic failed."²

Her speeches will be found in:


FRANCES E. WILLARD - 1839-1898
Reformer and Educator

Frances E. Willard was born at Churchville, New York,

¹ F. E. Willard and M. A. Livermore, A Woman of the Century, p. 646.
² Ibid., 349.
Her early childhood was spent at Janesville, Wisconsin, and she attended the Milwaukee College for Women. Later in 1859 she was graduated from the Woman's College of Northwestern University. In 1861 she began teaching there and was Dean of the College from 1870 to 1874. After she resigned, she traveled, wrote for philanthropic and religious papers. For sixteen years she traveled for prohibition.

Frances Willard was with Dwight Moody in his Boston meetings in 1877 and spoke in his tabernacle and in leading churches. She is the only woman whose statue appears in the House of Representatives in Illinois. Her public speeches exceed in number those any public speaker except John Moody and Henry Ward Beecher.

"Her annual addresses to the W.C.T.U. would form volumes unmatched in their way in the libraries of the world."

Her speeches will be found in:


---

MARY ASHTON LIVERMORE - 1829-1899
Author, Lecturer, and Reformer.

Mary Ashton Livermore was born in Boston, Massachusetts, December 19, 1820. She was educated at the Female Seminary there and taught school for some years. She married Dr. Daniel Livermore. They went to live at Fall River, Massachusetts, then to Connecticut, then to New York and finally to Illinois.

She was interested in anti-slavery and woman suffrage movements. Her first public address was at Dubuque, Iowa, during the Civil War. There her spirit almost failed her when she saw the large convocation to which she was to speak but after being coaxed by the chairman she gained courage enough to try herself. After that, she spoke hundreds of times, lecturing five nights a week for five months, after the Civil War. She was editor of the Woman's Journal up to 1872. For her Lecture platform, "she had a wide range of lecture subjects, including biographical, historical, political, religious and reformatory subjects. She lectured on the average of 100 times a year in the Lyceum, besides over 1,000 times on temperance and 1,000 times on woman suffrage. As a lecturer she traveled over 25,000 miles annually, visiting every state in the union, as well as Scotland.
and England.¹

"Mary A. Livermore stands at the head of women lecturers of the world. In truth, there are many of both sexes in our land who would not hesitate an instant to declare that no man can hold an audience as she can and startle one with the combination of characteristics as a speaker. The weight of her logic, the storehouse of facts, displaying a marvelous memory, the sparkle of her humor, the magic of her tones, her fearlessness, her endurance, her magnetic influence, all combine to make her as a lecturer and woman, a marvel of the age. It is not eulogy nor panegyric run wild, but solemn truth; and a sense of deep out thanksgiving for such a champion of truth dwells in many hearts."²

Her lectures may be found in:

1. What Shall We Do With Our Daughters, M. A. Livermore, Boston: Dana Estes Company, 1883.


MRS. ISABELLA BEECHER HOOKER - 1822-1907
Lecturer and Suffragist

Isabella Beecher was born in Litchfield, Connecticut, February 22, 1822. She was a half-sister to the oratorical

¹ Amelia Bersch, Who's Who in Women Orators, p. 25.
preacher Henry Ward Beecher and a sister of Harriet Beecher Stowe. She married John Hooker, a lawyer. Mrs. Hooker studied with her husband and began lecturing on movements of importance in the country. "Her lectures on legislation and jurisprudence have done much to educate the people upon the relations of the individual to the commonwealth and the nation. For many years she held the office of vice-president for Connecticut in the National Suffrage Association, and at the yearly conventions at Washington, she delivered a number of able and brilliant addresses. In the International Council of Women she delivered an address, "The Constitutional Rights of Woman," a masterly and exhaustive and unanswerable presentation of the subject."¹ This speech has been used in this study, and is given completely in the Speech section.

Mrs. Beecher wrote and lectured, studied and expounded the doctrine of free suffrage. "She considered woman suffrage the greatest movement in the world's history. For more than thirty years she has been at the front of this and other movements, and has gone cheerful and undetermined through years of that ridicule and abuse that fall to the lot of the earnest agitators and reformers.

¹ F. E. Willard and M. A. Livermore, A Woman of the Century, p. 391.
During several seasons she has held a series of afternoon talks in Boston, New York and Washington, and in these assemblages she has discussed political economy.\(^1\)

Her speeches will be found in:

2. *Memorial of Connecticut Woman Suffrage Association*, (Pamphlet in Kansas Historical Library)

**VICTORIA C. WOODHULL - 1838-1927**

Politician

"Victoria Woodhull was the firebrand of her time and her story is as strange as her personality," says Emanie Sachs, who has just completed the biography of this "Terrible Siren," as she calls her.\(^2\) "She did anything she wanted to do and then denied she had done so and died at the age of eighty-nine, in the odor of sanctity."\(^3\)

---

2. Emanie Sachs, *The Terrible Siren*, p. XI.
3. Ibid., p. XII.
She believed and practised free love. Consequently she had several husbands and many lovers during most of her life. When she was old she went to England, posed as a virtuous woman, married a wealthy bachelor and lived a very secluded and devoted married life the rest of her days.

Victoria Woodhull was born in Homer, Ohio, in 1838. Since the family was both poor and large, her training in childhood was very meager. Her mother believed in spiritualism and Victoria found this belief an excellent subject for lectures.

Of her speaking we read, "She was a greater orator and people flocked to hear her lecture on constitutional equality and spiritualism, the social revolution and the principles of finance as well as free love."¹

More honor goes to her as a suffragist than to the other women working for suffrage, for she was the first to have an official hearing in Washington. Her speech was respected by Congress, and the women who disdained her for her unconventionalities brought her into great power in the Woman Suffrage Association. The description of this event says, "She has spoken at the Capitol of the nation, the first woman to speak there officially;  

¹ Emanie Sachs, *The Terrible Siren*, p. XI.
she has triumphed over women who spurned her. Finally they confessed, "This woman stands before us an able speaker and writer." 1

After speaking in Washington, D. C., she was asked to deliver her "Constitutional Argument" many times in New York. Her audiences were large. They came to be shocked. Her later lectures in England were entirely different from the lectures in America. Some of the subjects for lectures in England were, "The Human Body, the Temple of God" and "The Scientific Propagation of the Race."

Historically Victoria C. Woodhull will be remembered as a candidate for the presidency of the United States in 1872 of the Equal Rights Party. Frederick Douglass, the negro reformer, was nominated for vice-president by the same party. She and her sister, Tennessee Claflin, will be remembered as the "lady brokers of wall street." The two will also be remembered for their publication of "Woodhull, Claflin Weekly," a newspaper for free expression. Victoria herself will perhaps be remembered the longest for her interference in the love affair of Henry Ward Beecher and Mrs. Tilton.

1 Emanie Sachs, The Terrible Siren, p. 79.
The name Martin should be attached to Victoria Woodhull's name because of her marriage in England, but since she is known in America as Woodhull, that name has been used throughout this study.

Her speeches can be found in:


**MRS. LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE - 1835-1913**
Reformer and author

Lillie Devereux was born at Raleigh, North Carolina, August 12, 1835. She was educated at Yale University under private tutors. In 1869 she became interested in the suffrage cause and lectured frequently for it. She addressed the Constitutional Convention in 1873, and the New York Legislature in 1873, 1874, and 1876. She also gave many lectures on literary subjects in various parts of the country. In 1894 she took active part in
the Constitutional Convention on behalf of a proposed amendment to strike out the word "male" in the amendment of the Constitution.

She married Frank Umsted in 1855. When he died in 1859, leaving her with two children, she began earning her living by writing. In 1869 she married Grinfill Blake of New York.

Besides her lecturing for suffrage, she took part in campaigns for better salaries for women. Her longest lecture series was in the form of four lectures prepared in reply to the Lenten Lectures on "Women" given by Reverend Morgan Dix, Rector of Trinity Church, New York. In the preface to these lectures she says of her own speaking, "My own addresses can hardly with propriety be called lectures, as no part of them was read, they were delivered, entirely free, and without any thought that they might be required for publication. Argument and appeal, rather than concise and logical reasoning, therefore, characterize my replies." Amelia Bersch says of her, "She was a witty and eloquent speaker" and ranks her as a woman of great oratorical ability.

Besides her agitation for equal suffrage, Mrs. Blake has worked for co-education. "In 1873 she made

1 Lillie Devereux Blake, Woman's Place Today, p. 98.
2 Amelia Bersch, Who's Who of Women Orators in America, p. 16.
an application for the opening of Columbia College to young women as well as men, presenting a class of girl students, qualified to enter the university. The agitation then begun has since led to the establishment of Barnard College.  

Among the reforms in which she was actively interested is that of securing matrons to take charge of women detained in police stations. The employment of women as census takers was first urged in 1880 by Mrs. Blake. The bills giving seats to saleswomen, ordering the presence of a woman physician in every insane asylum where women were detained, and many other beneficent measures were presented or aided by her.

Comments on Mrs. Devereux Blake as a speaker have been recorded from contemporary newspapers. They are:

The Evening Telegram, New York: "Mrs. Blake's was the most interesting and spicy speech of the evening. She was in a sparkling mood and hit at everything and everybody that came to her mind.

New York Citizen: "......She advanced to the front of the platform, gesticulated gracefully and spoke vigorously, defiantly and without notes."

---

**Troy Times:** "...A most eloquent and polished oration. The peroration was a grand burst of eloquence."

**Albany Sunday Press:** "There are very few speakers on the platform who have the brightness, vivacity and fluency of Lillie Devereux Blake."

**New York Times:** "Mrs. Blake's address was forcible and eloquent. The speaker was frequently interrupted by applause."

**New York Herald:** "The most brilliant speaker in the city."

**San Antonio Express:** "Has the reputation of being the wittiest woman on the platform."

Her speeches can be found in:


**CLARA BARTON - 1821-1912**

Philanthropist called "The American Florence Nightingale"

Clara Barton was born in Oxford, Massachusetts, in
1821. She was educated at Clinton, New York. She taught school and worked for the improvement of the school systems. When she was forty years old, she became interested in soldier relief for the Civil War in America and volunteered to go to the front as a nurse. After the Civil War in America, she went to Europe for a rest, but found herself called upon to help organize the relief for the Franco-German war. When she returned to United States, she founded and organized the Red Cross work in America. She was its first president and served until 1904.

Her plan to write a book changed when she realized how powerful lectures would be. William E. Barton, in the *Life of Clara Barton, Founder of the American Red Cross*, says, "She realized that the lecture platform promised to be immediately remunerative. She wrote a lecture, read it to John B. Gough, and with his approval made out an itinerary and prepared for three hundred nights on the lecture platform. Her rates were $100 per night ($75.00 when under the auspices of Grand Army Post). She lectured in the East at various New England cities; in Cooper Institute, New York; and in moderate sized cities in Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska."¹ She made at least three

¹ W. E. Barton, *Life of Clara Barton*, p. 150
lecture tours.

Her speeches will be found in:

1. Life of Clara Barton, P. H. Epler.  
2. The Red Cross, Clara Barton.  
   Washington: American Red Cross, 1898.

MRS. MARY ELIZABETH LEASE - 1853-19  
Lecturer, Writer and Lawyer

Variously known as "Mary Ellen," "Mary Yellin,"  
the "greatest living stateswoman," and the "American  
Joan of Arc." Mrs. Lease was born in 1853 at Ridgeway,  
Pennsylvania, of Irish descent. She was educated at  
St. Elizabeth's Academy, Alleghany, New York. She  
rebelled against the low wages paid to women, and having  
heard that women were well paid in the West, came to  
Neosha County, Kansas, when seventeen, and taught at  
the Osage Mission. She was admitted to the Kansas bar  
in 1885, and made her first speech before the Union Labor  
Convention in 1888. During the Alliance Campaign of  
1890, she made 161 speeches. Her influence in Kansas  
and national politics was strongly felt and is said to  
have caused the retirement of Senator John J. Ingalls.  
She was a leader of the Populist party and has claimed  
the honor of having given it its name, the People's party.
Later when the Populists allied with the Democrats, she turned her forces to the Republican party and is given credit for defeating Bryan in his own state. Governor Lewelling appointed her president of the State Board of Charities, making her first woman in the United States to hold such a position. Without her knowledge or approval she was proposed for United States Senator. In 1893 she was national vice-president of the World's Peace Congress at Chicago. She has written "The Problem of Civilization solved" and has contributed much to magazines. She lectures on literary, political, and economic subjects, and since 1902 has been staff lecturer and instructor in the service of the New York school board in what is known as the "People's University."

She has a commanding presence and is very tall and stately. Her oratorical ability entitles her to rank among the great, but her face is that of a dreamer and poet rather than that of orator. She says she does not prepare her speeches, but "feels" them. Before beginning an address she stands silent for nearly a minute and seems to draw the thousands of souls before her into sympathy with hers. She credits much of her accomplishment to her four children. There is something charmingly womanly and appealing in the personality of
of Mrs. Lease, and this appeal, united with a certain rugged logic born of earnest conviction is perhaps her greatest power on the platform.

Speeches can be found in:


2. *Heritage of the Bluestem*, Anna M. Carlson

   Anthony and Gage, New York: Fowler and Wells, 1881.

4. *Joint Debate Between M. E. Leasa and J. M. Brumbaugh* (Pamphlet in Kansas Historical Library),
   Concordia: Peoples Party Pamphlet, 1891.

5. *Congress of Women*, World's Columbian Exposition,
   Chicago, 1893, Kansas City: Thompson and Hood, 1895.

6. *Great Quadrangular Debate at Salina, Kansas* (Pamphlet in Kansas Historical Library)
   Salina: The Open Church, 1894.

MRS. CARRIE LANE CATT - 1859-19
Suffragist and Lecturer

Carrie Lane was born at Ripon, Wisconsin, January 9, 1859. She was graduated from Iowa State College. Her teaching culminated in being superintendent of the schools at Mason City, Iowa, where she married Leo Chapman. She studied law, edited a paper and lectured. She made her first suffrage address in 1887. Amelia Borsch says of her, "After her first suffrage speech she visited every state and territory in the union, working without
salary and speaking before innumerable women's clubs and meetings. In 1900 she was elected president of the National Woman Suffrage Association to succeed Susan B. Anthony. In 1893 when the constitutional amendment giving the ballot to women in Colorado was submitted to the voters, she went there, organized the movement and spoke daily in its support. She addressed constitutional conventions and legislative bodies in Colorado, Idaho, South Dakota, Kansas, Iowa, California, Montana, and New Hampshire. Likewise she addressed legislative bodies in Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Saxony, Bohemia, Prussia and Hungary. To arouse worldwide interest in the suffrage movement, she started on a tour round the world in 1911. Her speech before the Congress in Stockholm was translated into 24 languages and distributed in every country as an accepted plea for suffrage. In her appeals from the platform she spoke extemporaneously in an easy, confidential manner. Her voice is clear, musical and ringing.\(^1\)

Speeches can be found:


Jane Addams was born at Cedarville, Illinois, September 6, 1860. She was graduated at Rockford College in 1881, and then entered the study of sociology, which she studied and pursued in both Europe and America. In 1889 she and Ellen G. Starr established Hull House, a famous social settlement house in Chicago. She has lectured on International Peace, on Woman Suffrage, and on sociological subjects. The League of Women Voters and The American Association of University Women report her as a good speaker.¹

The Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wisconsin, says of Jane Addams at the time of her death, May 22, 1935, "Jane Addams, America's foremost woman citizen, devoted her entire life to serving humanity. From her early days in Chicago, where her greatest monument, Hull House, stands, to her later years as a world citizen when she was awarded the Nobel prize for peace, she never deviated from her ideals of aiding the under-privileged, the persecuted and the downtrodden." ¹

In 1932 she addressed the platform committee at the Republican and Democratic national conventions. When she arose to speak, the entire audience stood in respect to the grand old woman.

The National Council of Women included Jane Addams in their list of the greatest ten women in American history.

Speeches of Jane Addams will be found in the following sources:


FLORENCE E. ALLEN - 1884-19
Judge

Florence E. Allen was born in Salt Lake City, Utah, March 23, 1884. She attended Salt Lake College and was graduated from Western Reserve University in 1904. She received an M. A. Degree in Political Science and Constitutional Law from that university and then studied law at Chicago University Law School, and
at New York University Law School, graduating from the latter with honors in 1913.

She became a lecturer for the New York Board of Education and for women's clubs in New York and Philadelphia. She was elected to the Ohio Bar in 1914 and practised until 1919. Then she was elected to be judge of the Court of Common Pleas in 1920; later, in 1922, she was elected to the Supreme Court of Ohio, re-elected to the same office in 1926 and finally in 1934 appointed by President Roosevelt as Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit.

Her characteristics as a public speaker are sincerity, serenity, and poise. In speaking of a convention held in Chicago in 1914, Emily N. Blair says of Florence Allen's speech, "I cannot remember any other speech and my memory of hers is due not to the forcefulness of manner or to the logic of her argument but to the sincerity which animated it, a sincerity so passionate that it placed her at once above all partisanship."1 In describing her speaking

---

1 E. W. Blair, "Americans We Like", Nation, (Dec. 7, 1927) p. 11.
ability, the same writer says, "Her voice is thick, and, even when raised in appeal, round."

Judge Allen is listed by the League of Women Voters as a good speaker. Many of her speeches are in behalf of peace and the World Court.

Her speeches can be secured from:

1. *Modern Eloquence*, Vol. VIII and directly from her office: 405 Weber Road, Columbus, Ohio.

---

1 E. N. Blair, "Americans We Like" *Nation* (Dec. 7, 1927) p. 12.
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V  SERMON AT BRISTOL  1860
A Sermon
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"Thee we reject, unable to abide, 
Thy purity, till pure as thou art pure; 
Made such by thee, we love thee for that cause, 
For which we shunned and hated thee before. 
Then we are free. Then liberty, like day, 
Breaks on the soul, and by a flash from Heaven 
Fires all the faculties with glorious joy. 
A voice is heard, which mortal ears hear not, 
Till thou hast touched them; 'tis the voice of song, 
A loud Hosanna sent from all thy works; 
Which he that hears it, with a shout repeats, 
And adds his rapture to the general praise."

This inspired language of the simple and artless poet, arose in my mind, as the secret prayer was offered:

"Oh Thou my voice inspire, 
Who touched Isaiah's hallowed lips with fire!"

Aware that, to many present, the opening of a meeting of this kind, without the harmonious note—the sacred hymn, would be to say the least, novel; if, indeed it would not divest it of the character of a religious meeting; and the service, of the nature of divine service;—aware also, that many are accustomed to the offering of prayer on their behalf; it is due to these to say, that some of us believe we may understand the sacred harmony and melodious note, arising in the soul—singing and making melody in the heart, without a dependence upon measured lines or the music of the voices; that we may no less in the secret of the heart, offer aspirations to Him who heareth the sincerely-devoted always, and maketh them "joyful in his house of prayer," without the intervention of words, or the aid of the priest or minister.

Is not the time arrived, that intelligent, spiritually-enlightened minds, should have such free access to this throne of grace, as to render less necessary, in the assemblies of the people, the delivery of the oral prayer? The recommendation of Jesus—the beloved, the blessed of God—appears to be to this end. "Enter into thy closet, and there pray in secret." Even while he bowed before the Father in outward prayer, he said: "I know that thou hearest me always, but because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me."

My prayer is that this occasion may be blessed, both to the
hearers and to the speaker. That the hearers may be impressed
with the importance of coming together for the consideration
of their highest and best interests, and that the speaker also
be benefitted, by the deep mysterious divinity. The divinity
of Christ was not in mystery or miracle. It was in doing the
will of his Father. He was "the Son of God with power according
to the spirit of holiness.

Cultivate this ennobling view; be obedient to the truth; so will
you make advancement in your several neighborhoods and become
wiser than your teachers. You will exalt the standard of just­
ice and mercy above that around with your Fathers have rallied.
One object in inviting you here this evening was, to speak
plainly, as regards the prevailing errors and sins of the time.
This is a most important day,—a notable age in which we live.
Great principles of truth, noble views of humanity are being advo­
cated. Faith in human nature is increasing, and many are coming,
from every department of society, and investigating great ques­
tions of human concernment. The former dependence on the mono­
poly of the pulpit is broken, the people are thinking and acting
for themselves and their fellow beings, in their various re­
lations in society. And what is the result? Look at the great
temperance movement. Is not this reformation one of the great­
est moral miracles of our age? Many are the families in this
city, as well as elsewhere, in this and other lands, many the
mothers, daughters, and sons, who are hailing the temperance
reform, who behold the rescue of their husbands and fathers, and
are offering praises unto Him, who has put it into the hearts
of the people to plead on their behalf, and to restore such
as have fallen. Are you willing, my young friends, who are just
coming upon the stage of action, in your various relations in
society, to aid in carrying forward this great movement? Will
you be faithful, in this great work, by example and precept,
and "walk worthy the vocation unto which ye are called?" By
practising total abstinence from that which intoxicates, by
ceasing to hand the wine as an act of hospitality to a friend,
and by going forward to rescue those who have sunk to the lowest
degradation, you may be instrumental in setting the feet of
many upon the rock of Temperance, and putting the song of total
abstinence into their mouths.

Your growing knowledge of the system of man impresses the im­
portance of observing every law of his physical being, in order
to be preserved a perfect whole. The light of truth has re­
vealed to you your noble powers, and the responsibility of
exercising them in the purity with which then have been bestow­
ed. If then by your studies you are made intelligently acquaint­
ed with these things, and if superadded, you have a quick sense
of the divinity in the soul, responding to and according with
this knowledge, how increasingly incumbent is it upon you to
carry out your principles among your associates, so that you
be not found in the background in the great reformation that is
taking place in human society.

This is a part of my religion—a part of true Christianity, and
you must bear with me, my friends, if I press upon you duties,
having reference to your different relations in society, to your
intercourse with men, wherever you are placed. It has been my privilege and pleasure to meet with some of you in our Anti Slavery Rooms. When those have been disposed to come there, though perhaps from mere curiosity, to see what the deepest abolitionist was doing, I have been glad to meet them, and to offer such considerations as would induce a reflection upon the relation which they bear to our fellow beings in their own country and neighborhood. This, in the view of many, is a subject of delicacy—lightly to be touched. Still it is an essential part of Christianity; and one object is asking your audience this evening, was to offer for your consideration some views connected with it, in the hope that you would at least patiently hear, and "suffer the word of exhortation."

There are many now looking at the subject of slavery in all its bearings, who are sympathizing with the condition of the poor and oppressed in our land. Although many of you may be more immediately connected with this system, yet it is coming to be regarded as not a mere sectional question, but a national and an individual one. It is interwoven throughout our country, into so much with which we have to do, that we may well acknowledge we are all, all "verily guilty concerning our brother." There is, therefore, the greater responsibility that we first examine ourselves and ascertain that there is for us to do in order that we may specifically rid ourselves of the great evil that is clinging to us. Evil—this mighty sin which so heavily besets us! There are those here who have had their hearts touched, who have been led to feel and have entered into sympathy with the bondsman, and have known where the evil lies. I believe there is a work for you to do, when you return home, if you will be faithful to yourselves. You will be brought more deeply to enter into feeling with the poor and oppressed slave; you will find that the mission of the gospel is "to bind up the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captive." It would be a reflection upon the intelligence and the conscience of those who are here, to suppose that they would always resist the wisdom and power with which truth is speaking to their hearts upon this subject. There are many disposed to examine, to cultivate their minds and hearts in relation to their duties in this respect. May you be faithful, and enter into a consideration as to how far you are partakers in this evil, even in other men's sins. Nor far, by permission, by apology, or otherwise, you are found lending your sanction to a system which degrades and brutalizes three millions of our fellow beings; which denies to them the rights of intelligent education, rights essential to them, and which we acknowledge to be dear to us.

Is this an evil that cannot be remedied? A remedy is nigh at hand, even at the door. The voice has been heard saying, "Proclaim liberty to the captive, the opening of the prison to them that are bound." "Proclaim ye liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." To this land peculiarly is this language applicable. In this land especially are we called to be faithful in this subject. Be true to your convictions of duty then, oh my brethren, and you will have the blessing of beholding your own country purged of its iniquity; and be brought to acknowledge that the divine hand of mercy and love has been stretched over our land.
(Here a few persons, irritated by this reference to the question of slavery, left the meeting.)

It is not strange that the allusion to this subject should create some little agitation among you; and while I can but respect it, I stand here on behalf of the suffering and the dumb, and must express the desire, that there may be a disposition to hear and reflect, and then judge. I speak unto those who have ears to hear, who have hearts to feel. May their understandings not be closed! May they be willing to receive that which conflicts with their education, their prejudices and preconceived opinions. The subject of slavery you must know, is now agitating the country one end to the other. The Church and the Legislative Hall are occupied with its discussion. It will be presented to you under the impression that without divine aid no good result can be expected or received.

I have desired for months, aye, for more than a year past, this opportunity with you, my friends; those of you for whom this meeting was especially called. In walking the streets of this city, at this season of the year, and approaching the places where ye are wont to gather for your instruction, maternal desires have often flowed from a heart, touched with solicitude for young men, separated from the tender care, the cautionary admonition of parents, of a beloved mother or sister; that you may be preserved in innocence and purity, while surrounded with the allurements of this city—the many temptations to vice of almost every description. While I may not speak of the things that are done in secret—delicacy may revolt from an exposure of the "rioting and drunkenness, the chambering and wantonness," that abound in our midst; due regard to the conviction of duty to invite you hither, will not allow me to be silent, and avoid an allusion to vices, of which some may think it "a shame to speak."

I called you not here for any theological discussion. The religion we profess—the principles of Christianity we believe it our duty to inculcate, were not wrapped in mystery, or in the theories that are dividing and sub-dividing Christendom. In the view of many, the gospel is not preached, unless it embraces a certain scheme of salvation and plan of redemption. Faith in Christ has become so involved with a belief in human depravity and a vicarious atonement, imputed sin and imputed righteousness, that a discourse is divested of the character of gospel preaching, and regarded as little other than a mere lecture, if this scheme and plan—this system or theory, not to be embraced.
I confess to you, my friends, that I am a worshipper after the way called liberty — a believer after the manner which every divine indeed. While, at the same time, my faith is firm in the blessed, the eternal doctrine preached by Jesus, and by every child of God from the creation of the world, especially the great truth that God is the teacher of his people himself; the doctrine which Jesus most emphatically taught, that the kingdom of God is within man — that there is his sacred and divine temple. This religious doctrine is simple, because it appeals to self-evident conviction. It is divested of mystery and mysticism, for it is not necessarily connected, with anything miraculous or extraordinary.

This noble gift of God, is as legitimate a part of man's being, as the moral sense with which he is quickened, the intellectual power with which he is so abundantly endowed, or as the animal propensities which are bestowed for his pleasure, his comfort, his good. All these are equally of divine origin. The religion offered to our acceptance tends in no wise to degrade man, to lessen his proper self-respect, or lead him to undervalue any of the gifts of the great Creator. I believe man is created infinitely good; that his instincts are for good. It is by a perversion of these, through disobedience, that the purity of his soul becomes sullied. Rejecting then, the doctrine of human depravity, denying that by nature we have wicked hearts, I have every confidence, every hope, in addressing an audience of unsobered minds, that they may be reached, because I know that the love of God has previously touched their hearts; that He has implanted there, a sense of justice and mercy, of charity and all goodness. This is the beauty and divinity of true religion, that it is universal. Wherever man is found, these all are recognized truths. My object in asking your audience this evening, was to offer for your consideration some views connected with it, in hope that you would at least patiently hear, and "suffer the word of exhortation."

There are many new looking at the subject of slavery in all its bearings, who are sympathizing with the condition of the poor and oppressed in our land. Although many of you may be more immediately connected with this system, yet it is coming to be regarded as not a mere sectional question, but a national and an individual one. It is interestingly interwoven throughout our country, into so much with which we have to do, that we may well acknowledge we are all, all "verily guilty concerning our brother." There is, therefore, the greater responsibility that we first examine ourselves and ascertain what there is for us to do in order that we may speedily rid ourselves of the great evil that is crying to us, "Evil" — this mighty sin which so easily besets us. There are those here who have had their hearts touched, who have been led to feel and have entered into sympathy with the bondman, and have known where the evil lies. I believe there is a work for you to do, when you return home, if you will be faithful to yourselves. You will be brought more deeply to enter into feeling with the poor and oppressed slave; you will find that the mission of the gospel is "to bind up the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captive." It
would be a reflection upon the intelligence and the conscience
of those who are here, to suppose that they would always resist
the wisdom and power with which truth is speaking to their
hearts upon the subject. There are many disposed to examine,
to cultivate their minds and hearts in relation to their duties
in this respect. You may be faithful, and enter into a consider-
eration as to how far you are partakers in this evil, even in
other men's sins. How far, by permission, by apology, or oth-
erwise, you are found lending your sanction to a system which
degrades and brutalizes three millions of our fellow beings; which
denies to them the rights of intelligent education, rights es-

tential to them, and which we acknowledge to be dear to us.

Is this an evil that cannot be remedied? A remedy is nigh at
hand, even at the door. The voice has been heard saying, "pro-
claim liberty to the captive, the opening of the prison to them
that are bound." "Proclaim ye liberty throughout all the land
unto all the inhabitants thereof." To this land peculiarly is
this language applicable. In this land especially are we
called to be faithful in this subject. Be true to your con-

victions of duty then, oh my brethren, and you will have the
blessing of beholding your own country purged of this iniquity,
and be brought to acknowledge that the divine hand of mercy
and love has been stretched over our land. (Here a few persons,
irritated by this reference to the question of slavery, left
the meeting.)

Repetition

It is not strange that the allusion to this subject should
create some little agitation among you; and while I can but
regret it, I stand here on behalf of the suffering and the dumb,
and must express the desire, that there may be a disposition
to hear and reflect, and then judge. I speak unto those who
have ears to hear, who have hearts to feel. May their under-
standings not be closed! May they be willing to receive that
which conflicts with their education, their prejudices and pre-
ceived opinions. The subject of slavery you must know, is now
agitating the country from one end to the other. The Church
and the Legislative Hall are occupied with its discussion. It
will be presented to you in all its various bearings, and let
me urge such faithfulness to the light which you have, as shall
prepare you to become able advocate for the oppressed. So
shall the blessing descend upon you as well as upon those
for whom the appeal is made. I should not be true to myself
did I not thus urge this subject upon your consideration.
When you have opportunities for meditation and reflection, when
your feelings are soothed by the circumstances around you,
may you be led to reflect upon your duties, and the responsibil-
ities of your position in society.)

I long for you my friends, that you may be so true to your
best feelings as to be preserved from the temptations with
which you are surrounded, that your hearts may be preserved in
unsullied purity. And in so far as any of you have swerved from
the right, and have gone down to the chambers of dissipation, or
been found in any indulgence from which your better nature would revolt, oh, be persuaded to make a stand in your course, to return, repent, and live. The God with whom we have to do, our tender Father "who is plenteous in redemption, and abundant in mercy," requireth only that those who have departed from the right shall return, shall give up their practices and walk uprightly. "As I live, saith the Lord, if the wicked shall depart from his wickedness and do that which is right in my sight, his wickedness shall no more be remembered. In the righteousness which he doeth he shall live." Are any of you, then approaching the state of the poor prodigal, in your indulgences, in giving unbridled license to your propensities? Remember, that the Father's love is ever near, that he will meet you as you may be disposed to turn from your course and return to his love. He will meet you, as the parable beautifully illustrates, and conduct you to his heavenly mansion, where his banner over you will ever be love.

When we read the numerous revelations unto the faithful of the present day, the advancement in truth and knowledge, in moral duty and obligation, we may well hail the age in which we live, the generation coming on the platform of humanity. Even now behold the nations, beginning to discuss the great question of peace. It has recently been brought before the British Parliament, as well as our own National Legislature, by the statesmen of the age, whether there is not a more rational mode of settling national disputes, than a resort to arms. The labors of Elihu Burritt, and others not a few, to enlighten the people on both sides of the Atlantic, on the blessings of peace, the glorious principles of the Messiah's reign—the readiness of the part of many, who have been heretofore wedded to their forms and religious services, now to regard war in its just light, as belonging to a barbarous age, unfit for the intelligence and spiritual growth of this time—the increasing faith that true principles are capable of being applied now, and that it is a visionary idea that the "sword may be beaten into the ploughshare and the spear into the pruning hook," that "nation shall not lie up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more"—these all give evidence that "the kingdom of God is at hand," when "violence shall not be heard in the land, wasting, and destruction within her borders."

Not only is this hope filling the minds of many of the faithful, but they behold the spirit of mercy spreading over the country. The prisons are visited; insane hospitals are erected for mitigating the condition of suffering humanity; efforts are made to remove the gallows and other barbarous inflictions from our midst; and an increasing regard for the poor and the lowly, leading many to give countenance to systems which shall raise these, and tend to equalize the condition of the human family. If that equality which is our nation's boast were recognised, we should not see large classes, crushed by existing monopolies, laboring for their scanty pittance. True christian democracy and republicanism would lead us not to "look upon our own things merely, but also upon the things of others." The practical precept.
of the Son of God requires, "whosoever we would that men should do unto us, even so should we do unto them."

This then is the religion that is offered to your acceptance. I would not weary you with words, fully believing that each has a teacher within himself; and obey this, we need not that any man should teach us. It will be found superior to any other revelation, to everything external. Come then, to this principle, this Word of God in the soul, and you will be led into all righteousness and truth, though you may now shrink from their presentation here.

We have the revelation of God as much in this age as in any that has gone before us, and if we have faith, we shall do the things done in former times and greater—that which has been spoken in the ear in closets, shall be heard upon the house-top. May all the difficulties that have hindered the progress of true religion be removed. May it be stripped of the gloomy appendages of the sects, and presented to view in its pristine purity and beauty, bearing the impress of the Divinity. Nothing of gloominess, nothing of dulness connected with it; nothing that bars from innocent cheerfulness, or conflicts with any of the national powers with which we are gifted. The noble intelligence of man has not been allowed its proper place. There is ever a blessed harmony between every revelation of truth and reason, when not corrupted by the false dictates of appetite, or clouded by tradition and superstition.

Let us then be true to our calling, preserving the holy union of faith and righteousness, religion and humanity; so shall all the mists and covers of ignorance and prejudice be dispelled. "The light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun as the light of seven days."

These great and glorious principles filling our hearts, liberty, like day, would break upon the soul, and fill all the faculties with glorious joy. A voice would be heard that mortal ears hear not till thou, Oh God, hast touched them.

"But oh, Thou bounteous giver of all good
Thou art of all thy gifts thyself the crown;
Give what thou canst, without thee we are poor;
And with thee rich, take what thou wilt away."

And in acknowledging, O God, that every good and perfect gift is from thee, the Father of lights, we are bound to prostrate ourselves before thee and to bless thy holy name, and in remembrance of thy many mercies, to ask to thee a renewed clothing of that spirit which breathes glory to thee in the highest, on earth peace and good will to men; even thine own spirit which resisteth not evil, nor revengeth wrong, but which through thy power, is enabled to bless them that curse and to pray for them that persecute. We are sensible that this cannot be attained
by our finite comprehension, that thou hast veiled it from human understanding; for thou continuest to hide these things from the wise and simple and reveal them unto babes.

Grant, then, O Father, that we may be brought unto such a childlike state as to receive all the mysteries that belong to thy kingdom. We would ask to be kept so humble by thy mighty power that we vaunt not ourselves, saying that by our own hand we have gained any victory. But we would acknowledge, that thou only hast the power, and that to thee alone belongs all the glory.
Lucretia Mott spoke in Assembly Buildings in Philadelphia in 1849 shortly after Richard H. Dana of Boston had delivered a lecture where he ridiculed the new demand of American women. At that time Lucretia Mott arose to answer him but Dana fled from the building. Shortly after she delivered the following speech: (History of Woman Suffrage Vol. I 3680375)

I have not come here with a view of answering any particular parts of the lecture alluded to, in order to point out the fallacy of its reasoning. The speaker, however, did not profess to offer anything like argument on that occasion, but rather a sentiment. I have no prepared address to deliver to you, being unaccustomed to speak in that way; but I felt a wish to offer some views for your consideration, though in a desultory manner, which may lead to such reflection and discussion as will present the subject in a true light.

Why should not woman seek to be a reformer? If she is to shrink from being such an iconoclast as shall "Break the image of man's lower worship," as so long held up to view; if she is to fear to exercise her reason, and her noblest powers, lest she should be thought to "attempt to act the man," and not "acknowledge his supremacy"; if she is to be satisfied with the narrow sphere assigned by her man, nor aspire to higher, lest she should transcend the bounds of female delicacy; truly it is a mournful prospect for woman. We would admit all the difference, that our great and beneficent Creator has made, in the relation of man and woman, nor would we seek to disturb this relation; but we deny that the present position of woman, is her true sphere of usefulness; nor will she attain to this sphere, until the disabilities and disadvantages, religious, civil, and social, which impede her progress, are removed out of her way. These restrictions have enervated her mind and paralyzed her powers. While man assumes that the present is the original state designed for woman, and that the existing "differences are not arbitrary nor the result of accident," but grounded in nature; she will not make the necessary effort to obtain her just rights, lest it should subject her to the kind of scorn and contemptuous manner in which she has been spoken of.

So far from her "ambition leading her to attempt to act the man," she needs all the encouragement she can receive, by the removal of obstacles from her path, in order that she may become the "true woman." As it is desirable that man should act a manly and generous part, not "mannish," so let woman be urged to exercise a dignified and womanly bearing, not womanish. Let her cultivate all the graces and proper accomplishments of her sex, but let not these degenerate into a kind of effeminacy, in which she is satisfied to be the mere plaything or toy of society, content with her outward adornings, and the flattery and fulsome adulation too often addressed to her.
Did Elizabeth Fry lose any of her feminine qualities by the public walk into which she was called? Having performed the duties of a mother to a large family, feeling that she owed a labor or love to the poor prisoner, she was empowered by Him who sent her forth, to go to kings and crowned heads of the earth, and ask audience of these, and it was granted her. Did she lose the delicacy of woman by her acts? No. Her retiring modesty was characteristic of her to the latest period of her life. It was my privilege to enjoy her society some years ago, and I found all that belonged to the feminine in women—to true nobility, in a refined and purified moral nature. Is Dorothea Dix throwing off her womanly nature and appearings in the course she is pursuing? In finding duties abroad, has any "refined man felt that something of beauty has gone forth from her"? To use the contemptuous word applied in the lecture alluded to, is she becoming "mannish"? Is she compromising her womanly dignity in going forth to seek to better the condition of the insane and afflicted? Is not a beautiful mind and a retiring modesty still conspicuous in her?

Indeed, I would ask, if this modesty is not attractive also, when manifested in the other sex? It was strikingly marked in Horace Mann, when presiding over the late National Educational Convention in this city. The retiring modesty of William Ellery Channing was beautiful, as well as of many others who have filled the elevated stations in society. These virtues, differing as they may in degree in man and woman, are of the same nature, and call forth our admiration wherever manifested.

The noble courage of Grace Darling is justly honored for risking her own life on the coast of England, during the raging storm, in order to rescue the poor, suffering, shipwrecked mariner.

Woman was not wanting in courage in the early ages. In war and bloodshed that trait was often displayed. Treacian and Roman history have lauded and honored her in this character. English history records her courageous women too, for unhappily we have little but the records of war handed down to us. The courage of Joan of Arc was made the subject of a popular lecture not long ago by one of our intelligent citizens. But more noble, moral daring is marking the female character at the present time, and better worthy of imitation. As these characteristics come to be appreciated in man too, his warlike acts with all the miseries and horrors of the battle-ground will sink into their merited oblivion, or be remembered only to be condemned. The heroism displayed in the tented field must yield to the moral and Christian heroism which is shadowed in the signs of our times.

The lecturer regarded the announcement of woman's achievements, and the offering of appropriate praise through the press, as a gross innovation upon the obscurity of female life—he complained that the exhibition of attainments of girls in schools was now equal to that of boys, and the newspapers announce that "Miss Brown received the first price for English grammar," etc.
If he objected to so much excitement of emulation in schools, it would be well; for the most enlightened teachers discountenance these appeals to love of approbation and self-esteem. But while prizes continue to be awarded, can any good reason be given why the name of the girl should not be published as well as that of the boy? He spoke with scorn, that "we hear of Mrs. President and so; and committees and secretaries of the same sex." But if women can conduct their own business, by means and presidents and secretaries of their own sex, can he tell us why they should not? They will never make much progress in any moral movement while they depend upon men to act for them. Do we shrink from reading the announcement that Mrs. Somerville is made an honorary member of a scientific association? That Miss Herschel has made some discoveries, and is prepared to take her equal part in science? Or that Miss Mitchell, of Nantucket, has lately discovered a planet, long looked for? I can not conceive why "honor to honor is due" should not be rendered to woman as well as man; nor will it necessarily exalt her, or foster feminine pride. This propensity is found alike in male and female, and it should not be ministered too improperly in either sex.

In treating upon the affections, the lecturer held out the idea that as manifested in the sexes they were opposite if not somewhat antagonistic, and required a union as in chemistry to form a perfect whole. The simile appeared to me far from a correct illustration of the true union. Minds that can assimilate, spirits that are congenial, attract one another. It is the union of similar, not of opposite affections, which is necessary for the perfection of the marriage bond. There seemed a want of proper delicacy in his representing man as being bold in the demonstration of the pure affection of love. In persons of refinement, true love seeks concealment in man as well as in woman. I will not enlarge upon the subject, although it formed so great a part of his lecture. The contrast drawn seemed a fallacy, as has much, very much, that has been presented in the sickly sentimental strains of the poet from age to age.

The question is often asked, "What does woman want, more than she enjoys? What is she seeking to obtain? Of what rights is she deprived? What privileges are withheld from her?" I answer, she asks nothing as favor, but as rights; she wants to be acknowledged a moral, responsible being. She is seeking not to be governed by laws in the making of which she has no voice. She is deprived of almost every right in civil order, and is a cipher in the nation, except in the right of presenting a petition. In religious society her disabilities have greatly retarded her progress. Her exclusion from the pulpit or ministry, her duties marked out for her by her equal brother man, subject to creeds, rules, and disciplines made for her by him, is unworthy her true dignity.

In marriage there is assumed superiority on the part of the
husband and admitted inferiority with a promise of obedience on the part of the wife. This subject calls loudly for examination in order that the wrong may be redressed. Customs suited to darker ages in Eastern countries are not binding upon enlightened society. The solemn covenant of marriage may be entered into without these lordly assumptions and humiliating concessions and promises.

There are large Christian denominations who do not recognize such degrading relations of husband and wife. They ask no aid from magistrate or clergyman to legalise or sanctify this union. But acknowledging themselves in the presence of the Highest and invoking His assistance, they come under reciprocal obligations of fidelity and affection, before suitable witnesses. Experience and observation go to prove that there may be as much harmony, to say the least in such a union, and as great purity and permanence of affection, as can exist where the common ceremony is observed.

The distinctive relations of husband and wife, of father and mother of a family, are sacredly preserved, without the assumption of authority on the one part, or the promise of obedience on the other. There is nothing in such a marriage degrading to woman. She does not compromise her dignity or self-respect; but enters married life upon equal ground, by the side of her husband. By proper education, she understands her duties, physical, intellectual, and moral; and fulfilling these, she is a helpmeet in the true sense of the word.

I tread upon delicate ground in alluding to the institutions of religious associations; but the subject is of so much importance that all which relates to the position of woman should be examined apart from the undue veneration which ancient usage receives.

"Such dupes are men to custom, and so prone
To reverence what is ancient, and can plead
A course of long observance for its use,
That even servitude, the worst of ills,
Because delivered down from sire to son,
It kept and guarded as a sacred thing."

So with woman. She has so long been subject to the disabilities and restrictions with which her progress has been embarrassed, that she has become enervated, her mind to some extent paralysed; and like those still more degraded by personal bondage, she hugs her chains. Liberty for man. I would not go so far, either as regards the abject slave or woman; for in both cases they may be so degraded by the crushing influences around them, that they may not be sensible of the blessings of freedom. Liberty is not less a blessing, because oppression has so long darkened the mind that it can not appreciate it. I would, therefore, urge that woman be placed in such a situation in society, by the recognition of her rights, and have such opportunities...
for growth and development, as shall raise her from this low enervated, and paralyzed condition, to full appreciation of the blessing of entire freedom of mind.

It is with reluctance that I make the demand for the political rights of women, because this claim is so distasteful to the age. Woman shrinks, in the present state of society, from taking any interest in politics. The events of the French Revolution, and the claim for woman's rights, are held up to her as a warning. Let us not look at the excesses of women alone, at that period; but remember that the age was marked with extravagances and wickedness in men as well as women. Political life abounds with these excesses and with shameful outrage. Who knows but that if woman acted her part in governmental affairs, there might be an entire change in the turmoil of political life? It becomes man to speak modestly of his ability to act without her. If woman's judgment were exercised, why might she not aid in making the laws by which she is governed? Lord Brougham remarked that the works of Harriet Martineau upon Political Economy were not excelled by those of any political writer of the present time. The first few chapters of her "Society in America," her views of a Republic, and of government generally, furnish evidence of woman's capacity to embrace subjects of universal interest.

Far be it from me to encourage women to vote, or to take an active part in politics in the present state of our government. Her right to the elective franchise, however, is the same, and should be yielded to her, whether she exercise that right or not. Would that man, too, would have no participation in a government recognizing the life-taking principle; retaliation and the sword. It is unworthy a Christian nation. But when in the diffusion of light and intelligence a convention shall be called to make regulations for self-government on Christian principles, I can see no good reason why women should not participate in such an assemblage, taking part equally with man.

Professor Walker, of Cincinnati, in his "Introduction to American Law," says: (Quotation omitted) Woman, however, is beginning so to regard it.

He further says: (Quotation omitted)

I would ask if such a code of laws does not require change? If such a condition of the wife in society does not claim redress? On no good ground can reform be delayed. Blackstone says: (Quotation omitted). Hurst, in his "Essay on Human Rights," says: (Quotation omitted).

May these statements lead you to reflect upon this subject, that you may know what woman's condition is in society, what her restrictions are, and seek to remove them. In how many cases in our country the husband and wife begin life together, and by
equal industry and united effort accumulate to themselves a
comfortable home. In the event of the death of the wife, the
household remains undisturbed, his farm or his workshop is
not broken up or in any way molested. But when the husband
dies he either gives his wife a portion of their joint accumu-
lation, or the law apportions to her a share; the homestead is
broken up, and she is dispossessed of that which she earned
equally with him; for what she lacked in physical strength
she made up in constancy of labor and toil, day and evening.
The sons then coming into possession of the property, has
been the custom until of later time, speak of having to keep
their mother, when she in reality is aiding to keep them.
Where is the justice of this state of things? The change in
the law of this state and of New York in relation to the pro-
erty of the wife, goes to a limited extent toward the redress
of these wrongs which are far more extensive and involve much
more than I have time this evening to point out.

On no ground can the legal existence of the wife be sus-
pended during marriage, and her property surrendered to her hus-
band. In the intelligent ranks of society the wife may not in
point of fact be so degraded as the law would degrade her; be-
cause public sentiment is above the law. Still, while the law
stands, she is liable to the disabilities which it imposes.
Among the ignorant classes of society, woman is made to bear
heavy burdens, and is degraded almost to the level of the
slave. There are many instances now in our city, where the
wife suffers from the power of the husband to claim all that
she can earn with her own hands. In my intercourse with the
poorer class of people, I have known cases of extreme cruelty
from the hard earnings of the wife being thus robbed by the hus-
band, and no redress at law.

An article in one of the daily papers lately presented the
condition of needle-women in England. There might be a pre-
sentation of this class in our own country which would make
the heart bleed. Public attention should be turned to this
subject in order that avenues of more profitable employment
may be opened to women. There are many kinds of business which
women, equally with men, may follow with respectability and suc-
cess. Their talents and energies should be called forth, and
their power brought into the highest exercise. The efforts of
women in France are sometimes pointed to in ridicule and sar-
casm, but depend upon it, the opening of profitable employment to
women in that country is doing much for the enfranchisement of
the sex. In England and America it is not an uncommon thing for
a wife to take up the business of her deceased husband and carry
it on with success.

Our respected British Consul stated to me a circumstance which
occurred some years ago, of an editor of a political paper
having died in England; it was proposed to his wife, an able
writer, to take the editorial chair. She accepted. The patron-
age was greatly increased, and she a short time since retired from her labors with a handsome fortune. In that country, however, the opportunities are by no means general for woman's elevation.

In visiting the public school in London a few years since, I noticed that the boys were employed in linear drawing, and instructed upon the blackboard in the higher branches of arithmetic and mathematics; while the girls, after a short exercise in the mere elements of arithmetic, were seated during the bright hours of the morning, stitching wristbands. I asked why there should be this difference made; why the girls too should not have the black-board? The answer was, that they would not probably fill any station in society requiring such knowledge.

The demand for a more extended education will not cease until girls and boys have equal instruction in all the departments of useful knowledge. We have as yet no high-school in this State. The normal school may be a preparation for such an establishment. In the late convention for general education, it was cheering to hear the testimony borne to woman's capabilities for head teachers of the public schools. A resolution there offered for equal salaries to male and female teachers when equally qualified, as practiced in Louisiana, I regret to say, was check-ed in its passage by Bishop Potter; by him who has done so much for the encouragement of education, and who gave his countenance and influence to the Convention; still, the fact of such a resolution being offered, augurs a time coming for woman which she may well hail. At the last examination of the public schools in this city, one of the alumni delivered an address on Woman not as is too common in eulogistic strains, but directing the attention to the injustice done to woman in her position in society in a variety of ways, the unequal wages she receives for her constant toil etc., presenting facts calculated to arouse attention to the subject.

Let women go on, not asking favors, but claiming as right, the removal of all hindrances to her elevation in the scale of being; let her receive encouragement for the proper cultivation of all her powers, so that she may enter profitably into the active business of life; employing her own hands in ministering to her necessities, strengthening her physical being by proper exercise and observance of the laws of health. Let her not be ambitious to display a fair hand to promenade, the fashionable streets of our city, but rather, coveting earnestly the best gifts, let her strive to occupy such walks in society as well will benefit her true dignity in all the relations of life. No fear that she will then transcend the proper limits of female delicacy. True modesty will be as fully preserved in acting out these important vocations, as in the nursery or at the fireside ministering to man's self-indulgence. Then in the marriage union, the independence of the husband and wife will be equal, their dependence mutual, and their obligations reciprocal.
Women's property has been taxed equally with that of men's to sustain colleges endowed by the States; but they have not been permitted to enter those high seminaries of learning. Within a few years, however, some colleges have been instituted when young women are admitted upon nearly equal terms with young men; and numbers are availing themselves of their long denied rights. This among the signs of the times, indicative of an advance for women. The book of knowledge is not opened to her in vain. Already is she aiming to occupy important posts of honor and profit in our country. We have three female editors in our State, and some in other States of the Union. Numbers are entering the medical profession; one received a diploma last year; others are preparing for a like result.

In conclusion, let me say, with Nathaniel P. Willis: (quotation omitted).
Lucretia Mott's
discourse on woman
Delivered Dec. 14, 1849

From pages 487-500 of "James and Lucretia Mott", Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1896 being a full phonographic report, revised by the author. (Pamphlet from the Library of Congress)

There is nothing of greater importance to the well-being of society at large—of man as well as woman—than the true and proper position of woman. Much has been said, from time to time, upon this subject. It has been a theme for ridicule, for satire, and sarcasm. We might look for this from the ignorant and vulgar; but from the intelligent and refined we have a right to expect that such weapons shall not be resorted to that gross comparisons and vulgar epithets shall not be applied, so as to place woman, in a point of view, ridiculous to say the least.

This subject has claimed my earnest interest for many years. I have long wished to see woman occupying a more elevated position than that which custom for ages has allotted to her. It was with great regret, therefore that I listened a few days ago to a lecture upon this subject, which, though replete with intellectual beauty, and containing much that was true and excellent, was yet fraught with sentiments calculated to retard the progress of woman to the high elevation destined by her Creator. I regretted the more that these sentiments should be presented with such attractiveness, because they would be likely to ensnare the young.

The minds of young people generally are open to the reception of more exalted views upon this subject. The kind of homage that has been paid to woman, the flattering appeals which have too long satisfied her—appeals to her more fancy and imagination—are giving place to a more extended recognition of her rights, her important duties and responsibilities in life. Woman is claiming for herself stronger and more profitable food. Various are the indications leading to this conclusion. The increasing attention to female education, the improvement in the literature of the age, especially in what is called the "Ladies' Department," in the periodicals of the day, are among the proofs of a higher estimate of woman in society at large. Therefore we may hope that the intellectual and intelligent are being prepared for the discussion of this question, in a manner which shall tend to ennoble woman and dignify man.

Free discussion upon this, as upon all other subjects, is never feared; nor will it be, except by such as prefer darkness to light. "Those only who are in the wrong dread discussion. The light alarms those who feel the need of darkness." It was sound philosophy uttered by Jesus, "He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are worthy in God."

I have not come here with a view of answering any particular parts of the lecture alluded to, in order to point out the fall-
any of its reasoning. The speaker, however, did not profess to offer anything like argument on the occasion, but rather a sentiment. I have no prepared address to deliver to you, being unaccustomed to speak in that way; but I felt a wish to offer some views for your consideration, though in a desultory manner, which may lead to such reflection and discussion as will present the subject in a true light.

In the beginning, man and women were created equal. "Male and female created He them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam." He gave dominion to both over the lower animals, but not to one over the other.

"Man over woman
He made not lord, such title to himself
Reserving, human left from human free."

The cause of the subjection of women to man was early ascribed to disobedience to the command of God. This would seem to show that she was then regarded as not occupying her true and rightful position in society.

The laws given on Mount Sinai for the government of man and woman were equal, and the precepts of Jesus make no distinction. Those who read the Scriptures, and judge for themselves, not resting satisfied with the perverted application of the text, do not find the distinction that theology and ecclesiastical authorities have made, in the condition of the sexes. In the early ages, Miriam and Deborah, conjointly with Aaron and Borak, enlisted themselves on the side which they regarded as the right, unitedly going up to their battles, singing their songs of victory. We regard these with veneration. Deborah judged Israel many years—she went up with Barak against their enemies with an army of ten thousand, assuring that the honor of the battle should not be to him, but to a woman. Revolting as were the circumstances of their success, the acts of a semi-barbarous people, yet we read with reverence the song of Deborah! (Quotation omitted).

Coming down to later times, we find Anna, a prophetess of four-score years, in the temple day and night, speaking of Christ to all those who looked for redemption in Jerusalem. Numbers of women were the companions of Jesus—women going to the men of the city, saying, "Come, see a man who told me all things that ever I did; is not this the Christ?" Another, "Whosoever he said unto you, do it." Philip had four daring daughter who did prophesy. Tryphena and Tryphosa were co-workers with the apostles in their mission, to whom they sent special messages of regard and acknowledgment of their labors in the gospel. A learned Jew, mighty in the Scriptures, was by Priscilla instructed in the way of the Lord more perfectly. Phoebe is mentioned as a servant of Christ, and commended as such to the brethren. It is worthy of note that the work servant, when applied to Thymiocit, is rendered minister. Women professing godliness, should be translated preaching.
The first announcement, on the day of Pentecost was the fulfillment of ancient prophecy, that God's spirit should be poured out upon daughters as well as sons, and they should prophesy. It is important that we be familiar with these facts, because woman has been so long circumscribed in her influence by the perverted application of the text, rendering it improper for her to speak in the assemblies of the people, "to edification, to exhortation, and to comfort."

If these Scriptures were read intelligently, we should not learn Christ as to exclude any from a position where they might exert an influence for good to their fellow-beings. The epistle to the Corinthian church, where the supposed apostolic prohibition of woman's preaching is found contains express directions how woman shall appear when one prayeth or prophesieth. Judge then whether this admonition relative to speaking and asking questions, in the excited state of that church, should be regarded as a standing injunction on woman's preaching, when that work was not used by the apostle. When is the Scripture authority for the advice given to the early church, under peculiar circumstances, being binding on the church of the present day? Ecclesiastical history informs us, that for two or three hundred years, female ministers suffered martyrdom, in company with their brethren.

These things are too much lost sight of. They should be known, in order that we may be prepared to meet the assertion, so often made, that woman is stepping out of her appropriate sphere when she shall attempt to instruct public assemblies. The present time particularly demands such investigation. It requires also, that "of yourselves ye should judge what is right," that you should know the ground wherein you stand. This age is notable for its works of mercy and benevolence—for the efforts that are made to reform the inebriate and the degraded, to relieve the oppressed and suffering. Women as well as men are interested in these works of justice and mercy. They are efficient co-workers, their talents are called into profitable exercise, their labors are effective in each department of reform. The blessing to the merciful, to the peacemaker, is equal to man and to woman. It is greatly to be deplored, now that she is increasingly qualified for usefulness, that any view should be presented, calculated to retard her labors of love.

Why should not woman seek to be a reformer? If she is to shrink from being such an iconoclast as shall "break the image of man's lower worship," as so long held up to view; if she is to fear to exercise her reason and her noblest powers, lest she should be thought to "attempt to act the man," and not acknowledge his supremacy—if she is to be satisfied with the narrow sphere assigned her by men, nor aspire to a higher, lest she should transcend the bounds of female delicacy, truly it is a mournful prospect for women. We would admit all the differences that our great and beneficent creator has made, in the relation of man and woman, nor would we seek to disturb this relation;
but we deny that the present position of woman is her true sphere of usefulness; nor will she attain to this sphere, until the disabilities and disadvantages, religious, civil, and social, which impede her progress, are removed out of her way. These restrictions have enervated her mind and paralysed her powers. While man assumes that the present is the original state designed for woman, that the existing "differences are not arbitrary nor the result of accident," but grounded in nature, she will not make the necessary effort to obtain her just rights, lest it should subject her to the kind of scorn and contemptuous manner in which she has been spoken of.

So far from her "ambition leading her to attempt to act the man," she needs all the encouragement she can receive, by the removal of obstacles from her path, in order that she may become a "true woman." As it is a desirable thing that man should act a manly and generous part, not "mannish," so let woman be urged to exercise a dignified and womanly bearing, not womanish. Let her cultivate all the graces and proper accomplishments of her sex, but let not these degenerate into a kind of effeminacy, in which she is satisfied to be the mere plaything or toy of society, content with her outward adornments, and with the tone of Flattery and fulsome adulation too often addressed to her. True, nature has made a difference in her configuration, her physical strength, her voice,—and we ask no change we are satisfied with nature. But how has neglect and mismanagement increased this difference! It is our duty to develop these natural powers by suitable exercise, so that they may be strengthened "by reason of use." In the ruder state of society, woman was made to bear heavy burdens, while her "lord and master" walks idly by her side. In the civilisation to which we have attained, if cultivated and refined women would bring all her powers into use, she might engage in pursuits which she now shrinks from as beneath her proper vocation. The energies of men need not then be wholly devoted to the counting-house and common business of life, in order that women in fashionable society may be supported in their daily promenades and nightly visits to the theatres and ball-rooms.

The appeal of Catharine Beecher to woman, some years ago, urging her to aim at higher pursuits, was greatly encouraging, it gave earnest consent of an improved condition of woman. She says, "The time etc." (quotation omitted)?

A new generation of women is now upon the stage, improving the increased opportunities furnished for the acquirement of knowledge. Public education is coming to be regarded to the right of the children of a republic. The hill of science is not so difficult of ascent as formerly represented by poets and painters; but by fact and demonstration smashed down, so as to be accessible to the assumed weak capacity of woman. She is rising in the scale of being through this as well as other means, and finding heightened pleasure and profit on the right hand and on the left. The study of Physiology, now introduced into
our common schools, is engaging her attention, impressing the necessity of the observance of the laws of health. The intellectual lyceum and instructive lecture-room are becoming, to many, more attractive than the theatre and the ball-room. The sickly and sentimental novel and pernicious romance are giving place to writings calculated to call forth the benevolent affections and higher nature. It is only by comparison that I would speak commendatorily of these works of imagination. Their exciting contents, like stimulating drinks, when long indulged in, enervates the mind, unfitting it for the sober duties of life.

These duties are not to be limited by man. Nor will woman fulfill less her domestic relations, as the faithful companion of her chosen husband and the fitting mother of her children, because she has a right estimate of her position and responsibilities. For self-respect will be increased; preserving the dignity of her being, she will not suffer herself to be degraded into a mere dependent. Nor will her feminine character be impaired. Instances are not few, of women throwing off the incumbrances which bind her, and going forth in a manner worthy of herself, her creation, and her dignified calling. Did Elizabeth Fry lose any of her feminine qualities by the public walk into which she was called? Having performed the duties of a mother to a large family, feeling that she owed a labor of love to the poor prisoner, she was empowered by Him who sent her forth, to go to kings and crowned heads of the earth, and ask audience of these, and it was granted her, Did she lose the delicacy of woman by her acts? No. Her retiring modesty was characteristic of her to the latest period of her life. It was my privilege to enjoy her society some year ago, and I found all that belonged to the feminine in woman—to true nobility, in a refined and purified moral nature. Is Dorothea Dix throwing off her womanly nature and appearance in the course she is pursuing? In finding duties abroad, has any "refined man felt that something of beauty has gone forth from her." To use the contemptuous word applied in the lecture alluded to, is she becoming mannish? Is she compromising her womanly dignity in going forth to seek to better the condition of the insane and afflicted? Is not a beautiful mind and a retiring modesty still conspicuous in her?

Indeed, I would ask, if this modesty is not attractive also, when manifested in the other sex? It was strikingly marked, in Horace Mann, when presiding over the late National Educational Convention in this city. The retiring modesty of William Ellery Channing was beautiful, well as of many others, who have filled elevated stations in society. These virtues, differing as they may in degree in man and woman, are of the same nature, and call forth our admiration wherever manifested.

The noble courage of Grace Darling is justly honored, leading her to present herself on the coast of England, during the rag-
ing storm, in order to rescue the poor, suffering, shipwrecked mariner. Woman was not wanting in courage in the early ages. In war and bloodshed this trait was often displayed. Grecian and Roman history have lauded and honored her in this character. English history records her courageous women too, for unhappily we have little but the records of war handed down to us. The courage of Joan of Arc was made the subject of a popular lecture not long ago, by one of our intelligent citizens. But more noble moral daring is marking the female character at the present time, and better worthy of imitation. As these characteristics come to be appreciated in man too, his warlike acts, with all the miseries and horrors of the battle-ground, will sink into their merited oblivion, or be remembered only to be condemned. The heroism displayed in the tented field must yield to the moral and Christian heroism which is shadowed in the signs of our times.

The lecturer regarded the announcement of woman’s achievements, and the offering of appropriate praise through the press, as a gross innovation upon the obscurity of female life—he complained that the exhibition of attainments of girls in schools was no equal to that of the boys, and the newspaper announced that “Miss Brown received the first prize for English grammar,” etc. If he objected to so much excitement of emulation in schools it would be well; for the most enlightened teachers discomfitmen these appeals to love of approbation and self-esteem. While prizes continue to be awarded, can any good reason be given why the name of the girl should not be published as well as that of the boy? He spoke with scorn, that “we hear of Mrs. President so and so; and committees and secretaries of the same sex.” But of this, if women can conduct their own business, by means of presidents and secretaries of their own sex, can he tell us why they should not? They will never make such progress in any moral movement while they depend upon men to act for them. Do we shrink from reading the announcement that Mrs. Somerville is made an honorary member of a scientific association? That Miss Herschell has made some discoveries, and is prepared to take her equal part in science? Or that Miss Mitchell, of Nantucket, has lately discovered a planet long looked for? I cannot conceive why “honor to whom honor is due” should not be rendered to woman as well as man; nor will it necessarily exalt her, or foster feminine pride. This propensity is found alike in male and female, and it should not be ministered to improperly in either sex.

(The rest of this speech is found in the “Answer to Dana.”)
The kingdom of God is within us, and Christianity will not have performed its office in the earth until its professors have learned to respect the rights and privileges of conscience by a toleration without limit, a faith without contention. This is the testimony of one of the modern writers. And have we not evidence, both from our own religious records, and those of all the worshippers of all ages, that there has been this divine teaching acknowledged, in some way or another—that there is a religious instinct in the constitution of man, and that, according to the circumstances of his birth, of his education, of his exercise of his free agency, this religious essence has grown, and brought forth similar fruits, in every age of the world, among all peoples? This has been likened, by various figures, emblems, parables, to things without us and around us. It has been variously interpreted, variously explained; for no nation has a spiritual language, exclusively such. We must therefore speak of our spiritual experiences in language having reference to spiritual things. And we find this has been the case especially in the records of the Jews, and Scriptures of Israel, and what are called “Christian Scriptures.” They abound in emblems and parables.

This divine illumination is called "the spirit," it is said that "God breathed into man, life," a spirit, his "own image," which is spiritual, and he became a living soul, that after-writers acknowledge this divine spirit—"Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct us."

An idea has prevailed that the immorality of this spirit was not understood till about eighteen hundred years ago; but if we read the old Scriptures intelligently, we shall find the acknowledgment of its eternity, as well as its divine nature. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." And these same writers, even though they were very much clouded, and the clearness of their views obscured by traditions, so that, when Jesus came among them, he said "they made the word of God of none effect by their traditions;" yet, the far-seeing among them acknowledged that these obscurities must pass away, and that the time should come when the divine light should be more clearly understood, "when thou shalt hear a voice behind thee saying, "This is the way, Walk ye in it."

And it is spoken of sometimes as the "still small voice." It is spoken of again as a new covenant that should be made: "I will write my law in their hearts," the law of justice, mercy, forgiveness, that they should have no more need of the old proverb, "The father have eaten sour
grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge.” "But if a
man be just, and do that which is lawful and right," "in his
righteousness that he hath done he shall live." On the other
hand, "when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness,
and committeth unrighteousness, in the wickedness that he death shall
he die."

So we see that the teachings of this divine spirit have been the
same in all ages. It has led to truth, to goodness, to justice,
to love. Love was as much held up among these old writers,
these old religious teachers, and as clearly set forth, as in
the later days. Their testimony fell upon ears that heard not,
on eyes that say not, because they had closed their eyes,
shut their ears, and hardened their hearts. They had substitut-
ed something else for this divine light; this word, which
in a still earlier day, Moses declared to his people was "night
unto them." "in the mouth, and in the heart." The truths of in-
spiration are the way of life, and he that walketh in the right
shall grow stronger and stronger. These were the teachings
of the light— to walk uprightly; to act righteously; to be
just; to be faithful. "With the merciful, thou wilt show thy-
self merciful; with an upright man, thou wilt show thyself
upright; with the pure, thou wilt show thyself pure." Believe
not, then, that all these great principles were only known in
the day of the advent of the Messiah of the Jews— these beautiful
effects of doing right.

We should come to understand the divinity of this spirit, and
its teachings to us now. I believe there is a growing under-
standing of it. It has been likened unto heaven which was hid
in the meal, "till the whole was leavened;" and also to the
little seed that was sowed in the field, which became "greatest
among herbs." The word of God is life-giving, fruitful; and
as it is received, it produces its own generation, sometimes
called re-generation. Another beautiful figure is sometimes
employed, the change in the physical being. We have the first
little child; then the young man; then the strong man in the Lord.
All these things we must read and accept intelligently, ration-
ally. Too long had the religious element been upheld to the
veneration of man through some mystery whereby he could un-
derstand the growth of his own divine nature. Why, it needs no
miracles. They belong to darker times than ours. It is when
we are wide awake, and capable of reading, reflecting, and
receiving this ingrafted word, that we come to know the ancient-
ing that teacheth all things. And we shall not need that any man
shall teach us. We shall come away from these false depen-
dencies. We shall come to the source—the immediate access which
we have to the source of all truth, to the source of all good. I
know this is merely regarded as the Quaker doctrine, the ignis
fatuus of the Quakers, and it is everywhere spoken against. We
know how it was treated in the early days of the Quakers, and
it is everywhere spoken. We know how the Son of God was received
when he preached; and it was because his teachings led him to
non-conformity with the rituals of the day, that he was led
to bear his testimony against the doctrines of the Scribes and
Pharisees of his time.

All ecclesiastical history goes to assure us, that when there
has been a sectarian standard raised, and a mere verbal theol­
ogy and ceremonial performances instituted, good works have
invariably been lowered. We all know how bitter the sectarian
spirit has become—how hatred and antipathy have grown among
the people, and among people making the highest profession of
the name of Jesus, who become horrified, shocked, if any shall
deny that they are pleased to consider his divinity; and yet,
if any speaker of the fruits of obedience to the law of justice
and of goodness in the soul, they brand it as mere morality,
more human benevolence, and not the religion by which salva­
tion is wrought. This the tendency of sects, and it needeth a pro­
phet to come forth declaring your circumscriptions, your false
lights, to be of no avail. This has been the uniform condition
of acceptance, the working of righteousness,—doing justly,
loving mercy, and walking humbly before God,—and not in
oblations and sacrifices.

And so, down to the present time, we see the same tendency and
the same results. We need prophets among us, bold non-conform­
ists, to come forth and say, "Verily, your baptisms are not the
right tests; your communions are not the proper evidence of your
intimate union with the Father and with the Son. What are your
Sabbath-day observances but conventional rites? Verily, your
silent meetings, your plain attire, your peculiar language,—
are they the rightful tests of your sound faith, your pure wor­
ship, No more than those of any other denomination. We may
take every denomination, and where find them setting up their
forms as an evidence of worship above the pure acts of devotion
of God, manifested by love to the people,—to the common children
of God, the world over,—wherever this is to be found, there
is need of the right testimony to be born; there is need that
we should ask, he is not a true Christian who is one outwardly.
We need higher evidences, therefore, than now exist. Christian­
ity will not have to perform its work in the earth, until its
followers have learned to respect the rights and privileges of
conscience, by a toleration without limit, a faith without con­
tention.

What have we to do with granting to another a point, a belief,
a doctrine? It is assumption. It leads to despotism. It has
led to crucifixion; and it leads in the same direction now,
as far as the customs of the times will admit. The cause is
cast out now, just as much as ever. And why is it? Because
there is a verbal creed set up. Because there are doctrines
fixed upon as being the essential requirements of believers.
They assume that the Scriptures are the word of God, instead of
taking them and ascertaining the uniform testimonies to right­
eousness and truth, as found in the various pages, and discrimi­
inatating between these and the practices of those ancients, many
of whom were semi-civilized, many of whom regarded their God as
the God of war. The Scriptures should be read intelligently,
so that we should not be going back to the example of those an-
cients as our authority for the present day. They do not justi-
ify that. I would not shock the religious feelings of any, but
I would ask them to read their Scriptures again, and see if
they can find any authority for sustaining their actions, and
especially such as has done injury to their fellow-beings and
themselves. Especially as they appealed to for sanctioning the
use of wines and strong drinks, as our authority for the far-extend-
ing influence of these still evil among the children of men.
So has it been the practice to cite the example of olden times
in approval of the abomination of American slavery, as being a
patriarchal institution. It is time that we should no longer
refer, not knowing the Scriptures or the power of God, when we
resort to this Bible to find authority for anything that is
wrong. We have a divine teaching to which we should adhere.
The great principles of justice, love, and truth are divinely
implanted in the hearts of men. If we pay proper heed unto
them, we shall have no occasion to go to the ancient practices
to find authority for our actions in the present day.

We cannot help our opinions in these matters; this is impossible.
They grow up with us, and depend upon circumstances, on our ed-
education and immediate influences. We are justified in our skept-
ics. It is our religious duty to be skeptical of the plans
of salvation. The veneration of believers has been strengthened
by their not being allowed to think. They have been afraid to
exercise the test of enlightened reason which God has given
them, lest they should be called infidels—should be branded
with infidelity. It is time the theology of the day had passed
away. And it has, to a great extent, it is modified. As an
instance, we might refer to the New School Presbyterians, ar-
raying themselves against the old Calvinistic doctrines. Others
might be enumerated. The people now are ceasing to believe
what their verbal creed teaches them. If there was a freedom
and independence among them, such as the truth would give they
be less trammeled. "If the truth shall make you free, ye shall
be free indeed." How few are made free by the truth! They are
hampered by their undue adherence to the glistening appendages of
the church. I would not set a high opinion on the Catholic
Church, the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Quaker, or
any other. They all have their elements of goodness, and they
all have their elements of bondage; and if we yield obedience to
them, we become subject to them, and are brought under bondage.
If we acknowledge this truth, and how to do it, we shall dare
to show our dissent. We will let them alone, treating them with
toleration without limit, a faith without contention, with
regard to their opinions.

The doctrines of Christianity are perverted in order to sustain
the doctrine of total depravity. We take not to ourselves that
which belong to ourselves. The proper sense of the divine
culture of man, in all its relations, first the animal, next
the intellectual, and then the spiritual, is not properly un-
derstood. This is a beautiful trinity in the human being. We
shall find the glory of the natural to be one, and the glory
of the spiritual, another. While the general faith of Christians
is to denominate the animal, and to build up a kind of new birth
on this degradation, we are in not acknowledging the divinity
of all man's instincts as we would; and hence it is I deem it
necessary to speak forth, and be branded with heresy. And be-
lieving this, and asserting it before the people, I cannot feel
that I am advocating a mere Quaker degum. In this latter day,
we find it is regarded more and more by every sect, and also
by those who attach themselves to no religious denomination.

When we appeal to the teachings of the divine spirit, we find
it to exist in every human breast. This the revealed religion,
and it is time that it was claimed as such. It is time that
which is regarded as mere morality should be preached as the
everlasting, divine truth of God; and when it shines in the
hearts and minds of the children of men, and they come to re-
ceive it, they will behold its glory, and it will be the glory
of the only spiritually begotten of the Father, dwelling in
them as full of grace and of truth. They overlook it because of
its simplicity.

There is an acknowledgment of the regenerating power of the et-
neral, so far as we may call it regeneration, by application
to natural things, without basing it on the assumption that the
first birth is evil. Jesus said, "Except a man be born again,
he cannot see the kingdom of God." But he spoke to those dark
Jews, who did, no doubt, need to be born again, to die out of
their low forms and ceremonies. Well did he answer Nicodemus,
who thought this such a miracle, "That which is born of the
flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.
Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again."

We may all admit, that if we receive the divine spirit in its
operations of our soul, there will be no mistake; it will be
found a repeller of evil; and if we obey it, it will be regen-
erating in its nature. It will make us understand that which
is spiritual, and discriminate between that which is spiritual
and that which is natural, without underrating the natural. If we
suffer the propensities to have the mastery over us, we must reap
the consequences. Look at slavery in our country; look at war.
Hence come wars? "Come they not hence, even of your lusts
that war in your members?" If we attempt to govern ourselves
and our feelings by these low principles, they, of course, will
lead to evil, to wrong, to wickedness. The apostle says, "The
natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; nei-
ther can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."
The natural man hath natural powers and abilities; the intellec-
tual man hath powers differing from these; and the spiritual man
knoweth not the propensities of the natural.
We are not to be regarded as denying the Scriptures, because we have not so read them, and as learned Christianity; as have many of the authors of the theological opinions of the day. Men are too much wedded to these opinions, women in particular have pinned their faith in their minister's sleeves. They dare not rely on their own God-given powers of discernment. It is time that ye had looked to these Scriptures, and studied them rationally for yourselves, rather than follow the teaching which interprets them in support of the wrong, instead of the right. Women in the earliest day associated with men in carrying forward the great principles of truth; A Deborah arose, and Huldah a prophetess. It was a woman who introduced to the people of Samaria the advent of Christ: "Come see a man which told me all things whatsoever I did." And this induced the men to go forth "out of the city, unto Him." And they said unto the woman, now we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ." And the very first act on the day of Pentecost was to declare, that the time would come when the Spirit should be poured out upon women. Phebe was a minister of Christ. Priestcraft has rendered the word minister so as to apply only to men.

People should judge more intelligently than to take the practices of former times, and make them a test for practical Christianity of this day. "The kingdom of God is within us;" the word is nigh, in the heart, and in the mouth." If any are so faithless as still to need outward corroborative testimony, they will find it in any age, and from the earliest times, as recorded in the Bible. And this is the value of the Scriptures among us. We have no right to go to them now to establish a creed or form. We cannot control our opinions; we cannot believe as we will; therefore belief is no virtue. We have not the power to control our being; it is by the circumstances around us, by our power of receiving, that we come to see, and to know; and believe; therefore we must make a different use of the Bible in order to make it to us a book that is invaluable.

Goodness has been goodness in all ages of the world, justice, and uprightness, righteousness. "I will make all my goodness pass before thee." This was a beautiful answer to Moses. This is the way that God manifests himself to his children. It has been so in every age. It is emphatically the case in the present day, which is marked by the advances that have been made in this generation. It is this which should be held as an evidence that Christianity is being better understood; that the veneration of the people is being drawn away from undue observances of Sabbath days, of the worship of churches; that they are coming to judge in themselves what is right, when they are disposed to do this. How plentifully are the testimonies of the Scriptures found to be in favor of the right, in all ages?

The fact, then, that God has chosen, is easily recognised: "To loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke." Jesus did not say, Blessed is the believer in the trinity, blessed is
the believer in the popular scheme of salvation; blessed the believer in a mysterious divinity attached to himself. He said nothing of the kind. He called them to judge of himself by his works; "If I do the right works, believe me, and the Father also, for I come from the Father," "blessed," he said, "are the merciful, blessed the pure in heart; blessed the meek,"—not the meek that bow before sect. We must know a meekness that make us "as bold as a lion," that we may proclaim righteousness, and reclaim this generation from its sins, and denounced this meekness before sect. Jesus declares this by his life of goodness, of active righteousness, of pure morality, of sympathy for the poor. It is for the love of his principles that we should place him on the high pedestal given him by those who delight to worship him ceremonially.

It is not strange that there should be atheism in the world, while such false ideas of God are inculcated in the minds of the people. We cannot in any way come to the worship of God, by any of these fancied attributes, without humanizing Him. Therefore, we must come to know Him by our merciful acts, our pure, our upright conduct, our every-day righteousness, our goodness. We must come to be with Him by declaring "wee unto the transgressor." We must not make compromises with injustice. If the mission of Jesus was so emphatically to bring "peace on earth and good will to men," we must endeavor to carry it all out, and not place it away in the distance, in the "millennium." Why, the millennium is here; the kingdom of God has come. This is what we should preach. Oh, that the fruits of this divine spirit should appear, which are love, peace, joy, goodness, truth! the spirit that is first gently, pure, full of mercy, full of good fruits. Here is no disparagement of good works.

We forget the practical parts of the Bible, in our zeal for preaching up a religion that is to do nothing. And so we must let war go on "until the millennium comes." In the olden time, they knew that war was wrong, and hence the far-seeing proclaimed the day when "they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." They looked forward and prophetically proclaimed the day when the "King cometh, who is just, and having a salvation." "And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle-how shall be cut off; and he shall speak peace unto the heather; and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth." If we are believers in this, and believe in the Messiah that came with such a beautiful announcement, it is time that we should love the announcement of Christ and the name of Christ; should part with war, and leave nations to settle their disputes in some way that will put an end to the barbarism of war. It is abominable that we should retain it—that we should still have recourse to arms.

But the efforts for the dominion of peace are greater now than
ever before. The very first message transmitted to us across the Atlantic, by means of the noblest instrument wrought in our day, the offspring of the divine, intellectual intelligence of men, was a prophetic view of greater peace on earth. There is something so beautiful in this universal instinct of men for the right, that I am pained to know that people of intelligence, professing Christianity, should vouchsafe their assent to the duration of any of the relics of the dark ages. Let us do away with these things. We need the faith that works by love, and purifies the heart. And sorrowful is it that the hearts of men should be turned from the right by the temptations that so easily beset them, and lead them to do injustice to their fellow-man, binding him down to slavery. Ah! the chains of human bondage! They should make every one to blush and hang his head. Mournful is it that they should countenance the Sabbath day, and then, to-morrow, recognize a system by which their fellow-men are sold on the auction-block to the highest bidder. We should bear our testimony against the nefarious claim of the right to property in men; and the worst of this is, that we should bear this institution claimed as sanctioned by the Bible. It is the grossest perversion of the Bible, and yet many ministers have thus turned over the pages unworthily, to find testimonies in favor of slavery. "We unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." This is what we should quote. And we are all guilty of the blood of our brother. The crime is national. We are all involved in it; and how can we go forth and profess to believe the faith of the son of God, with all these great wrongs and evils clinging to us, and we upholding them? Every one has a responsibility in it. We are called to bear our testimony against sin, of whatever form, in whatever way presented. And how are we doing it? By partaking of the fruits of the slave's toil. Our garments are all stained with the blood of the slave. Let us, then, be clean-handed. Seek to be so; and if we find the monstrous evil so interwoven with what we have to do, politically, commercially, by manufacturing interests, by our domestic relations, then so much the more need is there for our laboring. Every church in the earth should be roused; every people, every profession and interest. We find democratic, republican America claiming slavery, and it will be found the last stronghold of sin in the civilized world. "He that doeth truth cometh to the light;" but we have rejected the light of Christ. We are told that the Lord, in his own time is going to put an end to this thing. "Break ye the bands of wickedness;" "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." And because ye have not done so, ye shall fall victims to the plagues that are around you. Here is where we need faith, to know that we must reap the reward of our doing.

I have nothing to do with preaching to you about what we shall be hereafter. We even now, by our obedience, come unto that kingdom which is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. We know something of an inheritance into that higher life where there is that communion from the Father, so that we can under-
stand, as far as is given us to understand, that we may elevate ourselves above that which is mortal to that which is immortal,

We need, therefore, this faith, which will make us believe and know that if we do the wrong, we must pay the penalty for the wrong that we are doing; for there is no respect of persons with God. He "rewardeth every man according to his works," and according to the fruits of his doing; God's laws are eternal, and I wish there were more conscientious believers in the immutable laws of God. When such a man as George Combe comes forth, teaching the everlasting laws of truth to the children of men, he is called a mere materialist, I would not exchange the true test for all the theology that ever existed. All the theological assemblies and gatherings united could not give such benefit to the world as the truth and writings of George Combe, and others who have a profound veneration for the laws of God.

It is impossible to hold any nation in slavery when their minds shall be enlightened sufficiently to appreciate the blessings of liberty. When the sacred principles of truth come to be evolved to the understandings of the children of men, how will all your false theologies sink before them! The rightful test, then, of the Christian character will be peace, and love, and justice, and a claim of greater equality among men. There will no longer be the lordly heel of a government trampling upon the children of men—no longer a high-bred aristocracy exercising their exclusiveness—no longer an aspiring priesthood, bringing all under its spiritual domination. It is time these things were understood; time that we should show how simple the religion of Jesus is. This was the highest theology uttered by Jesus: "By their fruits ye shall know them." The good man, out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is good; and the evil bringeth forth that which is evil. The soil must be good, and the seed received must be cared for, so that it may produce its own, and what will it produce? Ah, what will it not produce, my young friends? Overlook not the truth of God. There is nothing that requires that ye should underrate your natural powers. Let them grow with your growth and become strengthened, and you will be made advocates of the right.

This is really a notable age, and we have to hail it that we have not to wait for a distant day for the kingdom of God to come. There is an advancement, and its influence is felt so much that the minister begins to be ashamed to turn over the leaves of the Bible to prove the wrong, rather than to find therein advocacy of the right. The young people ever hear truth gladly; in their hearts there is an instinctive revolting from wrong. Did not the love of power abide to such an extent among us, there would be an instinctive revolt against slavery and wrong doing. Do justice to the colored man. Do away with your infernal prejudices; they are infernal. This impure spirit, this wrong that you indulge in, is not from above; it is earthly, sensual, devilish. A grave charge rests upon you who countenance the wickedness of American slavery.
Public sentiment is changing. What though the political horizon always may lower, believe me, that the labors of Bedrich, Chapin, Furness, Garrison, and many other advocates of the right and true of our day, presently preceded by those of Hicks, Clarkson, Wilberforce, and their confederates of former days, have not in vain. God ever blesses the righteous laborer. "In the morning sow they seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand; for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they shall both be alike good." So, having thus gone forth, we see how it is renovating, how it is purifying the Church from its corruptions.

The temperance movement is likewise prospering. It has given evidence of great advancement in this day. War, too, is falling from its original foothold in the earth. There is greater delight manifested in right doing. The power of moral-suggestion is becoming better understood. These are good indications, and, with many others, they point to a happier and better state of things, and the fruits of the ushering in of the great and glorious gospel, that which is to level distinctions, cause the highways to be strengthened, and institute equality among men. The day is coming; "the kingdom of God is at hand."

The people flock more to hear moral discourses than to hear the preaching from the pulpit. This would not be the case were the preaching of the pulpit like that of Jesus. There is a quick understanding in the fear of the Lord among the people, and I will trust the people. I have confidence in their intuitive sense of the right, of the good. It is this great heart of the people we are to preach unto and let it be done.

The immediate teaching of God's holy spirit, inspiring love for the brethren, inspiring a desire for the promotion of good, is your mission. Oh, it is your heavenly call; obey it, and look not for anything marvelous. Obey it, my young friends! Come ye unto the harvest, and labor truly. There is need of preachers against the excesses of the age. There is need of preachers against the existing monopolies and banking institutions, by which the rich are made richer, and the poor poorer. Then, man of God, flee these things, and follow that which is right! It is contrary to the spirit of this Republic that any should be so rich. Let this blessed Christian equality prevail. Let us have a Republic that shall be marked by Christian principles; and by Christian, I mean universally right principles. These are eternal; divine in their origin, and eternal in their nature. Let us have faith in these, and believe that the "kingdom of God is within us." Christianity will not have performed its effect in the earth, until the believers have learned the respect and privileges, by a toleration without limit, a faith without contention. That faith will fill the heart with holy joy. Thanksgiving will come up from such a heart, and there will be an entering into the joy of the Lord, acknowledging that He is good; that His mercy is everlasting; and that His truth endureth thru all ages.
Lucretia Mott's
Sermon at Bristol
Sixth month sixth day 1860

"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

It appears to have been a great comfort to one of old that he could say, "I have preached righteousness in the great congregation; lo, I have not refrained my lips, O Lord, thou knowest; and it is interesting to learn among these declarations of the ancient prophets that there seemed to be not one standard of goodness and truth. The scriptures derive advantage from the fact that we find herein an uniform testimony to the right; that is, among those who are not bound by sect, or devoted to forms and ceremonies. "Your new moons and appointed feasts, your Sabbaths, even the solemn meeting," were classed as abominations, and for the reason that they executed not judgment and justice and mercy in the land. The unjunctura was "Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." If they put away their iniquities, and did that which was right, then they would find acceptance.

This is the testimony from age to age, as we find it recorded; and it is time we should discriminate between these scriptures that conflict with righteous principles, and such as emanate from a spiritual understanding of the requirements of truth. These requisitions of the holy spirit in the mind of man have been the same in all ages, and it needs no learned disquisitions to lead men to understand them. The people that man should teach his brother, saying, "Know the Lord." It is this assurance that all men understand the truth and the right, justice, mercy, love, which inspire confidences that we may speed so as to meet a response in the hearts of the hearers; and the more we appeal to the inner consciousness and perception of truth as received by intuition, by divine instinct in the soul, and not through forms, ceremonies, and dogmas, the more will there be amendment in the conduct of life. Our appeals would be more effectual, were religion that encumbers it, and its operations will prove more availing when presented to the hearers and to the thinkers free from the gloomy dogma of the sects.

The true gospel is not identical with any scheme of theological plan of salvation, however partial and plausibly such a scheme may be drawn from isolated passages of scripture, ingeniously woven; it is through the times of intelligence of the age, the progress of civilisation, and individual thinking, that the right of judgment has been so far attained, that there is great daring of thought of belief and expression, and much shortening of the creeds. A great deal that was demoralising in its tendency has been separated from them. Still, what remains is so tenaciously held as the only touchstones of religious character, that there is a proportionate lessening of the effect of sound morals, and a lowering of the true standard. While we should feel a largeness of heart towards all religious denomin-
ations, at the same time, if we are true to God and divine principle of his blessed son, we must ever hold up the blessing to the merciful, the pure, and the upright; regarding honesty, goodness, every-day works of usefulness and love, as paramount to all the peace and enjoyment that would follow an adherence to any of the abstract propositions of faith, that are held as the touch-stone of sound Christianity. We must be as Jesus was, a non-conformist. That peace which "Passeth understanding" comes from obedience to truth, not to sect, for great hardness of heart often proceeds from this; it leads not to love, but to persecution and bitterness. Unless the faith of the sectarian is worked by a love, not of his own sect merely, but such as can go out beyond its own inclosure, together in the outcast and the oppressed, it is not an efficient conversion. The apostle Paul believed he was acting in good conscience when he was a great persecutor, and no doubt many of the persecutors that perform their vile acts towards men believe they are doing God's service; but their acts are wicked nevertheless. Many go so far as to say that if a man does what he believes is right, he is exempt from guilt. This is a mistake. We have far too much charity for any wrong-doer. What is wrong in itself, is wrong for any one to do. The truth must be spoken, and the dark conscience enlightened.

Many persons have become so imbued to slavery as not to discern its sinfulness. It has been said that "no one in his inmost heart ever believed slavery to be right." We know there is this instinct in man, else it would never have been proclaimed that all men are born equal, and endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Many have so scared their minds that the light of the glorious gospel, which is the image of God, does not and cannot shine in upon them. Hence it is that in this day there should be an earnestness in advocating right doing. The people should be so enlightened as to distinguish between mere creeds and forms, and practical goodness.

It is irrational to deny the sinfulness of slavery. "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; That useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." Woe unto them that are partakers of other men's sins." Woe unto them that will not "cry aloud, spare not, lift up the voice like a trumpet, and show the people their transgressions." These old sayings show that the requirements of truth are the same in all ages;—to right, to give freedom to the oppressed, the wronged, and the suffering. Those who have appealed in behalf of these have not appealed in vain. Progress attends the work; but nothing can be effected by sitting still, and keeping aloof from the arena of activity; it is by labor, by many crosses, many sacrifices, brother unto death, and even submitting to martyrdom, that beneficent result are accomplished. And what do we ask now? That slavery shall be held up in every congregation, and before all sects, as a greater sin than erroneous thinking; a greater sin than Sabbath breaking. If any of you are seen on Sabbath day with your thimble on, performing some piece of needlework, the
feelings of your neighbors are shocked on beholding the sight; and yet these very people may be indifferent to great sins, regarding them with comparative concern, and even complacency, this is what I mean in saying that the standard of religious observances is placed higher than the standard of goodness, of uprightness, and of human freedom. To some, the sin of slavish holding is not so horrifying as certain deviations from established observances. While the sticklers for these gather together and exhibit great marks of piety, in some instances they are guilt of small acts of unkindness, of meanness and oppression towards their neighbors. It is not enough to be generous, and give alms; the enlarged soul, the true philanthropist, is compelled by Christian principle to look beyond bestowing the scanty pittance to the mere beggar of the day, to the duty of considering the causes and sources of poverty. We must consider how much we have done towards causing it.

The feeling of opposition to war, that has been growing in the minds of men, is not confined to the Society of Friends; people of various denominations have examined this subject, and presented it in its true light. Faith in the efficacy of moral influences has increased, and the possibility of settling disputes without recourse to arms is being regarded more and more favorably. Still, the spirit of war exists, and it is surprising that those who look up the Son and adore his sacred name should forget that the anthem of his advent upon the earth was: "Peace on earth, and good will to men." Is this reformation going on? We should see how far we are attending to the practices by which nations become demoralized. In looking abroad we discover a revival of the brutal spirit of barbarous ages, to determine what may be done by single combat; and in our own land we find repetitions of these wicked experiments. Are those who disapprove of these things careful to use their influence in the family circle with their children, that they may not be carried away by this brutal spirit? Mind acting upon mind is of much greater power than brute force contending against brute force. We have been in the dark long enough. The likeness we bear to Jesus is more essential than our notions of him.

The temperance reformation has accomplished almost a revolution in our age, but the movement seems now to somewhat retarded by running too much into political and masacc channels. Much may be effected by the young men and the young women. How commendable that benevolence which lifts the poor victim from the gutter of degradation, to place him on the rock of temperance and put a song of total-abstinence in his mouth. This often times leads to something higher. I desire that all may be first pure, then actively engaged; that all, in their various religious denominations, and those not belonging to any, may see what their duty is, and neither shun nor disregard it. Let not these be forgotten that are beyond the reach of religious inclosures, for they, the lowly and the outcast, need our aid. Special attention should be paid to that which will exalt the condition of those that are downcast. If we perform our whole duty, we shall give them to these things, in the spirit of a broad, all-embracing philanthropy, the
tendency of which is to equalize society. We should act the part of true philosophers. Some are afraid to hear the word "philosophy" in connection with Christianity. But there is a divine philosophy which it should be our aim to reach, and when we have attained to this, we shall see a beautiful equality around us.

The efforts that are making for the elevation of woman, the enlargement of her mind, the cultivation of her reasoning powers, and various ameliorating influences are preparing her to occupy a higher position than she has hitherto filled. She must come to judge within herself what is right, and absolve herself from that sectarian rule which sets a limit to the divinity within her. Whatever is a barrier to the development of her inherent, God given powers, and to the improvement of her standing and character, whether it be ecclesiastical law or civil law, must be met and opposed. It is of more moment that she should be true and faithful to herself than to her sect.

The more we are disposed to enter this reforming theatre of the world, the greater will be the promise of improvement in the social system, and the nearer the approach to the true end of human existence. There is much to be done. If we are to have entire faith in the efficiency of right doing, we shall find strength for it. What is needed is confidence in the possibility of coming into the kingdom now. A great deal of time and effort has been spent in the sphere of poetic fancy, picturing the glory and joy of a kingdom hereafter; but what is chiefly required of us is to come into the divine government now and to be pure even as God is pure.

So far from preaching up human depravity, my practice is to advocate native goodness. It was a beautiful emblem that Jesus held up as an appropriate illustration of the heavenly condition—the little child. Had we faith in little children, treating them right, giving them a guarded education, we might see in the next generation far greater purity than is found at present.

It is essential that we have faith in uprightness, in justice, love, and truth, for these are among the highest evidences of true Christianity. I care not for charges of verbal infidelity; the infidelity I should dread, is to be faithless to the right, to moral principle, to the divine impulses of the soul, to a confidence in the possible realization of the millennium now. We know what we are at present: if we are doing right, acting in accordance with sacred principles, we all know how peaceful and happy we are. And we know how we are brought into torment by violating the right. We should have assurance that we resolve to do the right, if, we can do it.

All we can do, one for another, is to bring each to know the light of truth in the soul. It is pure, holy, unmistakable, and no ignis fatuus. Feeling and believing this, I would call you
you all to it. And we should come to recognize the great principles of justice, humanity, and kindness, holiness in all its parts; in the full belief that the establishment of the dominion of these in the earth is the divine purpose of the Eternal, in sending this essence, or, as some term it, in sending His Son into the world. What I mean by the "Son of God" is that divine word which is quick and powerful, which is a discerning of the thoughts and intents of the heart; and if any shall speak of it as the "Christ of God," let them so speak, and lay no stumbling-block in a brother's way; but have faith in it, never fearing; it will be sufficient for its own work. So believing, I can commend you, my friends, to God, and to the word of His grace, as sufficient to give an inheritance to those that are sanctified; and when we have finished our works here on earth, and are about to be removed from before the eyes of man, I doubt not but there will be a blessed earnest of that which shall appear hereafter, whatever it may be—that there will be an entrance into that which is glorious and eternal.

(Quotation from Hicks omitted)
SUSAN B. ANTHONY
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From "Life and Work of S. B. Anthony", I. H. Harper, Iowa,
Merril, Indianapolis 1859

Welcome, Gentlemen and Ladies, to this, our Hall of Temperance. We feel that the cause we have espoused is a common cause, in which you, with us, are deeply interested. We would that some means were devised, by which our brothers and sons shall no longer be allured from the right by the corrupting influence of the fashionable sippings of wine and brandy, those sure destroyers of Mental and Moral Worth, and by which our sisters and daughters shall no longer be exposed to the vile arts of the gentlemanly-appearing, gallant, but really half-intoxicated seducer. Our motive is to ask you counsel in the formation, and cooperation in carrying-out of plans which may produce a radical change in our Moral Atmosphere. —

But to the question, what good our Union has done? Though our Order has been strongly opposed by ladies professing a desire to see the moral condition of our race elevated, and though we still behold some of our thoughtless female friends whirling in the giddy dance, with intoxicated partners of their kind and, more than this, see them accompany their reeling companions to some secluded nook and there quaff with them from the Virtue-destroying cup, yet may we not hope that an influence, though now unseen, unfelt, has gone forth, which shall tell upon the future, which shall convince us that our weekly resort to these meetings has been not in vain, and which this now despised little band of Daughters of Temperance?

We count it no waste of time to go forth through our streets, thus proclaiming our desire for the advancement of our great cause. You, with us, no doubt, feel that Intemperance is the blighting mildew of all our social connections; you would be most happy to speed on to the time when no wife shall watch with trembling heart and tearful eye and body the slow, but sure descent of her idolized Companion down to the loathsome haunts of drunkenness; you would hasten the day when no mother shall have to mourn over a darling son as she sees him launch his bark on the circling waves of the mighty whirlpool.

How is this great change to be wrought, who are to urge on this vast work of reform? Shall it not be women, who are most aggrieved by the foul destroyer's incursions? Most certainly. Then arises the question, how are we to accomplish the end desired? I answer, not by confining our influence to our own home circle, but by centering all our benevolent feelings upon our own kindred, not by caring naught for the culture of any minds, save those of our own darlings. No, no; the
gratification of the selfish impulses along, can never produce a desirable change in the Moral aspect of Society....

It is generally conceded that it is our sex that fashions the Social and Moral State of Society. We do not presume that females possess unbounded power in abolishing the evil customs of the day; but we so believe that they en masse to discourage the use of wine and brandy as beverage at both their public and private parties, not one of the opposite sex, who has any claim to the title of gentleman, would so insult them as to come into their presence after having quaffed of the foul destroyer of all true delicacy and refinement.

I am not aware that we have any inebriate females among us, but have we not those, who are fallen from Virtue, and who claim our efforts for their reform, equally with the inebriates? And while we feel it our duty to extend the hand of sympathy and love to these poor, deluded ones, who have been robbed of their most precious gem, Virtue, and whom we blush to think belong to our Sex?

Now, Ladies, all we would do is to do all in our power, both individually and collectively, to harmonize and happy our Social system. We ask of you candidly and seriously to investigate the Matter, and decide for yourselves whether the object of our Union be not on the side of right, and if it is, then one and all, for the sake of erring humanity, come forward and speed on the right. If you come to the conclusion that the end we wish to attain is right, but are not satisfied with the plan adopted, then I ask of you to devise means by which this great good may be more speedily accomplished, and you shall find us ready with both heart and hand to cooperate with you. In my humble opinion, all that is needed to produce a complete Temperance and Social reform in this age of Moral Susception, is for our Sex to cast their United influences in the balance.

Ladies: there is no Neutral position for us to assume. If we sustain not this noble enterprise, both by precept and example, then is our influence on the side of Intemperance. If we say we love the Cause, and then sit down at our ease, surely does our action speak the lie. And now permit me once more to beg of you to lend your aid to this great Cause, the Cause of God and all Mankind.
Susan B. Anthony's
Short Speeches from Women's Suffrage Conventions

Miss Susan B. Anthony—Address in the National Suffrage Convention of 1884 in Seneca Falls, N. Y. In her address closing the convention Miss Anthony said:

The reason men are so slow in conceding political equality to women is because they can not believe that women suffer the humiliation of disfranchisement as they would. A dead and noble friend, one who aided our work most efficiently in the early days, said to me, "Why do you say the emancipation of women?" I replied, "Because women are political slaves!" Is it not strange that men think that what to them would be degradation, slavery, is to women elevation, liberty? Men put the right of suffrage for themselves above all price, and count the denial of it the most severe punishment. If a man serving a term in State's prison has one friend outside who cares for him, that friend will get up a petition begging the Governor to commute his sentence, if for not more than forty-eight hours prior to its expiration, so that, when he comes out of prison he may not be doomed to walk among his fellows with the mark of Cain upon his forehead. The only penalty inflicted upon the men, who a few years ago laid the knife at the throat of the Nation, was that of disfranchisement, which all men, loyal and disloyal, felt was too grievous to be borne, and our Government made haste to permit every one, even the leader of them all, to escape from this humiliation, this degradation, and again to be honored with the crowning right of United States citizenship. How can men thus delude themselves with the idea that what to them is ignominy unbearable is to women honor and glory unspeakable.

Note. Miss S. B. A. never wrote her addresses and no stenographic reports were made. Brief and inadequate newspaper accounts are all that remain.

Susan B. Anthony before the U. S. Senate, March 7, 1884. In her closing address Miss Anthony took up the question of obtaining suffrage for women through the States instead of Congress and said: (Hist. of Woman Suffrage—Vol I p. 80)

My answer is that I do not wish to see the women of the thirty-eight states of this Union compelled to leave their homes to canvass each one of these school districts by school district. It is asking too much of a moneyless class. The joint earnings of the marriage copartnership in all the states belong legally to the husband. It is only the wife who goes outside her home to work whom the law permits to own and control the money she earns. Therefore, to ask of women, the vast majority of whom are without an independent dollar of their own, to make a thorough canvass of their several States, is asking an impossibility.
We have already made the experiment of canvassing four States—Kansas in 1867, Michigan in 1874, Colorado in 1877, Nebraska in 1889—and in each, with the best campaign possible for us to make, we obtained a vote of only one-third. One man out of every three voted for the disfranchisement of the women of his household, while two out of every three voted against it.

We beg, therefore, that instead of insisting that a majority of the individual voters must be converted before women shall have the franchise, you will give us the more hopeful task of appealing to the representative men in the Legislatures of the several States. You need not fear that we shall get suffrage too quickly if Congress submits the proposition, for even then we shall have a long siege in going from Legislature to Legislature to secure the vote of three-fourths of the States necessary to ratify the amendment. It may require twenty years after Congress has taken the initiative step, to obtain action by the requisite number, but once submitted by Congress it always will stand until ratified by the States.

S. B. A. before the Judicary Committee of the House of Representatives, March 9, 1884. Miss Anthony opened the hearing with an earnest address in which she referred to the hundreds of thousands of petitions which had been sent to Congress for woman suffrage—far more than for any other measure—and continued: (Hist. of Woman Suffrage Vol I p. 43-3)

Negro suffrage was again and again overwhelmingly voted down in various States—New York, Connecticut, Ohio, etc., and you know, gentlemen, that if the negro had never had the right to vote until the majority of the rank and file of white men, particularly foreign-born men, had voted "Yes," he would have gone without it till the crack of doom. It was because of the prejudice of the unthinking majority that Congress submitted the question of the negro's disfranchisement to the Legislatures of the several States, to be adjudicated by the educated, broadened representatives of the people. We now appeal to you to lift the decision of woman suffrage from the vote of the populace to that of the Legislatures, that you may thereby be as considerate, as just, to the women of this nation as you were to the male ex-slaves.

How every new privilege granted to women has been by the Legislatures. The liberal laws for married women, the right of the wife to own and control her inherited property and separate earnings, the right of women to vote at school elections in a dozen States, the right to vote on all questions in three Territories, have been gained through the Legislatures. Had any one of these beneficent propositions been submitted to the masses, do you believe a majority would have placed their sanction upon them? I do not.
It takes all too many of us women, and too much of our hard earnings, from our homes and from the works of charity and education of our respective localities, even to come to Washington, session after session, until Congress shall have submitted the proposition, and then to go from Legislature to Legislature, urging its adoption; but when you insist that we shall beg at the feet of each and every individual voter of each and every one of the thirty-eight states, native and foreign, white and black, educated and ignorant, you doom us to insaluable hardships and sacrifices and to most exasperating insults and humiliations. I pray you, therefore, save us from the fate of working and waiting for our freedom until we shall have educated the masses of men to consent to give their wives and sisters equality of rights with themselves. You surely will not compel us to wait the enlightenment of all the freedom of this nation and all the newly-made voters from the monarchial governments of the Old World!

Liberty for one's self is a natural instinct possessed alike by all, but to be willing to accord liberty to another is the result of education, but also of self-discipline, of the practice of the golden rule—"Do unto others as you would others should do unto you." Therefore we ask that the question of equality of rights to women shall be arbitrated upon by the picked men of the nation in Congress, and the picked men of the several States in their respective Legislatures.

The entire audience arose with clapping of hands and waving of handkerchiefs to greet this leader, who had come from England to attend the Council. In the course of a long dignified address of welcome she said: (Hist. of Women Suffrage Vol I page 188-5)

Whether our feet are compressed in iron shoes, our faces hidden with veils and masks; whether yoked with cows to draw the plow through its furrows, or classed with idiots, lunatics and criminals in the laws and constitutions of the State, the principle is the same; for the humiliations of spirit are as real as the visible badges of servitude. A difference in government, religion, laws and social customs makes but little change in the relative status of woman to the self-constituted governing classes, so long as subordination in all countries is the rule of her being. Through suffering we have learned the open seeming to the hearts of each other. With the spirit forever in bondage, it is the same whether housed in golden cages with every want supplied, or wandering in the dreary deserts of life, friendless and forsaken. Long ago we of America heard of the deep yearnings of the souls of women in foreign lands for freedom responsive to our own. Mary Wollstonecraft, Madame de Stael, Madame Roland, George Sand, Frederica Bremer, Elizabeth B. Browning, Frances Wright, and George Eliot alike have pictured the wrongs of women in poetry and prose. Though divided by vast mountain ranges, oceans and
plains, yet the psalms of our lives have been in the same strain—too long, alas, in the minor key—for hopes deferred have made the bravest hearts sometimes despairing. But the same great over-soul has been our faith and inspiration. The steps of progress already achieved in many countries should encourage us to turn our hopes anew to songs of victory......

I think most of us have come to feel that a voice in the laws is indispensable to achieve success; that these great moral struggles for higher education, temperance, peace, the rights of labor, international arbitration, religious freedom, are all questions to be finally adjusted by the action of government and thus, without a direct voice in legislation, woman's influence will be entirely lost.

Experience has fully proved that sympathy as a civil agent is vague and powerless until caught and coined into logical propositions and coaxed into law. When every prayer and tear represents a ballot, and the mothers of the race will no longer weep in vain over the miseries of their children. The active interest women are taking in apathy and indifference in which we found them a half a century ago, and the contrast is their condition between now and then is equally marked. Those who endured the merciless storm of ridicule and persecution, mourned over by friends, ostracized in social life, scandalized by enemies, denounced by the pulpit, sacrificed and caricatured by the press, may well congratulate themselves on the marked change in public sentiment which this magnificent gathering of educated women from both hemispheres so triumphantly illustrates....

We, who lead the children of Israel, have been wandering in the wilderness of prejudice and ridicule for forty years feel a peculiar tenderness for the young women on whose shoulders we are about to leave our burdens. Although we have opened a pathway to the promised land and cleared up much of the underbrush of false sentiment, logic and rhetoric interwoven with law and custom, which blocked all avenues in starting, yet there are still many obstacles to be encountered before the rough journey is ended. The younger women are starting with great advantages over us. They have the results of our experience; they have superior opportunities for education; they will find more enlightened public sentiment for discussion; they will have more courage to take the rights which belong to them. Hence we may look to them for speedy conquests. When we think of the vantage-ground women hold to-day, in spite of all the artificial obstacles placed in her way. We are filled with wonder as to what the future mothers of the race will be when free to have complete development.

Thus far women have been mere echoes of men. Our laws and constitutions, our creeds and codes, and the customs of social life are all of masculine origin. The true woman is as yet a dream of the future. A just government, a humane religion, a pure social life await her coming......
We are here for the express purpose of urging you to present in your respective bodies, a bill to strike the word "male" from the District of Columbia Suffrage Act and thereby enfranchise the women of the District. We ask that the experiment of woman suffrage shall be made here, under the eye of Congress, as was that of negro suffrage. Indeed, the District has ever been the experimental ground of each step toward freedom. The auction-block was here first banished, slavery here first abolished, the freedmen here first enfranchised; and we now ask that women here shall be first admitted to the ballot. There was great fear and trepanion all over the country as to the results of negro suffrage, and you deemed it right and safe to inaugurate the experiment here; and you all remember that three day's discussion in 1866 on Senator Sumner's proposition to strike out the word "male." Well do I recollect that with what extended hope we watched the daily reports of that debate, and how we longed that Congress might then declare for the establishment in this District of a real republic. But conscience or courage or something was wanting, and women were hidden still to wait.

Then, on that March day of 1867, the negroes of the District first voted, the success of the election inspired Congress with confidence to pass the proposition for the Fifteenth Amendment, and the different States to ratify it, until it has become a fixed fact that black men all over the nation not only may vote but sit in legislature assemblies and constitution conventions. We now ask Congress to do the same for women. We ask you to enfranchise the women of the District this very winter, so that next March they may go to the ballot box, and all the people of this nation may see that it is possible for women and republic yet stand. There is no reason, no argument, nothing but prejudice against our demand; and there is no way to break down this prejudice but to make the experiment. Therefore, we most earnestly urge it, in full faith that so soon as Congress and the people shall have witnessed its beneficial results, they will go forward with a Sixteenth Amendment which shall prohibit any State from defranchising any of its citizens on account of sex.
Susan B. Anthony's Address to
Women's Nation Loyal League
New York, 1863

The meeting was held in Dr. Cheever's famous Church in New

There is great fear expressed on all sides lest this war shall
be made a war for the negro. I am willing that it shall be,
It is a war to found an empire on the negro in slavery, and
shame on us if we do not make it a war to establish the negro
in freedom, against whom the whole nation, North and South,
East and West, in one mighty conspiracy, has combined from the
beginning.

Instead of suppressing the real cause of the war, it should
have been proclaimed, not only by the people, but by the Preas-
dent, Congress, Cabinet, and every military commander. Instead
of President Lincoln's waiting two long years before calling to
the side of the Government the four millions of allies whom
we have had within the territory of rebellion, and it should
have been the first decree he sent forth. Every hour's delay,
every life sacrificed up to the proclamation that called the
slave to freedom and to arms, was nothing less than downright
murder by the Government. For by all the laws of common sense
to say nothing of laws military or national—if the President,
as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, could have devised
any possible means whereby he might hope to suppress the re-
bellion, without the sacrifice of the life of one loyal cit-
izen, without the sacrifice of one dollar of the loyal North,
it was clearly his duty to have done so. Every interest of the
insurgents, every dollar of their property, every institution,
however peculiar, every life in every state, even, if necessary,
should have been sacrificed, even before one dollar or one man
should have been drawn from the free States. How much more, then,
was it the President's duty to confer freedom on the four
million slaves, transform them into a peaceful army for the
Union, cripple the rebellion and establish justice, the only
cure foundation of peace? I therefore hail the day when the
Government shall recognize that it is a war for freedom. We talk
about returning to the old Union—"the Union as it was," and "the
Constitution as it is"—about "restoring our country to peace
and prosperity—to the blessed conditions that existed before
the war!" I ask you what sort of peace, what sort of prosper-
ity, have we had? Since the first slave-ship sailed up the
James River with its human cargo, and there, on the soil of
the Old Dominion, sold it to the highest bidder, we have had
nothing but war. Then when pirate captain landed on the
shores of Africa, and there kidnapped the first slavemast negro,
fashioned the first manacle, the struggle between that captain
and that negro was the commencement of the terrible war in the
midst of which we are today. Between the white man and the
African to-day there has been war, and war only. This is only a new form
of it. No, no; we ask for no return to the old conditions. We ask for something better. We want a Union that is a Union in fact, a Union in spirit, not a sham. (Applause)

By the Constitution as it is, the North has stood pledged to protest slavery in the States where it existed. We have been bound, in case of insurrections, to go the aid, not of those struggling for liberty, but of the oppressors. It was politicians who made this pledge at the beginning, and who have renewed it from year to year to this day. These same men have had control of the churches, the Sabbath-schools, and all religious influences; and the women have been a party in complicity with slavery. They have made the large majority in all the different religious organizations throughout the country, and have without protest, fellowshipped the slave-holder as a Christian; accepted pro-slavery preaching from their pulpits; suffered the words "slavery a crime" to be expurgated from all the lessons taught their children, in defiance of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you." They have had no right to vote in their churches, and, like slaves, have meekly accepted whatever morals and religion the selfish interest of politics and trade dictated.

Woman must now assume her God-given responsibilities, and make herself what she is clearly designed to be, the educator of the race. Let her no longer by the mere reflector, the echo of the worldly pride and ambition of man. (applause) Had the women of the North studied to know and to teach their sons the laws of justice to the black man, regardless of the from or the small smile of pro-slavery priest and politician, they would not now be called upon to offer the loved of their households to the bloody Moloch of war. And now, women of the North, I ask you to rise up with earnest, honest purpose, and go forward in the way of the right, fearlessly, as independent human beings, responsible to God alone for the discharge of every duty, for the faithful use of every gift, the good Father has given you. Forget conventionalisms; forget what the world will say, whether you are in your place out of your place; think your best thoughts, speak your best words, do your best works, looking to your own conscience for approval.
Friends and Fellow-Citizens:—I stand before you under indictment for the alleged crime of having voted at the last presidential election, without having a lawful right to vote. It shall be my work this evening to prove to you that in thus doing, I not only committed no crime, but instead simply exercised my citizen's right, guaranteed to me and all United States citizens by the Nation Constitution beyond the power of any State to deny.

Our democratic republican government is based on the idea of the natural right of every individual member thereof to wise and a vote in making and exercising the laws. We assert the province of government to be secure the people in the enjoyment of their inalienable rights. We throw to the winds the old dogma that government can give rights. No one denies that before governments were organized each individual possessed the right to protect his own life, liberty and property. When 100 or 1,100,000 people enter into a free government, they do not barter away their natural rights; they simply pledge themselves to protect each other in the enjoyment of them through prescribed judicial and legislative tribunals. They agree to abandon the methods of brute force in the adjustment of their differences and adopt those of civilization. Nor can you find a word in any of the grand documents left us by the fathers which assumes for government the power to create or to confer rights. The Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, the constitutions of the several States and the organic laws of the Territories, all alike propose to protect the people in the exercise of their Godgiven rights. Not one of them pretends to bestow rights.

All men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Here is no shadow of government authority over rights, or exclusion of any class from their full and equal enjoyment. Here is pronounced the right of all men and "consequently" as the Quaker preacher said, "of all women," to a voice in the government. And here, in this first paragraph of the Declaration, is the Assertion of the natural right of all to the ballot; and how can "the consent of the governed" be given, if the right to vote be denied? Again! (quotation omitted
Surely the right of the whole people to vote is here clearly implied; for however destructive to their happiness this government might become, a disfranchised class could neither alter nor abolish it, nor institute a new one, except by the old brute-force method of insurrections and rebellion. One-half of the people of this nation today are utterly powerless to blot from the statute books an unjust law, or to write there a new one and a just one. The women, dissatisfied as they are with this form of government, that enslaves them, that deprives them of the rights of citizenship, that forces upon them taxation without representation—that compels them to obey laws to which they never have given their consent—that imprisons and hangs them without a trial by a jury of their peers—that robs them, in marriage, of the custody of their own persons, wages and children—are this half of the people who are left wholly at the mercy of the other half, in direct violation of the spirit and letter of the declarations of the framers of this govern-
ment, every one of which was based on the immutable principle of equal rights to all. By these declarations, kings, popes, priests, aristocrats, all were alike de-throned and placed on a common level, politically, with the lowest-born subject or serf. By these, the men, as such, were deprived of their divine right to rule and placed on a political level with women. By the practice of these declarations, all caste and caste distinctions would be abolished, and slave, serf, plebeian, wife, woman, all alike arise from their subjects position to the broader platform of equality.

Thus, you see, these newly-freed men were in possession of every possible right, privilege and immunity of the government, except that of suffrage, and hence needed no constitution amendment for any other purpose. What right in this country has the Irishman the day after he receives his naturalization papers that he did not possess the day before, save the right to vote and hold office? The chinsman now crowing our Pacific coast are in precisely the same position. What privilege or immunity has California or Oregon the right to deny them, save that of the ballot? Clearly, then, if the Fourteenth Amendment was not to secure to black men their right to vote it did nothing for them, since they possess everything else before. But if it was intended to prohibit the States from denying or abridging their right to vote, then it did the same for all persons, white women included, born or naturalised in the United States for the amendment does not say that all male persons of African descent, but that all persons are citizens.

The second section is simply a threat to punish the States by reducing their representation on the floor of Congress, should they disfranchise any of the male citizens, nor does it in any wise weaken or invalidate the universal guarantee of the first section.

However much the doctors of the law may disagree as to whether people and citizens, in the original constitution, were one and
the same, or whether the privileges and immunities in the Fourteenth Amendment include the right of suffrage: the question of the citizen's right to vote is forever settled by the Fifteenth Amendment. "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude." How can the State deny or abridge the right of the citizen, if the citizen does not possess it? There is no escape for the conclusion that to vote is the citizen's right and the specifications of race, color or previous condition of servitude can in no way impair the force of that emphatic assertion that the citizen's right to vote shall not be denied or abridged.

The political strategy of the second section of the Fourteenth Amendment fail to coerce the rebel States into enfranchising their negroes, and the necessities of the Republican party demanding their votes throughout the South to insure the re-election of Grant in 1872, that party was compelled to place this positive prohibition of the Fifteenth Amendment upon the United States and all the States thereof.

If once we establish the false principle that United States citizenship does not carry with it the right to vote in every State in the Union, there is no end to the petty tricks and联盟 devices which will be attempted to exclude one and another class of citizens from the right of suffrage. It will not always be the men combining to disfranchise all women; native born men combining to abridge the rights of all naturalized citizens, as in Rhode Island. It will not always be the rich and educated who may combine to cut off the poor and ignorant; but we may live to see the hard-working, unsanctified day laborers, foreign and native born, learning the power of the ballot and their vast majority of numbers, combined and amend State constitutions as to disfranchise any such as the Vanderbuilt the Stewards, the Comkings and the Fentons. It is a poor rule that won't work more ways than one. Establish this precedent, admit the State's right to deny suffrage, and there is no limit to the confusion, discord and disruption that may await us. There is and can be but one safe principle of government-equal rights to all. Discrimination against any class on account of color, race, nativity, sex, property, culture, can but embitter and disaffect that class, and thereby endanger the safety of the whole people. Clearly, then, the national government not only must define the rights of citizens, but must stretch out its powerful hand and protect them in every State in the Union.

If, however, you will insist that the Fifteenth Amendment's emphatic interdiction against robbing United States citizens of their suffrage "on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude," is a recognition of the right of either the United States or any State to deprive them of the ballot for any or all other reasons, I will prove to you that the

end of
class of citizens for whom I now plead are, by all the principles of our government and many of the laws of the States, included under the term "previous condition of servitude."

Consider first married women and their legal status. What is servitude? "The condition of a slave." What is a slave? "A person who is robbed of the proceeds of his labor; a person who is subject of the will of another." By the laws of Georgia, South Carolina and all the States of the South, the Negro had no right to the custody and control of his person. He belonged to his master. If he were disobedient, the master had the right to use correction. If the Negro did not like the correction and ran away, the master had the right to use coercion to bring him back. By the laws of almost every State in this Union today, North as well as South, the married woman has no right to the custody and control of her person. The wife belongs to the husband; and if she refuses obedience he may use moderate correction, and if she does not like his moderate correction and leaves his "bed and board," the husband may use moderate coercion to bring her back. The little word "moderate," you see, is the saving clause for the wife, and would doubtless be overstepped should her offended husband administer his correction with the "cat-o'-nine-tails," or accomplish his coercion with blood-hounds.

Again the slave had no right to the earnings of his hands, they belonged to his master; no right to the custody of his children, they belonged to his master; no right to sue or to be sued, or to testify in the courts. If he committed a crime, it was the master who must sue or be sued. In many of the States there has been special legislation, giving married women the right to property inherited or received by bequest, or earned by the pursuit or any avocation outside the home; also given them the right to sue and be sued in matters pertaining to such separate property; but not a single State of this Union has ever secured the wife in the enjoyment of her right to equal ownership of the joint earnings of the marriage partnership. And since, in the nature of things, the vast majority of married women never earn a dollar by work outside their families, or inherit a dollar from their fathers, it follows that from the day of their marriage to the day of the death of their husbands not one of them ever has a dollar, except it shall apiece her husband to let her have it.

In some of the States, also, all laws have been passed giving to the mother a joint right with the father in the guardianship of the children. Twenty-five years ago, when our woman's rights movement commenced, by the laws of all the States the father had the sole custody and control of the children. No matter if he were brutal, drunken libertine, he had the legal right, without the mother's consent, to apprentice her sons to musketeers or her daughters to the brothel-keepers. He could even will away an unborn child from the mother. In most of the States this law
still powerless, and the mothers are utterly powerless.

I doubt if there is, today, a State in this Union where a married woman can sue or be sued for slander of character, and until recently there was not one where she could sue or be sued for injury of person. However damaging to the wife’s reputation any slander may be, she is wholly powerless to institute legal proceedings against her accuser unless her husband shall join with her; and how often have we heard of the husband conspiring with some outside barbarian to blast the good name of his wife? A married woman can not testify in courts in cases of joint interest with her husband.

A good farmer’s wife in Illinois, who has all the rights she wants, had made for herself a full set of false teeth. The dentist pronounced them an admirable fit, and the wife declared it gave her fits to wear them. The dentist sued the husband for his bill; his counsel brought the wife as witness; the judge ruled her off the stand saying, “A married woman can not be a witness in matters of joint interest between herself and her husband.” Think of it, ye good wives, the false teeth in your mouths are a joint interest with your husbands, about which you are legally incompetent to speak! If a married woman is injured by accident, in nearly all the states it is her husband who must sue, and it is to him that the damages will be awarded. In Massachusetts a married woman was severely injured by a defective sidewalk. Her husband sued the corporation and recovered $13,000 damages, which belonged to him absolutely, and whenever that unfortunate wife wished a dollar of that money she must ask her husband for it, and if he be of a niggardly nature she will hear him say, every time, “What have you done with the twenty-five cents I gave you yesterday?” Isn’t such a position humiliating enough to be called “servitude?” That husband sued and obtained damages for the loss of the services of his wife, precisely as he would have done had it been his ox, cow or horse; and exactly as the master, under the old regime, would have recovered for the services of his slave.

I submit the question, if the deprivation by the law of the ownership of one’s own person, wages, property, children, the denial of the right as an individual to sue and be sued and testify in the courts, is not a condition of servitude most bitter and absolute, even though a sacred name of marriage! Does any lawyer doubt my statement of the legal status of married women? I will in fact remind him of the fact that the common law of England prevails in every State in but two in this Union, except where the legislature has enacted special laws annulling it. I am ashamed that not one of the States yet has blotted from its statute books the old law of marriage, which summed up in the few words possible, is in effect “husband and wife are one and that one the husband.”
Thus all married women and widows, by the laws of the several States, be technically included in the Fifteenth Amendment's specification of "condition of servitude," present or previous. The facts also prove that, by all the great fundamental principles of our free government, not only married women but the entire womanhood of the nation are in a "condition of servitude" as surely as were our Revolutionary fathers when they rebelled against King George. Women are taxed without representation, governed by not their consent, tried, convicted and punished without a jury of their peers, is all this tyranny any less humiliating and degrading to women under our democratic-republican government today than it was to men under their aristocratic, monarchial government one hundred years ago? There is not an utterance of John Adams, John Hancock, Patrick Henry, but finds a living response in the soul of every intelligent, patriotic woman of the nation. Show me a justicia-loving woman property-holder, and I will show you one whose world is fixed with all the indignation of 1776 every time the tax-collector presents himself at her door. You will not find one such but feels her condition of servitude as galling as did James Otis when he said: (Quotation omitted)

What was the three-penny tax on tea or the paltry tax on aper and sugar to which our Revolutionary father were subjected, when compared with the taxation of the women of this republic? And again, to show that disfranchisement was precisely the slavery of which the fathers complained, allow me to cite Benjamin Franklin, who in those olden times was admitted to be good authority, not merely in domestic but also in political economy: (Quotation omitted)

Suppose I read it with the feminiae gender: (Quotation omitted)

And yet one more authority, that of Thomas Paine, than whom not one of the Revolutionary patriots more ably vindicated the principles upon which our government is founded: (Quotation omitted)

Is anything further needed to prove woman's condition of servitude sufficient to entitle her to the guarantees of the Fifteenth Amendment? Is there a man who will not agree with me that to talk of freedom without the ballot is mockery to the women of this republic, precisely as New England's orator, Wendell Phillips, at the close of the late war declared it to be to the newly emancipated black man? I admit that, prior to the rebellion, by common consent, the right to enslave, as well as to disfranchise both native and foreign born persons, was conceded to the States. But the one grand principle settled by the war and the reconstruction legislation, is the supremacy of the national government of protecting the citizens of the United States in their right to freedom and the elective franchises, against any and every interference on the part of the several States, and again and again have the American people asserted the triumph of this principle by their overwhelming
The one issue of the last two presidential elections was whether the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments should be considered the irrevocable will of the people; and the decision was that they should be, and that it is not only the right, but the duty of the national government to protect all United States citizens in the full enjoyment and free exercise of their privileges and immunities against the attempt of any State to deny or abridge. In this conclusion Republicans and Democrats alike agree. Senator Frelinghuysen said: "The heresy of States rights has been completely buried in these amendments, and as amended, the Constitution confers not only National but State citizenship upon all persons born or naturalized within our limits."

The call for the National Republican Convention of 1872 said: (quotation omitted)

If that means anything it is that Congress should pass a law to protect women in their equal political rights, and that the States should enact laws making it the duty of inspectors of elections to receive the votes of women on precisely the same conditions as they do those of men.

Judge Stanley Matthews, a substantial Ohio Democrat, in his preliminary speech at the Cincinnati Liberal Convention, said most emphatically: (quotation omitted).

President Grant, in his message to Congress, March 30, 1870, on the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment, said, (quotation omitted).

How could four million negroes be made voters if two million out of the four were women?

Benjamin F. Butler, in a recent letter to me, said (quotation omitted).

It is upon this just interpretation of the United States Constitution that our National Woman Suffrage Association, which celebrates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the women's rights movement next May in New York City, has based all its arguments and action since the passage of these amendments. We no longer petition legislature or Congress to give us the right to vote but appear to women everywhere to exercise their too long neglected "citizen's right." We appeal to the inspectors of election to receive the votes of all United States citizens, as it is their duty to do so. We ask the juries to return verdicts of "not guilty" in the cases of law-abiding United States citizens who cast their votes, and inspectors of election who receive and count them.
We ask the judges to render unprejudiced opinions of the law, and wherever there is room for doubt to give the benefit of the side of liberty and equal rights for women, remembering that, as Sumner says, "The true rule of interpretation under our National Constitution, especially since its amendments, it that anything for human rights is constitutional, everything against human rights is unconstitutional." It is on this line that we propose to fight our battle for the ballot—peaceably but nevertheless persistently—until we achieve complete triumph and all United States citizens, men and women alike, are recognized as equal in the government.
When she reached the opera house, the crowd was so dense she
could not get inside and was obliged to go through the engine
room and up the back way to the stage. The gentlemen who were
to announce her could not make their way through the crowd and
do the service was gratefully performed by "Long John" Bent-
worth who was seated on the stage. At the close of the speech
A. Bronson Alcott congratulated the speaker. "You have stated
here this afternoon, in a fearless manner, truths that I have
hardly dared to think, much less to utter." No other speaker,
man or woman, has ever handled this question with such boldness
and severity and the lecture produced a great sensation. Even
the radical Mrs. Stanton wrote her she would never again be
asked to speak in Chicago and Mr. Slayton said she had ruined
her future chances there; nevertheless she was invited by the
same committee the following winter.

"It was given several places in Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa,
Kansas and Missouri to crowded houses and the newspaper comments
were varied. On the occasion of its delivery in Mercantile
Library Hall, St. Louis, in the Star Lecture Course, the Demo-
crat said: "The audience was large and composed of the most
respectable and intelligent of our citizens, a majority being
ladies. Miss Anthony is one of the most remarkable women of
the nineteenth century...and as brilliant a female lecturer
as ever flaunted upon the platform as preachers of social
impossibility."
Though women, as a class, are much less addicted to drunkenness and licentiousness than men, it is universally conceded that they are by far the greatest sufferers from these evils. Compelled by their position in society to depend on men for subsistence, for food, clothing, shelter, for every chance even to earn a dollar, they have no way to escape from the besetted victims of appetite and passion with whom their lot is cast. They must endure, if not endure, these twin vices, embodied, as they so often are, in the person of father, brother, husband, son, and employer. No one can doubt that the sufferings of the debauched, virtuous women, in legal subjection to the mastership of a drunken, immoral husband and father over herself and children, not only from physical abuse, but from spiritual shame and humiliation, must be such as the man himself can not possibly comprehend.

It is not my purpose to harrow your feelings by any attempt at depicting the horrible agonies of mind and body that grow out of these monster social evils. They are already too well known. Searce a family throughout our broad land but has its peace and happiness marred by one or the other, or both. That these evils exist, we all know; that something must be done, we are well acquainted; that the old methods have failed, that man, alone, has proved himself incompetent to eradicate, or even regulate them, is equally evident. It shall be my endeavor therefore, to prove to you that we must now adopt new measures and bring to our aid new forces to accomplish the desired end.

Forty years' efforts by men alone to suppress the evil of intemperance give us the following appalling figures: 600,000 common drunkards! Which reckoning our population to be 49,000,000 gives us one drunkard to every seventeen moderate drinkers and total abstinence men. Granting to each of these 600,000 drunkards a wife and four children, we have 3,000,000 of the women and children of this nation helplessly, hopelessly bound to this vast army of irresponsible victims of appetite.

The roots of the giant evil, intemperance, are not merely moral and social; they extend deep and wide into the financial and political structure of the government; and whenever women, or men, shall intelligently and seriously set themselves about the work of uprooting the liquor traffic, they will find something more than tears and prayers needful to the task. Financial and political power must be combined with moral and social influence, all bound together in one earnest, energetic, persistent force.

The prosecutions in our courts for breach of promise, divorce, adultery, bigamy, seduction, rape; the newspaper reports every day of every year of scandals and outrages, of wife murders and paramour shootings, of abortions and infanticides, are perpetual reminders of men's incapacity to cope successfully with this monster evil of society.
The statistics of New York show the number of professional prostitutes in that city to be over twenty thousand. Add to these the thousands and tens of thousands of Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, New Orleans, St. Louis, Chicago, San Francisco, and all our cities, great and small, from ocean to ocean and what a holocaust of the womanhood of the nation is sacrificed to the insatiate Moloch of lust. And yet more: those myriads of wretched women, publicly known as prostitutes, constitute but a small portion of the number who actually tread the paths of vice and crime. For, as the oft-broken ranks of the vast army of common drunkards are steadily filled by the boasted moderate drinkers, so are the ranks of professional prostitution continually replenished by discouraged seduced, deserted, unfortunates, who can no longer hide the terrible secret of their lives.

The Albany Law Journal, of December, 1876, says: (Quotation omitted)

In 1869 the Catholics established a Founding Hospital in New York City. At the close of the first six months Sister Irene reported thirteen hundred little waifs laid in the basket at her door. That meant thirteen hundred of the daughters of New York, with trembling hands and breaking hearts, trying to bury their sorrow and their shame from the world’s cruel gaze. That meant thirteen hundred mother’s hopes blighted and blasted. Thirteen hundred Rachels weeping for their children because they were not!

Nor is it womanhood along that is thus fearfully sacrificed. For every betrayed woman, there is always the betrayer, man. For every abandoned woman there is always one abandoned man and oftener many more. It is estimated that there are 50,000 professional prostitutes in London, and Dr. Ryan calculates that there are 400,000 men in that city directly or indirectly connected with them, and that this vice causes the city an annual expenditure of $40,000,000.

All attempts to describe the loathsome and contagious disease which it engenders defy human language. The Rev. Wm. J. Elliot, of St. Louis, say of it: (Quotation omitted).

Man’s legislative attempts to set back this fearful tide of social corruption have proved even more futile and disastrous than have those for the suppression of intemperance—as witness the Contagious Diseases Acts of England and the St. Louis experiment. And yet efforts to establish similar laws are constantly made in our large cities, New York and Washington barely escaping last winter.

To license certain persons to keep brothels and saloons is but to throw around their traffic the shield of law, and thereby to blunt the edge of all moral and social efforts against them. Nevertheless, in every large city, brothels are virtually
licensed. When "Maggie Smith," is to appear before the police
court at the close of each quarter, to pay her fine of $10, $20,
or $100, as an inmate of a house of ill-fame that, too,
is permission for her and all of her class to follow their trade
against the statute laws of the State, and that with impunity.

The work of women is not to lessen the severity of the certainty
of the penalty for the violation of the moral law, but to
prevent this violation by the removal of the causes which lead
to it. These causes are said to be wholly different with
the sexes. The acknowledged incentive, to this vice on the part
of man in his own abnormal passion; while on the part of women,
in the great majority of cases, it is conceded to be destitu-
tion—absolute want of the necessaries of life. Lecky, the fam-
cous historian of European morals, says: (Quotation omitted).

All other conscientious students of this terrible problem, on
both continents, agree with Mr. Lecky. Hence, there is no es-
cape from the conclusion that, while woman's want of bread in-
duces her to pursue this vice, man's love of the vice itself
leads him into it and holds him there. While statistics show
no lessening of the passionate demand on the part of man,
they reveal a most frightful increase of the temptations, the
necessities, on the part of woman.

In the olden times, when the daughters of the family, as well
as the wife were occupied with useful and profitable work in the
household, setting the meals and washing the dishes three times
in every day of every year, doing the baking, the brewing, the
washing and the ironing, the whitewashing, the butter and cheese
and soap making, the mending and the making of clothes for the
entire family, the carding, spinning and weaving of the cloth—
then everything to eat, to drink to wear was manufactured in
the home, almost as young women went out of work." But now,
when nearly all these handicrafts are turned over to men and
machinery, tens of thousands, nay, millions, of the women of
both hemispheres are thrust into the world's exter market of
work to earn their own subsistence. Society, ever slow to change
its condition presents to these millions but few and meager
shames. Only the barest necessaries, and oftentimes not even
these, can be purchased with the proceeds of the most excessive
and exhausting labor.

Hence, the reward of virtue for the homeless, friendless, pen-
niless woman is over a scanty larder, a pinched, patched, faded
wardrobe, a dank basement or rickety garret, with the colder,
shabbier sohn and neglect of the more fortunate of her sex.
Nightly, as weary and worn from her day's toil she wends her
way through the dark alleys towards her still darker abode,
where only cold and hunger await her, she sees on every side
and at every turn the gilded hand of vice and crime outstretched,
beckoning her to food and clothes and shelter; hears the whisper
in softest accents, "Come with me and I will give you all the
comforts, pleasures and luxuries that love and wealth can buy.
" Since the vast multitudes of human beings, women like
de men, are born to the sorrows and miseries of the world, can
we wonder that so many poor girls, fall, that so many accept
material ease and comfort at the expense of spiritual purity
and peace? Should we not wonder, rather, that so many escape
the sad fate?

Clearly, then, the first step toward solving this problem is to
lift this vast army of poverty-stricken women who now crowd
our cities, above the temptation, the necessity, to sell them-
sewelves, in marriage or out, for bread and shelter. To do that,
girls, like boys, must be educated— to some lucrative employments;
women, like men, must have equal chances to live. If the plan
that poverty is the cause of women's prostitution be not true,
perfect equality or chances to earn honest bread will demon-
strate the falsehood by removing that pretext and placing her
on the same plane with him. Then, if she is found in the ranks
of vice and crime, she will be there for the same reason that
man is and, from an object of pity, she, like him, will become a
fit subject for contempt. From being the party aimed against,
she will become an equal sinner, if not the greater of the two.
Women, like men, must not only have "fair play" in the world of
work and self-support, but, like men, must be eligible to all
the honors and encomiums of society and government. Marriage,
to women as to men, must be a luxury, not a necessity; an
incident of life, not all of it. And the only possible way
to accomplish this great change is to accord to women equal power
in a republic. Hence, our first and most urgent demand—that
women shall be protected in the exercise of their inherent,
personal, citizen's right to a voice in the government, munici-
pal, state, national.

Alexander Hamilton said one hundred year ago, "Give to a man the
right over my subsistence, and he has power over my whole moral
being." No one doubts the truth of this assertion as between
man and man; while, as between men and women not only does
almost no one believe it, but the masses of people deny it.
And yet it is the fact of man's possession of the right over
woman's subsistence which gives to him the power to dictate to
her a moral code vastly higher and purer than the one he chooses
for himself. Not less true is it, that the fact of woman's
dependence on man for his subsistence renders her utterly pow-
erless to exact from him the same high moral code she chooses
for herself.

Of the 8,000,000 women over twenty-one years of age in the Unit-
ed States, 3,999,900, one out of every ten, are unmarried, and ful-
lly one-half of the entire number, or 4,000,000 support them-
selves wholly or in part by the industry of their own hands and
brains. All of these, married or single, have to ask man
as an individual, a corporation, or a government, to grant them
even the privilege of hard work and small pay. The toil of thousands of poor but respectable young girls soliciting, copying, clerking, shop work, teaching, must ask of men, and not seldom receive in response, "Why work for a living? There are other ways!"

Whoever controls work and wages, controls morals. Therefore, we must have women employers, superintendents, committees, legislators; wherever girls go, to seek the means of subsistence, there must be some woman. Nay, more; we must have women teachers, lawyers, doctors—that wherever women go to seek counsel—spiritual, legal, physical—there, too, they will be sure to find the best and noblest of their own sex to minister to them.

Independence is happiness. "No man should depend upon another, not even upon his own father. By depend I mean, obey without examination—yield to the will of any one whatsoever." This is the conclusion to which Pierre, the hero of Madame Sand's "Honneur Sylvantere," arrives, after running away from the uncle who had determined to marry him to a woman he did not choose to wed. In freedom he discovers that, though deprived of all the luxuries to which he had been accustomed, he is happy, and writes his friend that "without having realized it, he had been unhappy all his life; and had suffered from his dependent condition; that nothing in his life, his pleasures, his occupations, had been of his own choice. And is not this the precise condition of what men call the "better half" of the human family?

In one of our western cities I once met a beautiful young woman, a successful teacher in its public schools, and only daughter who had left her New England home and all its comforts and luxuries and culture. Her father was a member of Congress and could bring to her all the attractions of Washington society. That young girl said to me, "The happiest moment of my life was when I received into my hands my first month's salary for teaching." Not long after, I met her father in Washington, spoke to him of his noble daughter, and he said: "Yes, you women's rights to his noble daughter, and he said: "Yes, you women's rights have robbed me of my only child and left the home of my old age sad and desolate. Would you ask that the notion of supporting herself had never entered her head? Had that same lovely, cultured, energetic young girl left the home, the luxury, and protection of the New England home for marriage, instead of self-support, had she gone out to be the light and joy of a husband's life, instead of her own, had she but chosen another man, instead of her father, to decide for her all her pleasures and occupations; had she but taken another position of dependence, instead of one of independence, neither her father nor the world would have felt the change one to be condemned....

Fathers should be most particular about the men who visit their daughters, and, to further this reform, pure women not only must refuse to meet intimately and to marry impure men, but, finding themselves deceived in their husbands, they must refuse to con-
times in the marriage relation with them. We have had quite
enough of the sickly sentimentality which accounts the women a
heroin and a saint for remaining the wife of a drunken, immoral
husband, incurring the risk of her own health and poisoning the
life-blood of the young beings that result from this unholy
alliance. Such company as ye keep, such ye are! must be the max-
im of married, as well as unmarried women.........

So long as the wife is held innocent in continuing to live with
a libertine and every girl whom he inveigles and betrays and
becomes an outcast whom no other wife will tolerate in her
house, there is, there can be, no hope of solving the problem
of prostitution. As long experience has shown, these poor,
homless girls of the world can not be relied on as a police
force, to hold all husbands true to their marriage vows. Here
and there they will fail and, where they do, wives must make
not the girls alone, but their husband also suffer for their
infidelity, as husbands never fail to do when their wives weak-
ly and wickedly yield to the blandishments of other men.

In a western city the wives conspired to burn down a house of
ill-fame in which their husbands had placed a half-dozen of the
demi-monde. Would it not have shown much more womanly wisdom
and virtue for these legal wives to have refused to recognize
their husbands, instead of wreaking their vengeance on the
heads of these wretched women? But how could they without
finding themselves, as a result, powerless and homeless? The
person, the service, the children, the subsistence, of each and
every one of those women belonged by law, not to herself, but to
her unfaithful husband.

Now, why is it that man can hold woman to this high code of
morals, like Caesar's wife—not only pure but above suspicion—and
so surely and severely punish her for every departure, while
she is so helpless, so powerless to check him in his license, or
to extricate herself from his presence and control? His power
grows out of his right over her subsistence. Her lack of power
grows out of her dependence on him for her food, her clothes,
her shelter.

Marriage never will cease to be a wholly unequal partnership
until the law recognizes the equal ownership in the joint
earnings and possessions. The true relation of the sexes nev-
er can be attained until woman is free and equal with man.
Neither in the making nor executing of the laws regulating
relations has woman ever had the slightest vote. The statutes
for marriage and divorce for adultery, breach of promise,
seduction, rape, bigamy, abortion, infanticide—all were made
by men. They, alone, decide who are guilty of violation of these
laws and what shall be their punishment, with judge, jury and
advocate all men, with no woman's voice heard in our courts,
save as accused or witness, and in many cases the married woman
is denied the poor privilege of testifying as to her own guilt
or innocence of the crime charged against her.
Since the days of Moses and the prophets, men and ministers have preached the law of "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and the children's children, to the third and fourth generations." But with absolute power over woman and all the conditions of life for the whole 6,000 years, man has proved his utter inability either to put away his own iniquities, or to cease to hand them down from generation to generation; hence, the only hope of reform is in sharing his absolute power with some other than himself, and that other must be woman. When no longer a subject, but an equal—a free and independent sovereign, believing herself created primarily for her own individual happiness and development and secondarily for man's, precisely as man believes she will constitute herself sole umpire in the sacred domain of motherhood. Then, instead of feeling it her Christian duty to live with a drunken, profligate husband, handing down to her children his depraved appetites and passions, she will know that God's curse will be upon her and her children if she flees not from him as from a pestilence.

It is worse than folly, it is madness, for women to delude themselves with the idea that their children will escape the terrible penalty of the law. The taint of their birth will surely follow them. For pure women to continue to devote themselves to their man-appointed mission of visiting the dark pavilions of society and struggling to reclaim the myriads of badly-born human beings swarming there, is as hopeless as would be an attempt to indle the ocean with a teaspoon; as unphilosophical as was the undertaking of the Old American Colonisation Society, which, with great labor and pains and money, redeemed from slavery and transported to Liberia annually 400 negroes; or the Fugitive Slave Societies, which succeeded in running off to Canada, on their "under-ground railroads," some 40,000 in a whole quarter of a century. While these good men were thus toiling to rescue the 400 or the 40,000 individual victims of slavery, each day saw hundreds and each year thousands of human beings born into the terrible condition of chattelism. All see and admit now that none but the Abolitionists saw the only effectual work was the entire overthrow of the system of slavery; the abrogation of the law which sanctioned the right of property in

In answer to my proposal to speak in one of the cities of Iowa, an earnest woman replied, "It is impossible to get you an audience; all of our best women are at present engaged in an effort to establish a "Home for the Friendless." All the churches are calling for the entire time of their members to get up fairs, dinners, concerts, &c., to raise money. In fact, even our women suffragists are losing themselves in devotion to some institution.

Thus, whenever you go, you find the best woman, in and out of the churches, all absorbed in establishing or maintaining bene-
valent or reform institutions; charitable societies, soup-
houses, ragged schools, industrial schools, mite societies, 
mission schools—at home and abroad—hospitals for the 
sick the aged, the friendless, the foundling, the fallen;
asylums for the orphans, the blind, and deaf and dumb, the in-
sane, the insane, the idiot. The women of this century are 
neither idle or indifferent. They are working with might and 
main to mitigate the evils which stare them in the face on 
every side, but much of their work is without knowledge. It is 
aimed at the effects, not the cause; it is plucking the spoil-
ed fruit; it is lopping off the poisonous branches of the deadly 
upsie tree, which but makes the root more vigorous in sending 
out shoots in every direction. A right understanding of phys-
iological law teaches us that the cause must be removed; 
the tree must be girdled; the tap-root must be severed.

The tap-root of our social ills lies deep down at the very 
foundation of society. It is woman's dependence. It is woman's 
subjection. Hence, the first and only efficient work must be 
to emancipate woman from her enslavement. The wife must no 
longer echo the poet Milton's idea Eve, when she adoringly 
said to Adam, "God, thy law; thou, mine!" She must feel her-
self accountable to God alone for every act, fearing and obey-
ing no man, save where his will is in line with her own high-
est idea of divine law.

The president of the Howard Mission School, New York, said, 
"Miss Anthony,—(quotation omitted)"

"Like the Howard Mission?" said I. "How many less children 
have you now than ten years ago?"

"Oh, no less, but many, many, more."

"Would it not be a practical work, then, to make it possible for 
every mother to support her own children? That is my aim and 
work; while yours is simply to pick up the poor children, 
leaving every girl-child to the mother's heritage of helpless 
poverty and vice. My aim is to change the condition of women 
by self-help; yours, simply to ameliorate the ills that must 
invariably grow out of dependence. My work is to lessen the 
numbers of the poor; yours, merely to lessen the suffering 
of their tenfold increase.

If the divine law visits the sins of the fathers upon the child-
ren, equally so does it transmit to them their virtues. There-
fore, if it is through woman's ignorant subjection to the ty-
ranity of man's appetites and passions that the life-current 
of the race is corrupted, then must it be through her intell-
ligent emancipation that the race shall be redeemed from the 
 curse, and her children and the children's children rise up 
to call her blessed. When the mother of Christ shall be made 
the true model of womanhood and motherhood, when the office of
maternity shall be held sacred and the mother shall consecrate herself, as did Mary, to the one idea of bringing forth the Christ-child, then, and not till then, will this earth see a new order of men and women, prone to good rather than evil.

I am full and firm a believer in the revelation that it is through woman that the race is to be redeemed. And it is because of this faith that I ask for her immediate and unconditional emancipation from all political, industrial, and social and religious subjection.

"What is most needed to insure the future greatness of the empire?" inquired Madame Campan of the great Napoleon. "Mothers!" was the terse and suggestive reply. Ralph Waldo Emerson says, "Men are what their mothers made them." But I say, to hold mothers responsible for the character of their sons while you deny them any control over the surroundings of their lives, is worse the mockery, it is cruel! Responsibilities grow out of rights and powers. Therefore before mothers can be held responsible for the vices and crimes, the wholesale demoralization of men, they must possess all possible right and power to control the conditions and circumstances of their own and their children's lives.

A minister of Chicago sums up the inanities of the great metropolis of the West as follows: 3,000 licensed dram-shops and myriad patrons; 300 gambling houses and countless frequenters, many of them young men from the best families of the city; 79 obscene theatres, with their thousands of degraded men and boys nightly in attendance; 500 brothels, with their thousands of poor girls, bodies and souls sacrificed to the 30,000 or 30,000 depraved men—young and old—married and single—who visit them. While all the participants in all these forms of iniquity, victims and victimizers alike—the women excepted—may go to the polls on every election day and vote for the mayor and members of the common council who will either continue to license these places, or fail to enforce the laws which would practically close them—not a single woman in that city may record her vote against those wretched blots on civilization. The profane, tobacco-chewing, whiskey-drinking, gambling libertines may vote, but not their virtuous intelligent, sober, law-abiding wives and mothers!

You remember the petition of 18,000 of the best women of Chicago, a year ago, asking the common council not to repeal the Sunday Liquor Law? Why were they treated with ridicule and contempt? Why was their prayer unheeded? Was it because the honorable gentlemen had no respect for these women or their demand? No; on the contrary, many of them, doubtless, were men possessed of high regard for women, who would have been glad to aid them in their noble efforts; but the power that placed those men in office, the representatives of the saloons, brothels and
observed show, crowded the council chamber and its corridors, threatening political death to the man who should dare to give his voice or his vote for the maintenance of that law. Could these 12,000 women, with the tens of thousands when they represented, have gone to the ballot-box at the next election and voted to re-elect the men who championed their petition and defeat those who opposed it, does any one doubt that it would have been heeded by the common council?

As the fountain can rise no higher than the spring that feeds it, so a legislative body will enact or enforce no law above the average sentiment of the people who created it. Any and every reform work is sure to lead women to the ballot-box. It is idle for them to hope to battle successfully against the men's barriers of society until they shall be armed with weapons equal to those of the enemy—votes and money. Archimedes said, "Give me a fulcrum on which to plant my lever, and I will move the world." And I say, to give to the woman the ballot, the political fulcrum, on which to plant her moral lever, and she will move the world into a nobler and purer atmosphere.

Two great necessities forced this nation to extend justice and equality to the negro.

First, military necessity, which compelled the abolition of crime and curse of slavery, before the rebellion could be overcome. Second, political necessity, which required the enfranchisement of the newlyfreed men, before the work of reconstruction could begin. The third is now pressing moral necessity—to emancipate women, before social purity, the nation's safeguard, can ever be established.
ERNESTINE L. ROSE
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Ernestine L. Rose, having known of European despotism, followed Mrs. Channing's speech where a letter from two women in prison in Paris had been read. The convention was held at Worcester, Massachusetts, October 23, and 24, 1850 to consider woman's rights, duties and relations. (in "History of Women Suffrage", Volume I, pages 237-42)

After having heard the letter read from our poor incarcerated sisters of France, well might we exclaim, Alas poor France, where is thy glory? Where is the glory of the Revolution of 1848, in which shines forth the pure and magnanimous spirit of an oppressed nation struggling for freedom? Where the fruits of that victory that gave to the world the motto, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity"? A motto destined to hurl the tyranny of kings and priests into the dust, and give freedom to the enslaved millions of the earth! Where, I again ask, is the result of those noble achievements, when woman, oy, one-half of the nation, is deprived of her rights? Has woman then been idle during the contest between "right and might"? Has she been wanting in ar- der and enthusiasm? Has she not mingled her blood with that of her husband, son, and sire? Or has she been recreant in hailing the motto of liberty floating on your banners as an ab- ence of justice, peace, and freedom to man, that at the first step she takes practically to claim the recognition of her rights, she is rewarded with the doom of a martyr?

But right has not yet asserted her peregrative, for might rules the day; and as every good cause must have its martyr, why should woman not be a martyr for her cause? But need we wonder that France, governed as she is by Russian and Austrian des- potism, does not recognize the rights of humanity in the re- cognition of the rights of women, when even here, in this far- famed land of freedom, under a Republic that has inscribed on its banner the great truth that "all men are created free and equal, and endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,"—a declaration borne like the vision of hope, on wings of light to the remotest parts of the earth, an echo of freedom to the oppressed and slave-bonded children of man—when, even here in the very face of this etern- nal truth, woman, the mockingly so-called "better half" of man, has yet to plead for her rights, nay, for her life. For what is life without liberty, and what is liberty without equality of rights? And line of action that might promote it; she has only thankfully to accept what man in his magnanimity decides as best for her to do, and this in what he does not choose to do himself.

Is she then not included in that declaration? Answer, ye wise man of the nation, and answer truly; add not hypocrisy to op-
pression! Say that she is not created free and equal, and therefore (for the sequence follows on the premise) that she is not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But with all the audacity arising from an assumed superiority, you care not to libel and insult humanity as to say, that she is not included in that declaration; and if she is, then what right has man, except that of might, to deprive woman of the rights and privileges he claims for himself? And why, in the name of reason and justice, why should she not have the same rights? Because she is a woman? Humanity recognizes no sex; virtue recognizes no sex; mind recognizes no sex, life and death, pleasure and pain, happiness and misery, recognize no sex. Like man, woman comes involuntarily into existence; like him, she possesses physical and mental and moral powers, on the proper cultivation of which depends her happiness; like him she is subject to all the vicissitudes of life; like him she has to pay the penalty for disobeying nature's laws, and for greater penalties has she to suffer from ignorance of her more complicated nature; like him she enjoys or suffers with her country. Yet she is not recognized as his equal.

In the laws of the land she has no rights; in government she has no voice. And in spite of another principle, recognized in this Republic, namely, that taxation without representation is tyranny, she is taxed without being represented. Her property may be consumed by taxes to defray the expenses of that unholy, unrighteous custom called war, yet she has no power to give her vote against it. From the cradle to the grave she is subject to the power and control of man. Father, guardian, or husband, one conveys her like some piece of merchandise over to the other.

At marriage she loses her entire identity, and her being is said to have become merged in her husband. Has nature thus merged it? Has she ceased to exist and feel pleasures and pains? When she violates the laws of her being, does her husband pay the penalty? When she breaks the moral laws, does she suffer the punishment? When he supplies his wants, is it enough to satisfy her nature? And when at his nightly orgies, in the grog-shop and the oyster-cellar, or at the gambling-table, he squanders the means she helped, by her co-operation and economy, to accumulate, and she awakens to penury and destitution, will it supply the wants of her children to tell them that, owing to the superiority of man she had no redress by law, and that as her being was merged in his, so also ought theirs to be? That an inconsistency, that from the moment she enters that compact, in which she assumes the high responsibility of wife and mother she ceases legally to exist, and becomes a purely submissive being. Blind submission in woman is considered a virtue, while submission to wrong is itself wrong, and resistance to wrong is virtue, alike in woman as in man.

But it will be said that the husband provides for the wife, or in other words, he feeds, clothes, and shelters her. I wish
I had the power to make every one before me fully realize the degradation contained in that idea. Yet he keeps her, and so he doos a favorite horse, by law they are both considered his property. Both may, when the cruelty of the owner compels them to run away, to be brought back to the strong arm of the law, and according to a still extant law of England, both may be lead by the halter to the market-place, and be sold. This is humiliating indeed, but nevertheless true; and the sooner these things are known and understood, the better for humanity. It is no fancy sketch. I know that some endeavor to throw the mantle of romance over the subject, and treat woman like some ideal existence, not liable to the ills of life, but those deal in fancy, that have nothing better to deal in; we have to do with sober, and sad realities, with stubborn facts.

Again, I shall be told that the law presumes the husband to be kind, affectionate, and ready to provide for and protect his wife. But what right, I ask, has the law to presume at all on the subject? What right has the law to intrust the interest and happiness of one being into the hands of another? And if the merging of the interest of one being into the others is a necessary consequence in marriage, why should woman always remain on the losing side? Turn the tables. Let the identity and interest of the husband be merged in the wife. Think you she would act less generously toward him, than he toward her? Think you she is not capable of as much justice, disinterested devotion, and abiding affection, as he is? Oh, how grossly you misunderstand and wrong her nature! But we desire no such undue power over man; it would be as wrong in her to exercise it as it now is in him. All we claim is an equal, legal and social position. We have nothing to do with individual man, we know, he be good or bad, but with the laws that oppress woman. We know that such and unjust laws must in the nature of things make man so too. If he is kind, affectionate, and consistent, it is because the kindlier feelings, instilled by a mother, kept warm by a sister, and cherished by a wife, will not allow him to carry out these barbarous laws against woman.

But the estimation she is generally held in, is as degrading as it is foolish. Man forgets that woman can not be degraded without its reacting on himself. The impress of her mind is stamped on him by nature, and the early education of the mother, which no after-training can entirely affect; and therefore, the estimation she is held in falls back with double force upon him. Yet, from the force of prejudice against her, he knows it not. Not long ago, I saw an account of two offenders, brought before a Justice of New York. One was charged with stealing a pair of boots, for which offence was sentenced to six months' imprisonment; the other crime was assault and battery upon his wife; he was let off with a reprimand from the judge! With my principles, I am entirely opposed to punishment, and hold, that to reform the erring and remove the causes of evil is much more efficient, as well as just, than to punish.
punish. But the judge shows us the comparative value set on
these two kinds of property. But then you must remember that
the boats were taken by a stranger, while the wife was insulted
by her legal owner! Here it will be said, that such degrading
cases are but few. For the sake of humanity, I hope they are.
But as long as women shall be oppressed by unequal law,
she long will she be degraded by man.

We have hardly an adequate idea how all-powerful law is in forming
public opinion, in giving tone and character to the mass of
society. To illustrate my point, look at that infamous, detestable
law, which was written in human blood, and signed and
sealed with life and liberty, that eternal stain on the statute
book of this country, the Fugitive Slave Law. Think you that
before its passage, you could have found any in the free States—
except a few politicians in the market—eager enough to desire
such a law? No! No! Even those who took no interest in the
slave question, would have shrunk from so barbarous a thing.
But no sooner was it passed, than the ignorant mass, the rabble
of the self-styled Union Safety Committee, found out that we
were a law-loving, law-abiding people! Such is the magic power
of law. Hence the necessity to stand against bad ones. Hence
also the reason why we call on the nation to remove the legal
shackles from woman, and it will have a beneficial effect on
that still greater tyrant she has to contend with, Public Opinion.

Carry out the republican principles of universal suffrage, or
strike it from your banners and substitute "Freedom and Power
to one half of society, and Submission and Slavery to the other,"
give woman the elective franchise, but married women have the
same right to property that their husbands have; for whatever
the difference in their respective occupations, the duties of
the wife are as indispensable and far more arduous than the
husband's. Why then should the wife, at the death of her hus-
band, not be heir to the same extent that he is heir to
her? In this inequality there is involved another wrong. When
the wife dies, the husband is left in the undisturbed possession
of all there is, and the children are left with him; no change
is made, as stranger intrudes on his home and his affiliation.
But when the husband dies, the widow, at best receives but a
mere pittance, while strangers assume authority denied to the
wife. The sanctuary of affection must be desecrated by execu-
tors; everything must be rummaged and assessed, lest she
should steal something out of her own house; and to cap the cli-
max, the children must be placed under guardians. When the
husband dies poor, to be sure, no guardian is required, and the
children are left for the mother to care and toil for, as best
she can. But when anything is left for their maintenance, then
it must be placed in the hands of strangers for safe keeping;
the bringing-up and safety of the children are left with the
mother, and safe they are in her hands. But a few hundred or
thousand dollars cannot be intrusted with her!

But, say then, "in case of a second marriage, the children must
Does that reason not hold as good in the case of the husband as in that of the wife? Oh, no! When he marries again, he still retains his identity and power to act; but she becomes merged once more into a mere nonentity; and therefore the first husband must rob her to prevent the second from doing so! Make the laws regulating property between husband and wife, equal for both, and all these difficulties would be removed.

According to a late act, the wife has a right to the property she brings at marriage, receives in any way after marriage. Here is some provision for the favored few; but for the laboring many, there is none. The mass of the people commence life with no other capital than the union of heads, hearts, and hands. To the benefit of this best of capital, the wife has no right. If they are unsuccessful in married life, who suffers more the bitter consequences of poverty than the wife? But if successful, she cannot call a dollar her own, the husband may will away every dollar of the personal property, and leave her destitute and penniless, and she has no redress by law. And even where real estate is left, she receives but a life-interest in a third part of it, and at her death, she cannot leave to any one belonging to her; it falls back even to the remotest relatives. This is law; but where is the justice of it? Well might we say that laws were made to prevent, not to promote, the ends of justice.

In case of separation, why should the children be taken from the protecting care of the mother? Who has a better right to them than she? How much do fathers generally do toward bringing them up? When he comes home from business, and the child is in good humor and handsome trim, he takes the little darling on his knee and plays with it. But when the wife, with the care of the whole household on her shoulders, with little or no help, is not able to put them in the best of order, how much does he do for them? Oh, no! Fathers like to have children good-natured, well-behaved, and comfortable, but how to put them in that desirable condition is out of their philosophy. Children always depend more on the tender, watchful care of the mother than of the father. Whether from nature, habit, or both, the mother is much more capable of administering to their health and comfort than the father, and therefore she has the best right to them. And where there is property, it ought to be divided toward the maintenance and education of the children.

Much is said about the burdens and responsibilities of married men. Responsibilities indeed there are, if they but felt them; but as to burdens, what are they? The sole province of man seems to be centered in that one thing, attending to some business. I grant that owing to the present unjust and unequal reward for labor, many have to work too hard for a subsistence; but whatever his vocation, he has to attend as much to it before
as after marriage. Look at your bachelors, and see if they do not strive as much for wealth, and attend as steadily to business, as married men. Nor the husband has little or no increase of burden, and every increase of comfort after marriage; while most of the burdens, cares, pains, and penalties of married life fall on the wife. How unjust and cruel, then, to have all the laws in his favor? If any difference should be made by law between husband and wife, reason, justice, and humanity, if their voices were heard, would dictate that it should be in her favor.

Nor there is no reason against woman's elevation, but there are deep-rooted, heart-headed prejudices. The main cause of them is a pernicious falsehood propagated against her being, namely, that she is inferior by her nature. Inferior in what? What has man ever done, that woman, under the same advantages, could not do? In morals, bad as she is, she is generally considered his superior. In the intellectual sphere, give her a fair chance before you pronounce a verdict against her. Cultivate the frontal portion of her brain as much as that of man is cultivated, and she will stand her equal at least. Even now, where her mind has been dwelled on at all, her intellect is as bright, as copious, and as powerful as his. You will tell us that women have no Newtons, Shakespeares, and Murrays. Greater natural powers than even those possessed may have been destroyed in women for want of proper culture, a just appreciation, reward for merit as an incentive to exertion, and freedom of action, without which, mind becomes cramped and stifled, blighting, crushing circumstances—confined within the narrowest possible limits, trodden upon by prejudice and injustice, from her education and position forced to occupy herself almost exclusively with the most trivial affairs—in spite of all these difficulties, her intellect is as good as his. The few bright asterisks in man's intellectual horizon could well be matched by woman, were she allowed to occupy the same elevated position. There is no need of naming the DeStaelis, the Helands, the Somervilles, the Wellingtons, the Sireneys, the Wrights, the Hartmanns, the Manners, the Pallars, Janeles, and many more of modern as well as ancient times, to prove her mental powers, her patriotism, her self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of humanity, and the eloquence that gushes from her pen, from her tongue. These things are too well known to require repetition. And do you ask for fortitude, energy, and perseverance? Then look at woman under suffering, reverse of fortune, and affliction, when the strength and power to rise have sunk to the lowest ebb, when his mind is overwhelmed by the dark waters of despair. She, like the tender ivy plant bent yet unbroken by the storms of life, not only upholds her own hopeful saviour, but sings around the tempest-fallen oak, to speak hope to his faltering spirit, and shed tears him from the returning blast of the storm.
Ernestine B. Rose's
Bible Argument — 1883

Taken from "The History of Woman Suffrage" Vol. I, pages 535-9

If the able theologian who has just spoken had been in Indiana when the Constitution was revised, she might have had a chance to give her definitions of the Bible argument to some effect. At that Convention Robert Dale Owen introduced a clause to give a married woman the right to her property. The clause had passed, but by the influence of a minister was recalled; and by his appealing to the superstition of the members, and by bringing the whole force of Bible argument to bear against the right of woman to her property, it was lost. Had Miss Brown been there, she might have beaten him with his own weapons. For my part, I see no need to appeal to any written authority, particularly when it is so obscure and indefinite as to admit of different interpretations. When the inhabitants of Boston converted their harbor into a teapot rather than submit to unjust taxes, they did not go to the Bible for their authority; for if they had, they would have been told from the same authority to "give unto Caesar what belonged to Caesar." Had the people, when they rose in the night of their right to throw off the British yoke, appealed to the Bible for authority, it would have answered them: "Submit to the powers that be, for they are from God." Not on Human Rights and Freedom, on a subject that is as self-evident as that two and two make four, there is no need of any written authority. But this is not what I intended to speak upon. I wish to introduce a resolution, and leave it to the action of the Convention.

Resolved, That we ask not for our rights as a gift of charity, but as an act of justice. For it is in accordance with the principles of republicanism that, as women has to pay taxes to maintain government, she has the right to participate in the formation and administration of it. That as she is a subject to the laws of her country, she is entitled to a voice in their enactment, and to all the protective advantages they can bestow; and as she is as liable as man to all the vicissitudes of life, she ought to enjoy the same social rights and privileges. Any difference, therefore, in political, civil, and social rights, on account of sex, is in direct violation of the principles of justice and humanity, and as such ought to be held up to the contempt and derision of every lover of human freedom.

... But we call upon the law-makers and law-breakers of the nation, to defend themselves for violating the fundamental principles of the Republic, to disprove their validity. Real they stand arrayed before the bar, not only of injured womanhood, but before the bar of moral consistency; for this question is awakening an interest abroad, as well as at home. Whatever human rights are claimed for man, moral consistency points to
the equal rights of woman; but statesmen dare not openly face the subject, knowing well they can not confute it, and they have not moral courage enough to admit it; and hence, all they can do is shelter themselves under a subterfuge which, though solidified by age, ignorance, and prejudice, is transparent enough for the most benighted vision to penetrate. A strong evidence of this, is given in a reply of Mr. Roebuck, member of Parliament, at a meeting of electors in Sheffield, England. Mr. R., who advocated the extension of the franchise to the occupants of five-pound tenements, was asked whether he would favor the extension of the same to women who pay an equal amount of rent? That was a simple, straight-forward question of justice; one worthy to be asked even in our republican legislative halls. But what was the honorable gentlemen's reply? Did he meet it openly and fairly? Oh, No! but hear him, and I hope the ladies will pay particular attention, for the greater part of the reply contains the draught poor, deluded woman has been accustomed—Flattery! (quotation omitted

Well, this is certainly a nice little romantic bit of parliamentary declamation. What a pity that he should give up all these enjoyments to give woman a vote! Poor man! his happiness must be balanced on the very verge of a precipice, when the simple act of depositing a vote by the hand of woman, would overthrow and destroy it forever. I don't doubt that the honorable gentlemen meant what he said, particularly the last part of it, for such are the views of the unthinking, unreflecting mass of the public, here as well as there. But like a true politician, he commenced very patriotically, for the happiness of society, and finished by describing his own individual interests. His reply is a curious mixture of truth, political sophistry, false assumption, and blind selfishness. But he was placed in dilemma, and got himself out as he could. In advocating the franchise to five-pound tenement-holders, it did not occur to him that woman may possess the same qualification that man has, and in justice, therefore, ought to have the same rights; and when the simple question was put to him (simple questions are very troublesome to statesmen), having too much sense not to see the justness of it, and too little moral courage to admit it, he entered into quite an interesting account of what a delightful little creature woman is, provided only she is kept quietly at home, waiting for the arrival of her lord and master, ready to administer a dose of purification, "which his politically sullied mind is unable to feel." Well! I have no desire to dispute the necessity of it, nor that he owes to woman all that makes life desirable—comforts, happiness, aye, and common sense too, for it's a well-known fact that smart mothers always have smart sons, unless they take after their father. But what of that? Are the benefits woman is capable of bestowing on man, reasons why she must pay the same amount of rent and taxes, without enjoying the same rights that man does?
But the justice of the case was not considered. The honorable gentlemen was only concerned about the "happiness of society." What does the term mean? As a foreigner, I understand by it a collection or union of human beings—men, women, and children, under one general government, and for mutual interest. But Mr. Roebuck, being a native Briton and a member of Parliament, gave us a parliamentary definition, namely, society means the male sex only; for in his solicitude to consult the "happiness of society," he enumerated the benefits man enjoys from keeping woman from her rights, without even dreaming that woman was at all considered in it; and this is the true parliamentary definition, for statesmen never include women in their solicitude for the happiness of society. Oh! not yet recognized as belonging to the honorable body, unless taxes are required for its benefit, or the penalties of law have to be enforced for its security.

Thus, being either unequal in the way of justice, he first flattered her; then, in his ignorance of her true nature, he assumed that if she was equal with man, she would cease to be woman—forsake the partner of her existence, the child of her bosom, dry up her sympathies, stifle her affections, turn recreant to her own nature. Then his bland selfishness took the alarm, lest, if women were more independent, she might not be willing to be the obedient, servile tool, implicitly to obey and minister to the passions and follies of man; "and as he could not rob himself of these inexpressible benefits, therefore he said, No."
Ernestine Rose's Address

to the
Seventh National Woman's Rights Convention
Nov. 25 & 26, 1850

Ernestine L. Rose addressed the Seventh National Woman's Rights Convention in New York, November 1850. (Taken from "History of Woman Suffrage" Vol. I, pp. 661-665)

This morning a young man made some remarks in opposition to our claims. We were glad to hear him, because he gave evidence to an earnest, sincere spirit of inquiry, which always welcome in every true reform movement. And as we believe our cause to be based on truth, we know it can bear the test of reason, and, like gold doubly refined, will come our purer and brighter from the fiery ordeal. The young man, who, I hope, is present, based his principal argument against us. "Because," said he, "you can bring no authority from revelation or from nature." I will not enter into an inquiry as to what he meant by these terms, but I will show him the revelation from which we derive our authority, and the nature in which it is written in living characters. It is true we do not go to revelations written in books; but ours is older than all books, and whatever of good there is in any written revelations, must necessarily agree with ours, or it is not true, for ours only is the true revelation, based in nature and in life. That revelation is no less than the living, breathing, thinking, feeling, and acting revelation manifested in the nature of woman. In her manifold powers, capacities, needs, hopes, and aspirations, lies her title-deed, and whether that revelation was written by nature or by nature's God, matters not, for here it is. No one can disprove it. No one can bring an older, broader, higher, and more sacred basis for human rights. Do you tell me that the Bible is against our rights? Then I say that our claims do not rest upon a book written no one knows when, or by whom. Do you tell me that what Paul or Peter says on the subject? Then again I reply that our claims do not rest on the opinions of anyone, not even on those of Paul and Peter, for they are older than they. Books and opinions, no matter from whom they came, if they are in opposition to human rights, are claimed by me nothing but dead letters. I have shown you that we derive our claims from humanity, from revelation, from nature, and from your Declaration of Independence; all proclaim our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and having life, which fact I presume you do not question, then we demand all the rights and privileges society is capable of bestowing, to make life useful, virtuous, honorable, and happy.

But I am told that woman needs not as extensive an education as man, as her place is only the domestic sphere; only the domestic sphere! Oh, how utterly ignorant is society of the true import of that term. Go to your legislative halls, and your congress; behold those you have sent there to govern you, and as you find them high and low, great or small, noble or base, you can presume
it directly or indirectly to the domestic sphere.

The wisest in all ages have acknowledged that the most important period in human education is in childhood—that period when the plastic mind may be moulded into such exquisite beauty, that no unfavorable influences shall be able entirely to destroy it—or into such hideous deformity, that it shall cling to it like a thick rust eaten into a highly polished surface, which an after-securing shall ever be able entirely to efface. This most important part of education is left entirely in the hands of the mother. She prepares the soil for further culture; she lays the foundation upon which a superstructure shall be erected that shall stand as firm as a rock, or shall pass away like the baseless fabric of vision, and leave not a wreck behind. But the mother can not give what she does not possess; weakness can not impart strength.

Sisters, you have a duty to perform—and duty, like charity, begins at home. In the name of your poor, vicious, outcast, dem-trodden sister! in the name of her who once was as innocent and as pure as you are! In the name of her who has been made the victim of wrong, injustice, and oppression! in the name of men! in the name of all, I ask you, I entreat you, if you have an hour to spare, a dollar to give, or a word to utter—spare it, give it, and utter it, for the elevation of woman! And when your minister asks you for money for missionary purposes, tell him there are higher, and holier, and nobler missions to be performed at home. Then he asks for colleges to educate ministers, tell him you must educate women, that they may be able to go to some useful employment. If he asks you to give to the churches (which means himself) then ask him what he has done for the salvation of woman. Then he speaks to you of leading a virtuous life, ask him whether he understands the causes that have prevented so many of your sisters from being virtuous, and have driven them to degradation, sin, and wretchedness. Then he speaks to you of a hereafter, tell him to help to educate woman, to enable her to live a life of intelligence, and independence, virtue, and happiness here, as the best preparatory step for any other life. And if he has not told you from the pulpit of all these things; if he does not know them; it is high time you inform him, and teach him his duty here in this life.

The subject is deep and vast enough for the wisest heads and purest hearts of the race; it underlies our whole social system. Look at your criminal records—look to your records of mortality, to your cemeteries, peopled by mothers before the age of thirty or forty, and children under the age of five; earnestly and impartially investigate the cause, and you can trace it directly or indirectly to woman's inefficient education; her helplessness, dependent position; her inexperience; her want of confidence in her own noble nature, in her own principles and powers, and her blind reliance in man. We ask, then, for women, an education that shall cultivate her powers, develop, elevate, and ennoble her being, physically, mentally, and morally; to
enable her to take care of herself, and she will be protected. But to give woman as full and extensive an education as man, we must give her the same motives. No one gathers keys without a prospect of having doors to unlock. Man does not acquire knowledge without the hope to make it useful and productive; the highest motives only can call out the greatest exertion. There is a vast field of action open to man, and therefore he is prepared to enter it; widen the sphere of action for woman, throw open to her all the avenues of industry, emolument, usefulness, moral ambition, and true greatness, and you will give her the same noble motives, the same incentives for exertion, application, and perseverance that man possesses—and this can be done only by giving her legal and political rights—pronounce her the equal of man in all the rights and advantages society can bestow, and she will be prepared to receive and use them, and not before. It would be folly to cultivate her intellect like that of man without giving her the right to the proceed of her industry, or to go without giving her the power to protect the property she may acquire; she must therefore have the legal and political rights, or she has nothing. The ballot box, to self-representation, she will see to it that the laws shall be just, and protect her person and her property, as well as that of man. Until she has political rights she is not secure in any she may possess. One legislature may alter some oppressive law, and give her some right, and the next legislature may take it away, for as yet it is only given as an act of generosity, as a charity on the part of man, and not as her right, and therefore it can not be lasting, nor productive of good.

Mothers, women of America! When you hear the subject of Woman's Rights broached, laugh at it and use, ridicule it as much as you please; but never forget, that by the laws of your country, you have no right to your children—the law gives the father as uncontrolled power over the child as it gives the husband over the wife; only the child, when it comes to maturity, the father's control ceases, while the wife never comes to maturity. The father may bequeath, bestow, or sell the child without the consent of the mother. But methinks I hear you say that no man deserving the name of man, or the title of husband and father, could commit such an outrage against the dearest principles of humanity; well, if there are no such men, then the law ought to be amended, a law against which nature, justice, and humanity revolt, ought to be wiped off from the statute book as a disgrace; and if there are such—which unhappily we all know there are—then there is still greater reason why the laws ought to be changed, for bad laws are not made for him who is a law unto himself, but for the lawless. The legitimate object of law is to protect the innocent and inexperienced against the designing and the guilty; we therefore ask every one present to demand of the Legislatures of every State to alter these unjust laws; give the wife an equal right with the husband in the property acquired after
marriage; give the mother an equal right with the father in the
control of children; let the wife at the death of the husband
remain her heir to the same extent that he would have been, at
her death; let the laws be alike for both, and they are sure to
be right; but to have them so, woman must help to make them.

We hear a great deal about the heroism of the battle-field.
What is it? Compare it with the heroism of the woman who
stands up for the right, and it sinks into utter insignificance.
To stand before the cannon's mouth, with death before him and
disgrace behind, excited to frenzy by physical fear, encouraged
by his leader, stimulated by the sound of the trumpet, and
sustained by the still emptier sound of glory, required no
great heroism; the merest coward could be a hero in such a
position; but to face the fire of an unjust and prejudiced
public opinion, to attack the adamantine walls of long-usurped
power, to brave not only the enemy abroad, but often that
severest of all enemies, your own friends at home, requires
a heroism that the world has never yet recognised, that the
battle-field can not supply, but which woman possesses.

When the Allied Powers endeavored to take Sebastopol they found
that every incision and inroad they made in the fortress during
the day was filled up by the enemy during the night; and even
now, after the terrible sacrifice of life to break it down, they
are not safe, but the enemy may build it up again. But in
moral warfare, no matter how thick and impenetrable the for-
tress of prejudice may be, if you once make an inroad in it, that
space can never be filled up again; every effort to replace it
tends only to loosen every other stone, until the whole foun-
dation is undermined, and the superstructure crumbles at our
feet.
Ernestine L. Rose's Address to the Tenth National Woman's Right Convention-1860 at Cooper Institute, N. Y.
Taken from "Hist. of Woman Suffrage" Vol. I, pp. 692-4

Frances Wright was the first woman in this country who spoke on the equality of the sexes. She had indeed a hard task before her. The elements were entirely unprepared. She had to break up the time-hardened soil of conservatism, and her reward was sure—the same reward that is always bestowed upon those who are in the vanguard of any great movement. She was subjected to public odium, slander, and persecution. But these were not the only things that she received. Oh, she had her reward!—that reward of which no enemies could deprive her, which no slanderers could make less precious—the eternal reward of knowing that she had done her duty; the reward springing from the consciousness of right, of endeavoring to benefit unborn generations. How delightful to see the molding of the minds around you, the infusing of your thoughts and aspirations into others, until one by one they stand by your side, without knowing how they came there! That reward she had. It has been her glory, it is the glory of her memory; and the time will come when society will have outgrown its old prejudices, and stepped with one foot, at least, upon the elevated platform on which she took her position, but owing to the fact that the elements were unprepared, she naturally could not succeed to any great extent.

After her, in 1837, the subject of woman's rights was again taken hold of—aye, taken hold by woman; and the soil having been already somewhat prepared, she began to sow the seeds for the future growth, the fruits of which we now begin to enjoy. Petitions were circulated and sent to our Legislature, and who can tell the hardships that then met those who undertook that great work! I went from house to house with a petition for signatures simply asking our Legislature to allow married women to hold real estate in their own name. What did I meet with? Why, the very name exposed one to ridicule, if not worse treatment. The women said: "We have rights enough; we want no more"; and the men, as a matter of course, echoed it, and said: "You have rights enough; may you have too many already." (Laughter). But by perseverance in sending petitions to the Legislature, and, at the same time, enlightening the public mind on the subject, we at last accomplished our purpose. We had to adopt the method which physicians sometimes use, when they are called to a patient who is so hopelessly sick that he is unconscious of his pain and suffering. We had to describe to women their own position, to explain to them the burdens that rested so heavily upon them, and through these means, as a wholesome irritant, we roused the public opinion on the subject, and through public opinion, we acted upon the Legislature,
and in 1848-49, they gave us the great boon for which we asked, by enacting that a woman who possessed property previous to marriage, or obtained it after marriage, should be allowed to hold it in her own name. Thus far, thus good; but it was only the beginning, and we went on. In 1849 we had the first Woman's Rights Convention, and then some of our papers thought it only a very small affair, called together by a few "strong-minded women," and would pass away like a nine-days' wonder. They little knew woman! They little knew that if woman takes anything earnestly in her hands, she will not lay it aside unaccomplished. (Applause). We have continued our Conventions ever since. A few year ago, when we sent a petition to our Legislature, we obtained, with but very little effort, upward of thirteen thousand signatures. What a contrast between this number and the five signatures attached to the first petition, in 1847! Since then, we might have had hundreds of thousands of signatures, but it is no longer necessary. Public opinion is too well known to require a long array of names.

We have been often asked, "What is the use of Conventions? Why talk? Why not go to work?" Just as if the thought did not precede the act! Those who act without previously thinking, are not good for much. Thought is first ever, and then the expression of it, and that leads to action; and action based upon thought never needs to be reversed; it is lasting and profitable, and produces the desired effect. I know that there are many who take advantage of this movement, and then say: "You are doing nothing; only talking." Yes, doing nothing! only talking. We have only broken up the ground and sowed the seed; they are reaping the benefit, and yet they tell us we have done nothing! Mrs. Swiesheim, who has proclaimed herself to be "no woman's rights woman," has accepted a position as inspector of logs and lumber. (Laughter). Well, I have no objection to her having that avocation, if she has a taste and capacity for it—far from it. But she has accepted still more, and I doubt not with great deal more rest and satisfaction—the five hundred dollars salary, and I hope she will enjoy it. Then, having accepted both the office and the salary, she folds her arms, and says: "I am none of your strong-minded women; I don't go for woman's rights." Well, she is still welcome to it. I have not the slightest objection that those who proclaim themselves not strong-minded, should still reap the benefit of a strong mind; it is for them we work. So there are some ladies who think a great deal can be done in the Legislatures without petitions, without conventions, without lectures, without public claim, in fact, without anything, but a little lobbying. Well, if they have a taste for it, they are welcome to engage in it; I have not the slightest objection. Yes, I have, I, as a woman, being conscious of the evil that is done by these lobby loafers in our Legislature and in the halls of Congress, object to it. I will wait five years longer to have a right given to me legitimately, from a sense of justice, rather than buy it in an underhand way of lobbying. Whatever my sentiments may be,
good, bad, or indifferent, I express them; and they are know. Nevertheless, if any desire it, let them do that work. But what has induced them, what has enabled them, to do that work? The Woman's Rights movement, although they are afraid or ashamed even of the name "woman's rights."

You have been told, and much more might be said on the subject, that already the Woman's Rights platform has upon its stage lawyers, ministers, and statesmen—men who are among the highest in the nation. I need not mention Mr. Lloyd Garrison, or Wendell Phillips; but there are others, those even who are afraid of the name of reformer, who have stood upon our platform. Brady! who would ever have expected it? Chapin! Beecher, think of it for a moment! A minister advocating the rights of woman, even her right at the ballot box! What has done it? Our agitation has purified the atmosphere, and enabled them to see the injustices that are done to woman.
Mrs. President—the question of a divorce law seems to me one of the greatest importance to all parties, but I presume that the very advocates of divorce will be called "free love." For my part (and I wish distinctly to define my position), I do not know what others understand by that term; to me, in its truest significance, love must be free, or it ceases to be love. In its low and degrading sense, it is not love at all, and I have as little to do with its name as it reality.

The Rev. Mrs. Blackwell gave us quite a sermon on what woman ought to be, what she ought to do, and what marriage ought to be; an excellent sermon in its proper place, but not when the important question of a divorce law is under consideration. She treats woman as some ethereal being. It is very well to be ethereal to some extent, but I tell you, my friends, it is quite requisite to be a little material also. In all events, we are so, and, being so, it proves a law of our nature.

It were indeed well if woman could be what she ought to be, man what he ought to be, and marriage what it ought to be; and it is to be hoped that through the Woman's Rights movement—the equalizing of the laws, making them more just, and making woman more independent—we will hasten the coming of the millennium, when marriage shall indeed be a bond of union and affection. But, alas! it is not yet; and I fear that sermon, however well meant, will not produce that desirable end; and as long as the evil is here, we must seek it in the face without shrinking, grapple with it manfully, and the more complicated it is, the more courageously must it be analyzed, combated, and destroyed.

Mrs. Blackwell told us that, marriage being based on the perfect equality of husband and wife, it can not be the destroyed, but is it so? Where? Where and when have the sexes yet been equal in physical or mental education, in position, or in law? When and where have they yet been recognized by society, or by themselves, as equal? "Equal in rights," says Mrs. D. But are they equal in rights? If they were, we would need no conventions to claim our rights. "She can assert her equality." Yes, she can assert it, but does that assertion constitute a true marriage? And when the husband holds the iron heel of legal oppression on the subjected neck of the wife until every spark of womanhood is stamped out, will it heal the wounded heart, the Injured spirit, the destroyed hope, to assert her equality? And shall she still continue the wife? Is that a marriage which must not be dissolved?
According to Mr. Greeley's definition, viz., that there is no marriage unless the ceremony is performed by a minister and in a church, the tens of thousands married according to the laws of this and most of the other States, by a lawyer or justice of the peace, a mayor or an alderman, are not married at all. According to the definition of our reverend sister no one has ever yet been married, as woman has never yet been perfectly equal with man. I say to both, take your position, and abide by the consequences. If the few only, or no one, is really married, why do you object to a law that shall acknowledge the fact? You certainly ought not to force people to live together who are not married.

Mr. Greeley tells us, that, marriage being a Divine institution, nothing but death should ever separate the parties; but when he was asked, "Would you have a being who, innocent and inexperienced, in the young and ardent of affection, in the fond hope that the sentiment was reciprocated, united herself to one she loved and cherished, and then found (no matter from what cause) that his profession was false, his heart hollow, his acts cruel, that she was degraded by his vice, despised for his crimes, cursed by his very presence, and treated with every conceivable ignominy—would you have her drag out a miserable existence as his wife?" "No, no," says he; "in that case, they ought to separate." Separate? But what becomes of the union divinely instituted, which death only should part?

The papers have of late been filled with the heart-eicken accounts of wife-poisoning. Whence come these terrible crimes? From the want of a Divorce law. Could the Hardings be legally separated, they would not be driven to the commission of murder to be free from each other; and which is preferable, a Divorce law, to dissolve an unholy union, which all parties agree is no true marriage, or a murder of one, and an execution (legal murder) of the other party? But had the unfortunate woman, just before the poisoned cup was presented to her lips, pleaded for a divorce, Mrs. Blackwell would have read her a sermon equal to St. Paul's "Wives, be obedient to your husbands," only she would have added, "You must assert your equality," but "you must deep with your husband and work for his redemption, as I would do for my husband"; and Mr. Greeley would say, "As you choose to marry him, it is your own fault; you must abide the consequences, for it is a divine institution, a union for life, which nothing but death can end. The Tribune had recently a long sermon, almost equal to the one we had this morning from our reverend sister, on "Fast Women." The evils it spoke of were terrible indeed, but like all other sermons, it was one-sided. Not one single word was said about fast men, except that the "poor victim had to spend so much money." The writer forgot that is is the demand which calls the supply into existence. But what was the primary cause of the tragic end? Echo answers, "what?" Ask the lifeless form of the murdered woman, and she may disclose the terrible secret, and show you
that, could she have been legally divorced, she might not have been driven to the watery grave of a "fast woman."

But what is marriage? A human institution, called out by the needs of social, affectional human nature, for human purposes, its objects are, first, the happiness of the parties immediately concerned, and, secondly, the welfare of society. Define it as you please, these are only its objects; and therefore if, from well-ascertained facts, it is demonstrated that the real objects are frustrated, that instead of union and happiness, there are only discord and misery to themselves, and vice and crime to society, I ask, in the name of individual happiness and social morality and well-being, why such a marriage should be binding for life?—why one human being should be chained for life to the dead body of another? "But they may separate and still remain married." What a perversion of the very term! Is that the union which "death only should part"? It may be according to the definition of the Rev. Mrs. Blackwell's theology and Mr. Treeley's dictionary, but it certainly is not according to common-sense or the dictates of morality. No, no! "It is not well for man to be alone," before nor after marriage.

I therefore ask for a Divorce law. Divorce is now granted for some crimes; I ask it for others also. It is granted for a State's prison offense. I ask that personal cruelty to a wife, whom he swore to "love, cherish, and protect," may be made a heinous crime—a perjury and a State's prison offense, for which divorce shall be granted. Willful desertion for one year should be sufficient cause for divorce, for the willful deserted forfeits the sacred title of husband or wife. Habitual intemperance, or any other vice which makes the husband or wife intolerable and abhorrent to the other, ought to be sufficient cause for divorce. I ask for a law of Divorce, so as to secure the real objects and blessings of married life, to prevent the crimes and immoralities now practiced to prevent "Free Love," in its most hideous form, such as is now carried on but too often under the very name of marriage, where hypocrisy is added to the crime of legalized prostitution. "Free Love," in its degraded sense, asks for no Divorce law. It acknowledges no marriage, and therefore I ask for a law to free men and women from false ones.

But it is said that if divorce were easily granted, "men and women would marry to-day and unmarry to-morrow." Those who say that, only prove that they have no confidence in themselves, and therefore can have no confidence in others. But the assertion is false; it is a libel on human nature. It is the indissoluble chain that corrodes the flesh. Remove the indissolubility, and there would be less separation than now, for it would place the parties on their good behavior, the same as during courtship. Human nature is not quite so changeable; give it more freedom, and it will be less so. We are a good deal the creatures of habit, but we will not be forced. We live (I speak
from experience) in uncomfortable houses for years, rather than move, though we have the privilege to do so every year; but force any one to live for life in one house, and he would run away from it, though it were a palace.

But Mr. Greeley asks, "How could the mother look the child in the face, if she married a second time?" With infinitely better grace and better conscience than to live as some do now, and shew their children the degrading example, how utterly father and mother despise and hate each other, and still live together as husband and wife. She could say to her child, "Was, unfortunately, your father proved himself unworthy, your mother could not be so unworthy as to continue to live with him. As he failed to be a true father to you, I have endeavored to supply his place with one, who, though not entitled to the name, will, I hope, prove himself one in the performance of a father's duties."

Finally, educate woman, to enable her to promote her independence, and she will not be obliged to marry for a home and a subsistence. Give the wife an equal right with the husband in the property acquired after marriage, and it will be a bond of union between them. Diamond cement, applied on both sides of a fractured vase, reunites the parts, and prevents them from falling asunder. A gold band is more efficacious than an iron law. Until now, the gold has all been on one side, and the iron law on the other. Remove it; place the golden band of justice and mutual interest around both husband and wife, and it will hide the little fractures which may have occurred, even from their own perception, and allow them effectually to reunite. A union of interest helps to preserve a union of hearts.
Ernestine L. Rose's speech at the Woman's National Loyal League, 1863

Taken from "History of Woman Suffrage" Vol II, pp. 73-8

Ernestine L. Rose, a native of Poland, was next introduced; she said: Louis Kossuth told us it is not well to look back for regret, but only for instruction. I therefore intend slightly to cast my mind's eye back for the purpose of enabling us, as far as possible, to contemplate the present and foresee the future. It is unnecessary to point out the cause of this war. It is written on every object we behold. It is but too well understood that the primary cause is Slavery; and it is well to keep that in mind, for the purpose of gaining the knowledge how ultimately to be able to crush that terrible rebellion which now desolates the land. Slavery being the cause of the war, we must look to its utter extinction for the remedy.

We have listened this evening to an exceedingly instructive kind and gentle address, particularly that part of it which tells how to deal with the South after we have brought them back. But I think it would be well, at first, to consider how to bring them back.

Abraham Lincoln has issued a Proclamation. He has emancipated all the slaves of the rebel States with his pen, but that is all. To set them really and thorough free, we will have to use some other instrument than the pen. The slave is not emancipated; he is not free. A gentleman once found himself of all of a sudden, without, as far as he knew, any cause, taken into prison. He sent for his lawyer, and told him: "They have taken me to prison." "What have you done?" said the lawyer. "I have done nothing," he replied. "Then, my friend, they can not put you in prison." "Well," he said, "I want you to come and take me out, for I tell you, in spite of all your lawyer logic, I am in prison, and I shall be until you take me out." Now the poor slave has to say, "Abraham Lincoln, you have pronounced me free; still I am a slave, bought and sold as such, and I shall remain a slave till I am taken out of this horrible condition." Then the question is, How? Have not already two long years passed over more than a quarter of a million of the graves of the noblest and bravest of the nation? Is that not enough? No; it has proved not to be enough. Let us look back for a moment. Had the proclamation of John C. Fre­ment been allowed to have its effect; had the edict of Hunter been allowed to have its effect, the war would have been over. Had the people and the Government, for the very commencement of the struggle, said to the south, "You have openly thrown down the gauntlet to fight for Slavery; we will accept it, and the fight for Freedom," the rebellion would long before now have been crushed. You may blame Europe as much as you please, but the heart of Europe beats for freedom. Had they seen us here
accept the terrible alternative of war for the sake of freedom, the whole heart of Europe would have been with us. But such has not been the case. Hence destruction of over a quarter of a million lives and ten millions of broken hearts that have already paid the penalty; and we know not how many more it needs to wipe out the stain of that recreancy that did not at once proclaim this war a war for freedom and humanity.

And now we have got her all around us Loyal Leagues. Loyal to what? What does it mean? I have ready that term in the papers. A great many times I have heard that expression today. I know not what others mean by it, but I will give you my interpretation of what I am loyal to. I speak for myself. I do not wish any one else to be responsible for my opinions. I am loyal only to justice and humanity. Let the Administration give evidence that they too are for justice to all, without exception, without distinction, and I, for one, had I ten thousand lives, would gladly lay them down to secure this boon of freedom to humanity. But without this certainly, I am not unconditionally loyal to the Administration. We women need not be, for the law has never yet recognized us. Then I say to Abraham Lincoln, "Give us security for the future, for really when I look at the past without a guarantee, I can hardly trust you." And then I would say to him, "Let nothing stand in your way; let no man obstruct your path."

Much is said in the papers and in political speeches about the Constitution. Now, a good constitution is a very good thing; but even the best of constitutions need sometimes to be amended and improved, but for after all there is but one constitution which is infallible, but one constitution that ought to be held sacred, and that is the human constitution. Therefore, if written constitutions are in the way of human freedom, suspend them till they can be improved. If generals are in the way of freedom, suspend them too; and more than that, suspend their money. We have got here a whole army of generals who have been actually dismissed from the service, but not from pay. Now, I say to Abraham Lincoln, if these generals are good for anything, if they are fit to take the lead, put them at the head of armies, and let them go South and free the slaves you have announced free. If there are them who are good for nothing, dispose of them as of anything else that is useless. At all events, put them loose from the pay. Why, my friends, from July, 1861, to October 1863—for sixteen long months—we have been electrified with the name of our great little Napoleon! And what had the great little Napoleon done? Why, he has done just enough to prevent anybody else from doing anything. But I have no quarrel with him. I don't know him. I presume none ask you do. But I ask Abraham Lincoln—I like to go to headquarters, for where the greatest power is assumed, there the greatest responsibility rests, and in accordance with that principle I have nothing to do with menials,
even though they are styled Napoleon—but I ask the President why McClellan was kept in the army so long after it was known for there never was a time when anything else was known—that he was both incapable and unwilling to do anything! I refer to this for the purpose of coming, by and by, to the question, "What ought to be done?" He was kept at the head of the army on the Potomac just long enough to prevent Burnside from doing anything, and not much has been done since that time. Now, McClellan may be a very nice young man—I haven't the slightest doubt of it—but I have read a little anecdote of him. Somebody asked the president of a Western railroad company, in which McClellan was an engineer, what he thought about his abilities. "Well," said the president, "he is a first-rate man to build bridges; he is very exact, very mathematical in measurement; very precise in adjusting the timber; he is the best man in the world to build a good, strong, sound bridge, but after he has finished it, he never wishes anybody to cross over it." Well, we have disposed of him partially, but we'll him yet, and you and I are taxed for it. But if we are to have a new general in his place, we may ask, what has become of Sigel? Why does that disinterested, noble-minded, freedom-loving man in vain ask of the Administration to give him an army to lead into the field?

A Voice: "Ask Mallock."

Mallock! If Mallock is in the way, dispose of him. Do you point me to the Cabinet? If the Cabinet is in the way of freedom, dispose of the Cabinet—some of them, at least. The magnitude of this war has never yet been fully felt or acknowledged by the Cabinet. The man at its head—I mean Seward—has hardly yet waken up to the reality that we have a war. He was going to crush the rebellion in sixty days. It was a mere bagatelle! Why, he could do it after dinner, any day, as easy as taking a bottle of wine! If Seward is in the way of crushing the rebellion and establishing freedom, dispose of him. From the sources of war, learn the remedy, decide the policy, and place it in the hands of men capable and willing to carry it out. I am not unconditionally loyal, until we know to what principle we are to be loyal. I promise justice and freedom, and all the rest will follow. Do you know, my friends, what will take place if something decisive is not soon done? It is high time to consider it. I am not one of those who look at the darkest side of things, but yet my reason and reflection forbid me to hope against hope. It is only eighteen months before another Presidential election—only one hour before another President will be nominated. Let the present Administration remain as indolent, as inactive, and, apparently, as indifferent as they have done; let them keep generals that are inferior to many of their private soldiers; let them keep the best generals there are in the country—Sigel and Fremant—unemployed; let them keep the country in the same condition in which it has been the last two years, and it would be the result, if, at the next election..."
—If I were the chief Democrat? I am a Democrat, and it is because I am a Democrat that I go for human freedom. Human freedom and true democracy are identical, but the Democrats, as they are now called, get into office, and what would be the consequences? Why, under this non-end-voy for Union, Union, Union, which is like a toad held out to the mass of the people to lure them on, they will grant to the South the moment and most contemptible compromises that the worst slaveholders in the South can require. And if they really accept such and come back — an only hope is that they will not — but if the South should accept these compromises, and come back, slavery will be fastened, not only in the South, but it will be nationally fastened on the North. Now, a good Union, like a good Constitution, is a most invaluable thing; but a false Union is infinitely more despicable than no Union at all; and for myself, I would rather prefer to have the South remain independent, than to bring them back with the eternal curse nationalized in the country. It is not enough for Abraham Lincoln to proclaim the slaves in the South free, new laws to confirm the war until they shall be really free. There is something to be done at home; for justice, like charity, must begin at home. It is a mockery to say that we emancipate the slaves we can not reach and pass by those we can reach. First, free the slaves that are under the flag of the States. If that flag is the symbol of freedom, let it move over free men only. The slaves must be freed in the Border States. Consistency is a great power. What are you afraid of? That the Border States will join with the new crippled rebel States? No, we have our army there, and the North can swell its armies. But we can not afford to fight without an object. We can not afford to bring the South back with slavery. We can not compromise with principle. What has brought on this war? Slavery, unembellished, slavery was the primary cause of it. But the great secondary cause was the fact that the North, for the sake of the Union, has constantly compromised. Every demand that the South made of the North was acceded to, until the South came really to believe that they were the natural and legitimate masters, not only to the slaves, but of the earth too.

Now, it is time to reverse all these things. This rebellion and this war have cost too dear. The money spent, the vast stores destroyed, and the poor shed, the lives sacrificed, the hearts broken, are too high a price to be paid for the mere name of Union. I never believed we had a Union. A true Union is based up on principles of mutual interest, of mutual respect and reciprocity, none of which ever existed between the North and South. They based their institutions on slavery, the North on freedom.

I care not by what measure you call the war, if you allow one single germ, one single seed of slavery to remain in the soil of America, whatever may be your object, depend on it, as such an effort follows cause, that germ will spring up, that nation
used will thrive, and again stifle the growth, wither the leaves, wilt the flowers, and poison the fair fruits of freedom. History and freedom can not exist together. There is an irresolvable conflict between freedom and slavery. You might as well say that light and darkness can exist together as freedom and slavery. We, therefore, must urge the Government to do something, and that speedily, to secure the boon of freedom, while they yet can, not only in the rebel States, but in our own States too, and in the Border States. It is just as wrong for me to keep slaves in the Union States as it is a wrong to the slaves; and yet while we free the rebel slaveholder from the curse, we allow it to continue with our Union-loving men in the Border States, free the slave in the Border States, in Western Virginia, in Maryland, and wherever the Union flag floats, and then there will be a consistency in our actions that will enable us to go to work earnestly with heart and hand united, as we move forward to free all others and crush the rebellion. We have had no energy yet in the war, for we have fought only for the purpose of restraining, and what has never been united, restoring the old Union -- to rather the shadow as it was. A small republic, a small nation, based upon the eternal principle of freedom, in great and powerful. A large empire based upon slavery, is weak and without foundation. The sound the light of freedom shines upon it, it discloses its defects, and un-masks its hideous deformities. As I said before, I would rather have a small republic without the stain and without the chain of slavery in 1865, than to have the South brought back by compromise. To avert such calamity, we must work, and our work must mainly be to watch and criticize and urge the Administration to do its whole duty to freedom and humanity.
ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL
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Antoinette L. Brown's Bible Argument — 1852

Antoinette L. Brown offered the following resolutions, and made a few good points on the Bible argument. (History of Woman Suffrage Vol. I, 535-6)

Preface: "The speech of Antoinette Brown, and the resolution she presented opened the question of authority as against individual judgment and roused a prolonged and somewhat bitter discussion."

---

Resolved, That the Bible recognizes the rights, duties, and privileges of woman as a public teacher, as every way equal with those of man; that it enjoins upon her no subjection that is not enjoined upon him; and that it truly and practically recognizes neither male nor female in Christ Jesus.

God created the first human pair equal in rights, possessions, and authority. He bequeathed the earth to them as a joint inheritance; gave them joint dominion over the irrational creation; gave them joint but none over each other. (Gen. 1:38). This rule was no more approved, endorsed, or sanctioned by God, than was the twin-born prophecy, "thou (Satan) shalt bruise his (Christ's) heel." God could not, from His nature, command Satan to injure Christ, or any other of the seed of woman. What particle of evidence is there then for supposing that in the parallel announcement He commanded man to rule over woman? Both passages should have been translated will, instead of shall. Either auxiliary is used indifferently according to the sense, in rendering that form of the Hebrew verb into English.

Because thou hast done this in God's preface to the announcement. The results are the effects of sin. Can woman then receive evil from this rule, and man receive good? Man should be blessed in exercising this power, if he is divinely appointed to do so; but the two who are one flesh have an identity of interests, therefore it is a curse or evil to woman, it must be so to man also. We most God, when we make Him approve of man thus cursing himself and woman.

The submission enjoined upon the wife in the New Testament, is not the unrighteous rule predicted in the Old. It is a Christian submission due from man towards man, and from man towards woman: "Ye, all of you be subject one to another" (Pet. V 5; Eph. V. 21; Rom. XII. 10, etc. In 1 Cor. XVI 16, the disciples are besought to submit themselves to everyone that helpeth with us and laboreth." The same apostle says, "help those women which labored with me in the Gospel, with Clement also, and with other of my fellow-laborers."
Man is the head of the woman. True, but only in the sense in which Christ is represented as head of His body, the Church. In a different sense He is head of all things -- of wicked men and devils. If man is woman's head in this sense, he may exercise over her all the prerogatives of God Himself. This would be blasphemous. The mystical Head and Body, of Christ and His Church, symbolizes oneness, which Christ so loved. He gave Himself for it, made it His own body, part and parcel of Himself. So ought men to love their wives. Then the rule which grew out of sin, will cease with the sin.

It is said woman is commanded not to teach in the Church. There is no such command in the Bible. It is said (Cor I XIV 34), "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak." This injunction, taken out of its connection, forbids singing also; interpreted by its context, woman is merely told not to talk unless she does teach. On the same principle, one who has the gift of tongue is told not to use it in the church, unless there is an interpreter. The rule enforced from the beginning to the end of the chapter is, "Let all things be done unto edifying." Their women, who had not been previously instructed like the men, were very naturally guilt of asking questions which did not edify the assembly. It was better that they should wait till they got home for the desired information, rather than put an individual good before the good of the Church. Nothing else is forbidden. There is not a word heard against woman's teaching. The apostle says to the whole Church, woman included, "Ye may all prophesy, one by one."

In I Tim. II 12, the writer forbids woman's teaching over man, or usurping authority over him; that is, he prohibits dogmatizing, tutoring, teaching in a dictatorial spirit. This is prohibited both in public and private; but a proper kind of teaching is not prohibited. Verse 14 -- a reference to Eve, who, though created last, sinned first, is merely such a suggestion as we would make to a daughter whose mother had been in fault. The daughters are not blamed for the mother's sin, merely warned by it; and cautioned against self-confidence, which o u ld make them presume to teach over man. The Bible tells us of many prophetesses approved of God. The Bible is truly democratic. Do as you would be done by, is its golden commandment, recognizing neither male nor female in Christ Jesus.
Antoinette Brown

World's Temperance Convention — 1853

Taken from "History of Woman Suffrage" Vol I pp. 152-60

Antoinette L. Brown was appointed a delegate by two Temperance associations. Her credentials were accepted, and she took her seat as a member of the Convention; but when she arose to speak, a tempest of indignation poured upon her from every side. As this page in history was frequently referred to in the Cleveland Convention, we will let Miss Brown here tell her own story:

Why did we go to that World's Convention? We went there because the calls were extended to "the world." On the 18th of May, a preliminary meeting had been held at New York — the far-famed meeting at the Brick Chapel. There, because of the objection taken by some who were not willing to have the "rest of mankind" come into the convention, a part of those present withdrew. They thought they would have a "Whole World's Temperance Convention," and they thought well, as the result proved. When it was known that such a Convention would be called, that all persons would be invited to consider themselves members of the Convention, who considered themselves members of the world, some of the leaders of the other Conventions—the half world's Convention — felt that if it were possible, they would not have such a meeting held; therefore they took measures to prevent it. Now, let me read a statement from another delegate to that Convention, Rev. Mr. H. Channing, of Rochester, (Miss Brown read an extract from the Tribune, giving the facts unregard to her appointment as delegate, by a society of long-standing, in Rochester, and extracts, also, of letters from persons prominent in the Brick Chapel meeting, urging Mr. Brely to persuade his party to abandon the idea of a separate Convention, a part of such writers pleading that it was an unnecessary movement, as the call to the World's Temperance Convention was broad enough, and intended to include all). This appointment was made without my knowledge or consent, but with my hearty endorsement, when I knew it was done. Let me state also, that a society organized and for years in existence in South Butler, N. Y., also appointed delegates, so that Convention, and myself among the members. They did so because, though they knew the call invited all the world to be present, yet they thought it best to have their delegations prepared with credentials, if being prepared would do any good.

When we reached New York, we heard some persons saying that women would be received as delegates, and others saying they would not. We thought we ought to test that matter, and do it
too, as delicately and quietly as possible. There was quite a number of ladies appointed delegates to that meeting, but it was felt that not many would be necessary to make the test of their sincerity.

We met at the Woman's Rights Convention on the day of the opening of the half world's Temperance Convention, and had all decided to be content with our own Temperance Convention, which had passed off so quietly and triumphantly. Wendell Phillips and I sat reconsidering the whole matter. I referred him to the facts, which had come to me more than once during the last few days, that the officials of the Convention in session at Metropolitan Hall, and others, had been saying that women would be received no doubt; that the Brick Chapel meeting was merely an informal preliminary meeting, and its decisions of no authority upon the Convention proper; and that the women were unjust in saying, that their brethren would not accept their cooperation before it had been fairly tested. Then, said Phillips, "So, by all means, if they receive you, you have only to thank them for rebuking the action of the Brick Chapel meeting. Then we will withdraw and come back to our own meeting. If, on the other hand, they do not receive you, we will quietly and without protest withdraw, and, in that case, not be gone half an hour." I turned and invited one lady, not on this platform, as gentle and lady-like as woman can be, Caroline M. Severance, of your own city, to go with me. She said: "I am quite willing to go, both in compliance with your wish, and from interest in the cause itself. But I am not a delegate, and I have in this city venerated grandparents, whose feelings I greatly regard, and would not willingly or unnecessarily wound; so that I prefer to go in quietly, but take no active part in what will seem to them an antagonistic position for woman, and uncalled for on my part. In that way I am quite ready to go." And so we went out from our meeting, Mr. Phillips, Mrs. S., and myself; none others went with us, nor knew we were going.

After arriving at Metropolitan Hall, accompanied by these friends, I did quietly what we had predetermined was the best to do. The Secretary was sitting upon the platform. I handed him my credentials from both societies. He said: "I can not now tell whether you will be received or not. There is a resolution before the house, stating, in substance, that they would receive all delegates without distinction or color or sex. If this resolution is adopted, you can be received." I than left my credentials in his hands, and went down from the platform. It was rather trying, in the sight of all that audience, to go upon the platform and come down again; and I shall not soon forget the sensations with which I stepped off the platform. It was rather trying, in a little time, they decided that the called admitted all delegates. I thought this decision settled my admission, and I went again upon the platform. In the meantime a permanent organization was effected. I went there, for the purpose of thanking them of course, and merely to express my sympathy with
the cause and their present movement, and then intended to leave
the Hall. I arose, and inquired of the President, Neal Dow, if
I was rightly a member of the Convention. He said, "Yes, if you
have credentials from any abstinence societies." I told him
I had, and then attempted to thank him. There was no appeal
from the President's decision, but yet they would not receive
my expression of thanks; therefore I took my seat and waited
for a better opportunity.

And now let me read a paragraph again from this paper, the
temperance organ of your State. The writer is still Gen. Carey.
(The extract intimated that Miss Brown, supported and urged on
by several others, made an unwomanly entrance into the Convention,
and upon the platform itself, which was reserved for officers,
and as it would imply, already filled.) There were only the
two other persons I mentioned who went with me to that Convention,
but they took their seats back among the audience, and did not
approach the platform. There were friends I found in that audi-
ence to sustain me, but none others came with me to that pur-
pose. The platform was far from being full; it is a large plat-
form, and there might a hundred persons sit there, and not in-
commode each other at all.

(Here Miss Brown read another extract from the same article,
in which Gen. Carey implies, that concerted measures had been
set on foot at the Woman's Rights meeting at the Tabernacle, the
evening after Miss Brown's first attempt at a hearing before the
Temperance Convention, for coming in upon them again en masse,
and revengefully.)

Not a word was said that night upon the subject, in the Con-
vention at the Tabernacle, except what was said by myself, and
I said what I did because some one inquired whether I was hissed
on going upon the platform. As to the matter, when I went upon
the platform I was not hissed, at other times I did not know
whether they hissed me or others, and "Where ignorance is bliss,
'tis folly to be wise." I stated some of the facts of our own
Convention, but I did not refer to this resolution (the one
which was to exclude all but officers or invited guests from
the platform), for I was not entirely clear with regard to the
nature of it, it was passed in so much confusion. I did
state this, that there had been a discussion raised upon such a
resolution, and that it was decided that only officers and
invited guests should sit upon the platform; but that they had
received me as a delegate, and had thus revoked the action of
the Brick Chapel meeting, and that on the morrow Neal Dow
might invite me to sit upon the platform. That was the sub-
stance of my remarks, and not one word of objection was taken,
or reply made by our convention.

I read again from this paper. (An extract implying that among
the measures taken to browbeat the Convention into receiving
Miss Brown, was the forming of a society instantly, under the sp-
sial urgency of herself and friends, for this especial object, etc.) That again is a statement without foundation. I intend to-night to use no harsh words, and I shall say nothing with regard to motives. You may draw your own conclusions in regard to all this. I shall state dispassionately, the simple, literal facts as they occurred, and they may speak for themselves.

Then when Wendell Phillips went out of the Convention, he told persons with whom he came in contact, that a delegate had been received by the President, and that the delegate had been insulted and nobody had risen to sustain her. He said to me, too, "I shall not go to-morrow, but you go. I can (not) do nothing for you, because I am not a delegate." There were a few earnest friends in New York, however, who felt that the rights for a delegate were sacred. They organized a society and appointed just three delegates to that Temperance Convention. Those three persons Wendell Phillips, of Boston; Mr. Cleveland, one of the editors of the Tribune; and Mr. Gibbon, son-in-law of the late venerated Isaac T. Hopper. The last two were men from New York City. The question was already decided that women might be received as delegates to that Convention; therefore there was no need of appointing any one to insist upon woman's right to appear, and no one was appointed for that purpose. The next morning we went there with Mr. Phillips, who presented his credentials. During the discussion, Mr. Phillips took part, and persisted in holding the Convention to parliamentary rules. He carried in his hand a book of rules, which is received everywhere as authority, and when he saw that they were wrong, he quoted the standard authority to them. After a while the preliminary business was disposed of, and various resolutions were brought forward. I arose, and the President said I had the floor. I was invited upon the stand, and was therefore an "invited guest" within their own rules; but when once there, I was not allowed to speak, although the President said repeatedly that the floor was mine. The opposition arose from a dozen or more around the platform, who were incessantly raising "points of order" — the extempore bantlings of great minds in great emergencies. For the space of three hours I endeavored to be heard, but they would not hear me (although as a delegate, and I spoke simply as a delegate), I could have spoken but ten minutes by a law of the house. Twice the President was sustained in his decision by the house. Twice the but finally some one insisted that there might be persons voting in the house who are not delegates, and it was decided that the Hall should be cleared by the police, and that those who were delegates might come in, one by one, and assume their seats.

There were printed lists of the delegates of the Convention, but there were several new delegates whose names were not on the lists. Wendell Phillips and his colleagues were among them. He went to the President and said: "I reply upon you to be admitted to the Hall, for we know that our names are not yet on the list." The president assented. As the delegates
returned; the names upon the printed lists were called, and while the rest of us were earnest to be admitted to the house, and while they were examining our credentials and deciding whether or not we should be received, Neal Dow had gone out of the Hall, and Sen. Carey had taken the Chair. The action of a part of the delegates who were in the house while the others were shut out, was like to nothing that ever had occurred in the annals of parliamentary history. These persons who came in afterward, asked what was the business before the house, and on being informed, moved that it be reconsidered. The President decided upon putting it to the house, that they had not voted in the affirmative, and would not reconsider. Sen., Samuel F. Carey is a man of firmness, and I could not but admire the firmness with which he presided, although I felt that his decisions were wrong. "Gentlemen," said he, "there can be no order when you are raising so many points of order; take your seats!" and they took their seats.

Previous to the adjournment, a question was risen about Bunsell Phillips' credentials, and again next morning they raised it and decided it against him, so that he felt all further effort in vain, and left the Hall. After this, there came up a multitude of resolutions, which were passed so rapidly that no one could get the opportunity to speak to them. A resolution also written by Sen. Carey, was presented by him, as follows: "Resolved, That the common wages have excluded women from the public platform," etc.

That resolution, amid great confusion, was declared as passed. Of course, then soon after I left the Hall, I ought to say, in regard to Mr. Phillips' credentials, that they had been referred to a committee, who decided that he had not properly been sent to the Convention, for no reason in the world, but because the society who sent him, had been organized only the night before; while I know positively, and others know, that there were societies organized one week before, for the very purpose of sending delegates to that Convention, which societies will never be heard of again, I fear. But the Neal Dow Association, of New York, exists yet. Their society shall not die; so good comes out of evil often.

A motion was also made by some one, as better justice to Mr. Phillips, to refer the credentials of all the delegates of Massachusetts to the Committee on Credentials, but for very obvious and prudent reasons, it was not suffered to have a moment's hearing or consideration. (Miss Kingsley here read a few additional lines from the same article, asserting that she was merely the tool of others, and thrust by them upon the platform; and charging all disorder and disturbance of that Convention to herself and friends, etc.) I needed no thrusting upon the platform. I was able to rise and speak without urging or suggestion. And as to the disorder which prevailed throughout the Convention, who made the disorder? I said not a
want to cause it, for they gave me no opportunity to say a word, and the other delegates with me, not quietly. He mentions in his paper that I had credentials. It is stated that throughout Ohio the impression is that I had none; and it is generally believed that I went there without proper credentials.

One word more as to Mr. Carey. He says, "The negro question was not discussed as Bresee and Co., wished it to be. O Bresee, how art thou fallen?" These are Mr. Carey's words, not mine. Mr. Bresee has risen greatly in my estimation, and not fallen. A colored delegate (James McCune Smith) did take his credentials to the Convention, but he was not received. I saw him myself, and asked him what could be done about it. He folded up his hands and said it was too late. And this was a "World's Temperance Convention!"

And this paper says that the New York Tribune, which has usually been an accredited sheet, has most shamefully misrepresented the whole affair, and refers to what was said in the Tribune, as to what the Convention had accomplished: "The first day, crowing a woman from the platform; second day, gagging her; and the third day voting she should stay gagged," and asserts that it is a misrepresentation.

The evenings of the Convention were not devoted to this discussion, and were not noisy or fruitless. There were burning words spoken for temperance during the evenings; but whether the Tribune's report of the day-sessions be correct or not, you yourselves can be the judges. I must say, however, the Tribune did not misrepresent that affair in its regular report; and I call upon Mr. Carey, in all kindness and courtesy, to point out just what the misstatements are — and upon any one acquainted with the facts, to show the false statement, if it can be shown.

And now I leave the motion of the Convention to say what were our motives in going there. From what I have related of the circumstances which conspired to induce us to go, and the manner of our going, you can but see that no absurd desire for notoriety, no coveting of such unwavering fame as we knew what await us, were the inducements. And as a simple fact, there was nothing so very important in a feeble woman's going as a delegate to that Convention; but the fact was made an unpleasant experience of that delegate, and was blown into notoriety by the untenable notion of that Convention itself. But what were our reasons for going to that Convention? Did we go there to forward the cause of Temperance or to forward the cause of women, or what were our motives in going? Woman was pleading her own cause in the Convention at the Tabernacle, and she had no need that any should go there to forward her cause for her; and much as I love Temperance, and love those poor sisters who suffer because of intemperance, it was not especially to plead their cause that I went there. I went to assert a principle, a
principle anteverted to the circumstances of the World's Convention to be sure, but one, at the same time, which acknowledged, most forward all good causes, and, disregarded must retard them. I went there, asking no favor as a woman, asking no special recognition of the women's cause. I went there in behalf of the cause of Humanity. I went there, asking the endorsement of no issue, and as the expressed of no measure, but as a simple item of the world in the cause of the world, claiming that all the sons and daughters of the race should be received in that Convention, if they went there with the proper credentials, I simply placed my feet upon the rights of a delegate. I asked for nothing more, and dare take nothing less. The principle which we went there to assert, was that which is the soul of the Golden Rule, the soul of that which says, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." I went there to see if they would be true to their own call, and recognize delegates without distinction of color, sex, creed, party, or condition; to see if they would recognize each member of the human family, as belonging to the human family; to see if they would grant the simple rights of a delegate to all delegates.

And do you ask, did this not retard the cause of Temperance? Eq: it carried it forward, as it carries every good cause forward. It awakened thought, and mankind need only to be aroused to thought, to forever destroy all wrong customs, and among them the rum traffic. They need only to think to the purpose, and when this shall be done, all good causes are bound to go forward together. Christianity is the heart and soul of them all, and those reforms which seek to elevate mankind and better their condition, cling around our Christianity, and are a part of it. They are like the cluster of grapes, all clinging about the central stem.

A wrong was done in that Convention to a delegate, and many people saw and felt that wrong, and they began to inquire for the cause of it; and as the cause of things are searched more nearly than before, and this was a good which promoted temperance. It is absurd to believe that any man or woman is any less a temperance man or woman, or a "loan law" man or woman now, than before. If ever they loved the cause they love it now as before.

Water is the very symbol of democracy! a single jet of it in a tube will balance the whole ocean. We went there, only to be treated alike and impartially. The human soul is a holy thing; it is the temple of living joy or sorrow. It is fraught with vital realities. It can outstrip Heaven itself, and it should be reverence everywhere, and treated always as a holy thing. We only went there in the name of the world, in the name of humanity, to promote a good cause; and it is what I pledge myself anew anew to do, at all times and under all circumstances, when the opportunity shall present itself to me. It was a good act,
a Christian duty, to go there under these circumstances.

But let us now leave this matter, and say something which may have a direct bearing upon the circumstances of our convention, and show why it is proper to bring up these facts here. Let us suppose ourselves gathered in Metropolitan Hall. It is a large hall, with two galleries around its sides, I could see men up there in checkered blouses, who looked as though they might disturb a convention, but they looked down upon the rows of the platform, a thing unprecedented before, with simple expressions of wonder, while they were quiet. Well, here we are upon the platform. The President is speaking.

President: "Miss Brown has the floor."  
A Delegate: "Mr. President, I rise to a point of order."  
President: "State your point of order."

It is stated, but at the same time, in the general whirr and confusion around, another voice from the floor exclaims: "I rise to a point of order!"

The President: "State it!"

But while these things are going on, a voice arises, "She sha'n't speak!" another, "She sha'n't be heard!" another, "You rise a point of order when he is done, and I will raise another." In confusion I hear something almost like swearing, but not swearing, for most of these men are "holy men," who do not think of swearing. The confusion continues. Most of this time I am standing, but presently a chair is presented me, and a new class of comforters gather around me, speaking smooth, consoling words in my ear, while upon the others side are angry disputants, clinching their fists and growing red in the face. Are the former good Samaritans, pouring into my wounded heart the oil and the wine? Listen. "I knew you are acting conscientiously; but now that you have made your protest, do, for your own sake, withdraw from this disgraceful scene."

"I can not withdraw," I say, "it is not now the time to withdraw; here is a principle at stake."

"Well, in what way can you better the cause? Do you feel you are doing any good?" Another voice chimes in with: "Do you love the Temperance cause? Can you continue here and see all this confusion prevailing around you? Why not withdraw, and then the Convention will be quiet," and all this in most mournful, dolorous tones. I think if the men arise, I shall certainly cry too.

But then a new interval of quiet occurs, and so I rise to get the floor, I fancy myself in a sitting room enough to beg them, with prayers and tears, to be just and righteous; but no, "this kind goeth not out by prayer and fasting, and as I
stand up again. Directly Rev. John Chambers points his finger at me, and calls aloud: "Shame on the woman! shame on the woman!"

Then I feel cool and calm enough again, and sit down until his anger has gone away. Again the "friends" gather around me, and there come more appeals to me, while the public ear is filled with "points of order"; and the two fail together, in a somewhat odd, but very pointed contrast, somewhere in the center of my brain. "Do you think," says one, "that Christ would have done so?" spoken with a somewhat negative emphasis. "I think He would," spoken with a positive emphasis. "Do you love peace as Christ loved it, and can you do thus?"

What answer I made I know not, but there came rushing over my soul the words of Christ: "I came not to send peace, but a sword." It seems almost to be spoken with an audible voice, and it aways the spirit more than all things else. I remember that Christ's doctrine was, "first pure, then peaceable," that He, too, was persecuted. So are my doctrines good, they ask only for the simple rights of a delegate, only that which must be recognized as just, by the impartial Father of the human race, and by His holy Son. Then come those most pleasing tones again upon my ear, and instinctively I think of the Judas kiss, and I perhaps never come to me again. There were angry men confronting me, and I caught the flashing of defiant eyes; but above me, and within me and all around me, there was a spirit stronger than they all. At that moment not the combined powers of earth and hell could have tempted me to do otherwise than to stand firm. Moral and physical cowardice were subdued, thanks to that Washington delegate for the sublime strength roused by his question: "Would Christ have done so?"

That stormy scene is passed; that memorable time when chivalrous men forgot the deference, which according to their creed is due to woman, and forgot it as they publicly said, because a woman claimed a right upon the platform; and so they neither recognized her equality of rights, nor her conceded courtesy as a lady. This way neither just nor gallant, but to me it was vastly preferable to those appeals made to me as a lady — appeals which never would have been made to a man under the same circumstances; and which only served to show me the estimation in which they held womanhood. It reminded me of a remark which was made concerning the Brick Chapel meeting: "If you had spoken words of flattery, they would have done what you wanted."

Let the past be the past, "let the dead bury their dead." contains truths we well may heed. Is God the impartial Father of humanity? Is He no respecter of persons? Is it true that there is known neither male nor female in Christ Jesus? In my heart of hearts, I believe it is all true. I believe it is the foundation of the Golden Rule. And now let me tell you in conclusion: if it be true, this truth shall steal unto your souls
like the recents of childhood; it shall come like a vision of hope to the despairing; it shall flash upon the incredulous; it shall twine like a chain of colder arguments about the reason of the skeptic.
Antoinette Brown Blackwell

speech to the

Tenth National Woman's Rights Convention

Mrs. Antoinette Brown Blackwell's address to the Tenth National Woman's Rights Convention at the Cooper's Institute in New York in 1860. (From "History of Woman Suffrage" Vol. 1, pp. 723-6) -09-

Rev. A. B. Blackwell followed, and prefaced her remarks by saying: "Our's has always been a free platform. We have believed the fullest freedom of thought and in the free expression of individual opinion. I propose to speak upon the subject discussed by our friend, Mrs. Stanton. It is often said that there are two sides to every question; but there are three sides, many sides, to every question. Let Mrs. Stanton take hers; let Horace Greeley take his; I only ask the privilege of stating mine. I have embodied my thoughts, hastily, in a series of resolutions, and my remarks following them will be very brief."

Mrs. Blackwell continued:

I believe that the highest law of life is that which we find written within our being; that the first moral law which we are to obey are the laws which God's own finger has traced upon our own soul. Therefore, our first duty is to ourselves, and we may never, under any circumstances, yield this to any other. I say we are first responsible to ourselves, and to the God who has laid the obligation upon us, to make ourselves the grandest we may. Marriage grew out of the relations of parties. The law of our development came wholly from within, but the relation of marriage supposes two persons as being united to each other, and from this relation originates the law. Mrs. Stanton calls marriage a "Tie." No, marriage is a relation; and, once formed, that relation continues as long as the parties continue with the nature which they now essentially have. Let, then, the two parties deliberately, voluntarily consent to enter into this relation. It is one which, from its very nature, must be permanent. Can the mother ever destroy the relation which exists between herself and her child? Can the father annul the relation which exists between himself and his child? Then, can the father and mother annul the relation which exists between themselves, the parents of the child? No, it cannot be. The interests of marriage arc such that they cannot be destroyed, and the only question there must be, "Was there been a marriage in this case or not?" If there has been, then the social law, the obligations growing out of the relation, must be life-long.

But I assert that every woman, in the present state of society,
is bound to maintain her own independence and her own integrity of character; to assert herself, earnestly and firmly, as the equal of man, who is only her peer. This is her first right, her first duty; and if she lives in a country where the law supposes that she is to be subjected to her husband, and she consents to this subjection, I do insist that she consents to degradation; that this is sin, and it is impossible to make it any other than sin. True, in this State, and in nearly all the States, the idea of marriage is that of subjection, in all respects, of the wife to the husband → personal sub- jection, subjection in the rights over their children and over their property; but this is a false relation. Marriage is a union of equals → equal interests being involved, equal duties at stake; and if any woman has been married to a man who chooses to take advantage of the laws as they now stand, who chooses to subject her, ignobly, to his will, against her own, to take from her the earnings which belong to the family, and to take from her the children which belong to the family, I hold that that woman, if she can not, by her influence, change her state of things, is solemnly obligated to go to some State where she can be legally divorced; and then she would be as solemnly bound to return again, and standing forth herself and her children, regard herself, in the sight of God, as being bound still to the father of those children, to work for his best interests, while she still maintains her own sovereignty. Of course, she must be governed by the circumstances of the case. She may be obliged, for the protection of the family, to live on one continent while her husband is on the other; but she is never to forget that in the sight of God and her own soul, she is his wife, and that she owes to him the wife’s loyalty; that to work for his redemption is her highest social obligation, and that to teach her children to do the same is her first motherly duty. Legal divorce may be necessary for personal and made family protection; if so, let every woman obtain it. This aside, helping me, is what I would certainly do, for under no circum- stances will I ever give my consent to be subjected to the will of another, in any relation, for God has hidden me not to do it. But the idea of most women is, that they must be timid, weak, helpless, and full of ignoble submission. Only last week, a lady who has just been divorced from her husband said to me → “I used to be required to go into the field and do the hardest laborer’s work, and when I was not able to do it, and my husband would declare, that if I would not take labor, I should not be allowed to eat, and I was obliged to submit. I say the fault was as much with the woman as with the man; she should never have submitted.

Our trouble is not with marriage as a relation between two; it is all individual. We have few men or women fit to be married. They neither fully respect themselves and their own rights and duties, nor yet those of another. They have no idea how noble, how godlike is the relation which ought to exist between the hus- band and wife.
Tell me, is marriage to be merely a contract — something entered into for a time, and then broken again — or is the true marriage permanent? One resolution ready by Mrs. Stanton said that as men are incompetent to select partners in business, teachers for their children, ministers of their religion, or makers, adjudicators, or administrators of their laws, and as the same weakness and blindness must attend in the selection of matrimonial partners, the latter and most important contract should no more be perpetual than either or all of the former. I do not believe that, rightly understood, she quite holds to that position herself. Marriage must be either permanent, or capable of being any time dissolved. Which ground shall we take? I insist that from the nature of things, marriage must be as permanent and indissoluble as the relation of parent and child. If so, let us legislate toward the right. Though evils must sometimes result, we are still to seek the highest law of the relation.

Self-devotion is always sublimely beautiful, but the law has no right to require either a woman to be sacrificed to any man or to a man to be sacrificed to any woman, or either to the good of society; but if either chooses to devote himself to the good of the other, no matter how low that other may have fallen, no matter how degraded he may be, let the willing partner strive to lift him up, not by going down and sitting side by side with him — that is wrong — but by steadily trying to win him back to the right; keeping his own sovereignty, but trying to redeem the fallen one as long as life shall endure. I do not wish to go to the other state of being, and state what shall be our duty there, but I do say, that whereas there is sin and suffering in this universe of ours, we may none of us sit still until we have overcome that sin and suffering. Then if my husband were wretched and degraded in this life, I believe that the greatest boon of existence is the privilege of working for those who are oppressed and fallen; and those who have oppressed their own natures are those who need the most help. My great hope is, that I may be able to lift them upwards. The great responsibility that has been laid upon me is the responsibility never to sit down and sing to myself psalms of happiness and content while anybody suffers. Then, if I find a wretched man in the gutter, and feel that, as a human sister, I must go and lift him up, and that I can never enjoy peace or rest until I have thus redeemed him and brought him out of his sins, shall I, if the man whom I solemnly swore to love, to associate with in all the interests of home and its holiest relations — shall I, if he is in sin, turn him off, and go on enjoying life, while he is sunk in wretchedness and sin? I will not do it. To me there is a higher idea of life. If, as an intelligent human being, I promised to co-work with him in all the higher interests of life, and if he proves false, I will
not turn from him, but I must seek first to regenerate him, the nearest and dearest to me, as I would work, secondly, to save my children, who are next, and then my brothers, my sisters, and the whole human family.

Mrs. Stanton asks, "Would you send a young girl into a nursery, when she has made a mistake?" Does Mrs. Stanton not know that nunneries belong to a past age, that people who had nothing to do might go there and try to expiate their own sins? I would teach the young girl a higher way. I do not say to her, "If you have foolishly united yourself to another, "(not if you have been tied by the law); for, remember, it was not the law that tied her; she said, "I will do it," and the law said, "So let it be[n]" — "sunder the bond"; but I say to her, that her duty is to reflect, "Now that I see my mistake, I will commence being true to myself; I will become a true unit, strong and noble in myself; and if I can never make our union a true one, I will work toward that good result, I will live for this great work — for truth and all its interests." Let me tell you, if she is not great enough to do this, she is not great enough to enter into any union.

Look at those who believe in thus easily dissolving the marriage obligations! In very many cases they can not be truly married, or truly happy in this relation, because there is something incompatible with it in their own natures. It is not always so; but when one feels that it is a relation easily to be dissolved, of course, incompatibility at once seems to arise in the other, and every difficulty that occurs, instead of being overlooked, as it ought to be, in a spirit of forgiveness, is magnified, and the evil naturally increased. We purchase a house, the deed is put into our hands, and we take possession. We feel at once that it is really very convenient. It suits us, and we are surprised that we like it so much better than we supposed. The secret is, that it is our house, and until we are ready to part with it; it is not like the home, we make ourselves content with it as it is. We go to live in some country town. At first we do not like it; it is not like the home we came from; but soon we begin to be reconciled, and feel that, as Dr. Holmes said of Boston, our town is the hub of the universe. So, when we are content to allow our relations to remain as they are, we adapt ourselves to them, and they adapt themselves to us, and we constantly, unconsciously (because God made us so) work toward the perfecting of all the interests arising from these relations. But the many defects we discover! The place has the same appearance to us as at all; we wish we could get out of it; we feel all the time more and more dissatisfied. So, let any married person take the idea that he may dissolve this relation, and enter into a new one, and how many faults he may discover that otherwise never would have been noticed! The marriage will become intolerable. The theory will work that result; it is in the nature of things, and that to us is everything.
She expects to live forever, to play about here as if we were
mere flies, enjoying ourselves in the sunshine. We would have
an earnest purpose outside of home, outside of our family rela-
tions. Then let the young girl fit herself for this. Let her
be taught that she ought not to be married in her teens. Let
her wait, as a young man does, if he is sensible, until she is
twenty-five or thirty. She will then know how to choose prop-
erly, and probably she will not be deceived in her estimate of
character; she will have had a certain life-discipline, which
will enable her to control her household matters with wise
judgment, so that, while she is looking after her family, she
may still keep her great life purpose, for which she was ed-
ucated, and to which she has given her best energies, steadily
in view. She need not absorb herself in her home, and Ted never
intended that she should; and then, if she has lived according
to the laws of physiology, the according to the laws of common-sense, she ought to be, at the age of fifty years, just where
man is, just where our great men are, in the very prime of
life. When her young children have gone out of her home, then
let her enter in earnest upon the great work of life outside
of home and its relations.

It is a shame for our women to have no steady purpose or pur-
suit, and to make the mere fact of womanhood a valid plea for
indolence; it is a greater shame that they should be instructed
thus to throw all the responsibility of working for the general
good upon the other sex. Ted has not intended it. But as
long as you make woman helpless, inefficient beings, who never
expect to earn a farthing in their lives, who never expect to
do anything outside of the family, but to be cared for and pro-
tected by others throughout life, you can not have true mar-
rriages; and if you try to break up the old ones, you will
do it against the woman and in the favor of the man. Last
week I went back to a town where I used to live, and was
told that a woman, whose husband was notoriously the most
miserable man in town, had in despair taken her own life.
I asked what had become of the husband, and the answer was,
"Married again." And yet everybody knows that he is the vilest
and most contemptible man in the whole neighborhood. Any man,
no matter how wretched he may be, will find plenty of women to
accept him, while they are rendered so helpless and weak by
their whole education that they must be supported or starve.
The advantage, if this theory of marriage is adopted, will
not be on the side of woman, but altogether on the side of
man. The sure for the evils that now exist is not in dissolv-
ing marriage, but it is in giving to the married woman her
own natural independence and self-sovereignty, by which she can
maintain herself.

Yes, our women and men are both degenerate; they are weak
and ignoble. "Dear me!" said a pretty, insolent young lady,
"I had a great deal rather my husband would take care of me,
than to be obliged to do it for myself." "Of course you would,"
said a blunt old lady who was present; "and your brother would a
great deal rather marry an heiress, and lie upon a sofa eating lollipops, bought with her money, then to do anything manly or noble. The only difference is, that as heiresses are not very plenty, he may probably have to marry a poor girl, and then society will insist that he shall exert himself to earn a living for the family; but you, poor thing, will only have to open your mouth, all your life long, like a clam, and eat."

So long as society is constituted in such a way that woman is expected to do nothing if she has a father, brother, or husband able to support her, there is no salvation for her, in or out of marriage. When you tie up your arm, it will become weak and feeble; and when you tie up woman, she will become weak and helpless. Give her, then, some earnest purpose in life, hold up to her the true ideal of marriage, and it is enough — I am content!
Possibly there may be nations, like individuals, that are without definite ideas or purposes. They sprang into being by accident, and they continue to live by the sufferance of circumstances. Our American Republic is not of this type. We were born to the heritage of one great idea; we are created by it and for it, and it is mightier than we; it must annihilate us, or it must establish us a nation as lasting as the ages.

Our anti-revolutionary statesmen were dissatisfied with an inadequate, partial, unjust representation. The thought grew in them till it developed the broad principle of self-government by the people. They perceived and asserted that truth; they fought for it, and died for and lived for it, as the case might be. So they constructed this great Republic, grounding it firmly upon a deep and wide democracy. Its frame-work was essentially democratic, but there were a few great beams and joists, and plenty of paint and mortar used, which were as purely aristocratic.

We, here at the North, have been accustomed to look at the strength of the foundations, and of the consistent massive frame-work; they, at the South admired the incongruous ornaments and decorations, and they did not forget any of the exceptional timbers. We were shocked when the great structure seemed ready to tumble about our ears; they expected it all the time, and were working for it, ready to perish in the general downfall, if that were inevitable. I have seen a drop of water spread over a small orifice in a layer of melting ice, which was brilliant red in color to me, but it was the intensest blue to my friend, who was standing at my side. The moral vision is quite as largely dependent upon the angle at which it receives its rays of reflected light. North and South represent the extremes of the moral spectrum. The equalizing of labor and capital, which is a beautiful violet to us, is a very angry red to them; and the soft-toned hues of their system of servitude are crimson with blood-guiltiness to ourselves. If we stood where the perfect and undivided sunshine rays could fall upon us, we should see all men under the common radiance of that pure white light, which Providence has unlimited supply.

No more unanimity of sentiment or principle existed among our own people in the war of the Revolution, than in this. Democracy, asserting its rights, brought on the conflict then, though aristocracy, goaded by the instinct of self-preservation and self-instinct, joined hands and aided it to its consummation.
Patriotism grew in the hearts of each, and held us together as a nation for about eighty years; but the subordinate antagonism, tortured by its unnatural alliance during all those years, now in turn strikes also for independence. Precedence, pre-eminence, might have satisfied it for a time; but, from the nature of our institutions, that was impossible. It entrenched at every point, and was generally rewarded for its self-assertion; but it was inherently and constitutionally subordinate, and must have remained so forever in the federation of the United States. It struck for independence, and it did well! It did all it could do, if it would not die insanely. One must always admire that instinct of the grub which leads it to weave its own winding-sheet, and lie down fearlessly in its sepulcher, preparatory to its resurrection as a butterfly, but immeasurably more to be admired is the calculating courage of men who are ready to stake their all upon any issue — even upon one so mistaken, so false, so partial, as that to one class and so unjust to another, as the cause of the slave-holders. Every earnest purpose must have its own baptism of blessings.

No, the interrogates of a sublime truth, have been grievously wanting in faith in our heritage! — wanting in aim and purpose to maintain its integrity! He wonder the hand is still washed with tears of the widowed and fatherless, and that such, there refuses to be comforted. Give us a living principle! to die for. "Make this a war for emancipation!" cries anti-slavery England, and our sympathies will be with you!" They demand such; but, that demand granted, it yet fails infinitely below the real point at issue. It is immeasurably short of the great conflict which we are actually waging. It is one phase of it — the most acute phase, undoubtedly; but not, therefore, the broadest and most momentous one. Slavery was the peculiar institution of the South; but, we, a nation, have an incomparably greater peculiar institution of our own. The one is only peculiarly exceptional to our general policy; the other is essentially and organically at war with it. It is the only thing which pointedly distinguishes us from a dozen other nations. The consent of the governed is the sole, legitimate authority of any government. This is the essential peculiar creed of our republic. That principle is on one side of this war; and the old doctrine of night makes right, the necessary ground-work of all anarchy, is on the other. It is a life-and-death conflict between all these grand, universal, non-possessing principles, which we call by the comprehensive term democracy, and all those partial, person-possessing, class-favoring elements which we group together under that silver-clipped word aristocracy. If this war does not mean that, it means nothing.

Slavery is malignantly aristocratic, and seems therefore to absorb all other manifestations of the principle to itself. It is Pharaoh's lean kine, which devour all the others of their
species, and yet are no better favored than before. But if she
very sure dead to-day, aristocracy might still grind our repub-
icic to powder. Men may cease to be slaves, and yet not be en-
franchised. Although they are no longer bondmen, yet they may
be governed without their own consent. But when you deny the
universal enfranchisement of our people, you deny the one dis-
tinctive principle of our government, and the only essential,
foreordained fact in the future of our national institutions.
We do not at all comprehend this.

There was one who builded wiser than he knew. Emerson says,
and I think that the result is not uncommon. The little Indian
boy in the pleasant fable, who ran on eagerly in advance of his
migrating tribe, to plant his single, three-cornered beach-sod
in the center of a great prairie, scarcely foresaw the many
acres of heavy timber which was to confront the white pioneer
hundreds of years afterward, as the outgrowth of his childish
deed. Many soldiers are fighting our battle upon a basis broad-
er than they knew. There are men who believe that they are sole-
lly engaged in putting down the rebellion; others are maintain-
ing the disputed courage and honor of the rebellion; some are
fighting to uphold our present Northern civilization and its
institutions; and a handful to set out definitely to carry
those into the South, to give them to the slave, and to the mas-
ter also, in spite of himself. All love the Union, and are
ready to fight, perhaps to die for it. And what does that
mean? Something as antagonistic in the interpretation thereof
as the decisions touching an ancient oracle, a disputed Biblia-
cal text, or a knotty passage from our own venerable Constitution.

If victory should come just as she is summoned by each class of
our patriotic and brave (even volunteer) would she meet favor
the rebels of the Government? Look at some of her conflicting
purposed achievements:

1. To protect our Constitution with all its guarantee as much as the smell of
fire upon its garments, when it shall emerge from the ordeal of
war.

2. To gratuitously establish slavery forever, by solemn and
unchanging guarantee.

3. To leave slavery to perish slowly and ingloriously, as
it must when unprotected.

4. To cripple and destroy slavery by a long guerrilla warfare
against its special manifestations.

5. To kill slavery at a blow, by right of an imperious and
undoubted military necessity.

6. To exterminate slavery without compromise or weighing of
consequence, because it is a gross moral wrong.
These are a few of the many platforms upon which husbands, brothers, and sons are fighting to-day. No two opposing armies ever reared heavier with asking more impossible cures—pursues than does this fraternal, Union army of ours. The grand and fish of these are stone and scorpions to these. We are a practical people, but we are fighting for practical paradoxes. Do we expect any massive concentration of results! Our warring, anarchy system of warfare is typical of our moral status as a people. It is the spontaneous and legitimate expression of our aims and motives. Many or decisive victories I despair of, till we are better educated in the early lessons of the fathers. But from the President — God bless him that he seems to be more teachable than many others — down to the youngest drummer-boy of the army, the severe discipline of this war is schooling us into a better appreciation of our heritage as a peculiar people.

All governments, said the fathers, are subordinate to the people, not the people to their governments. The distinct emanation of that principle was the net result of the war of the Revolution. Born of the long-suffering anguish of bleeding nations, is worth its yet incomparably greater than the cost, for it is placed securely upon the throne of all nations: for, from the inherent nature of things, it is destined to become the mightiest revolutionist of the ages. The reinstating of that principle in the chair of our Republic will be the net result of this war of the Rebellion.

Then the statesmen of '76 sought to embody this principle in the complicated machinery of a vast government, there they partially failed — there they designedly failed. The minority seceded from it in that day and in this, and they compromised, the antagonism which they engrained on the young Republic, assuming as it does, that power, not humanity, is statute-maker, could not be more diametrically opposed to the axiom which asserts, that humanity, not power, is lawful arbiter of its own rights. The, man, unwhashed, unwashed, unlearned, is a safer judge of his own interests than is all the rank, the wealth, or the wisdom of men or angels. Thomas Simes is a better witness as to his own need of freedom than the combined wisdom of all the Boston lawyers, judges, and statesmen. No can swamp and fire upon the same planet, but it never does to bring them too near together. A nation proclaiming to the astonished world that governments derive all just powers solely from the consent of the governed, yet in the very face of this assertion enslaving the black man, and disfranchising half its white citizens, besides minor things of like import and consistency — do you wonder that eighty years of such policy culminated in rebellion?

Do we expect the whole-hearted sympathy of any monarchy? Cannot they see, also, that two entire opposing civilizations are mustard into the conflict? They may hate slavery, and since
we have found the courage to point our cannon more directly against the heart of that, they may rejoice so far; but do they desire to establish the abdication of any government to the rights of the very meanest of its subjects? Are they in fact with our plebeian democracy of nations is but so much base clay in the hands of the multitudes of royal potentates? We are now testing the practical possibilities of democratic theories; and here are those who would a thousand times rather see these shattered into hopeless fragments than any other result which could possibly transpire in the national affairs of all Christendom. Let our democracy prove shallow, weak, inefficient, unfit for emergencies, and incapable of sustaining itself under the test of determined opposition, to them it is enough. Our great national axiom, is, per se, the eternal foe of all monarchies, aristocracies, oligarchies, of all possible despotes, because it is the fulcrum of a mighty lever which must one day overturn them all, if it be not itself jostled from the resting-place.

What are we to do with our conquered provinces of the South? Give them all the franchises which we hold ourselves, assuredly — as many personal rights and as many State rights — provided always that they cease to encroach upon our liberties, and are no longer rebels against the common government. Now that the issue is forced upon us, let us apply our principles unsparingly to all, and conclude by asking the slaves, men and women too, as free and equal in all civil and political functions as their male masters. Secretary Chase has seized the occasion of our heavy financial troubles to give us a general national banking system so out of the bottle danger to our liberal institutions let us pluck the flower safety to the interest of the most subject. It is thus that the darkest evil is often made nurse to the brightest good. The black and at its root acquires the pure white water lily. When the Southern people, white and black, and male and female, are all voters together, by simple virtue of their human needs and rights, then, but not till then, will I consent to their freely voting themselves into an independent nation, if they are disposed. Even then, democracy requires that the question shall be decided by the suffrage of the whole country, North as well as South. A republic can never be dismembered except by the consent of a majority of all its citizens.
The earth has its green valleys, its lofty mountains, its fertile plains and its stony hills; but the elevations become the conspicuous landmarks. The higher they rise, the greater distance they overlook, the more noted are they as objects of remote interest and observation. Today we are to consider character as offering mental and ethical landmarks. Fifty years ago, with a few exceptions, the womanhood of Christendom was restricted to a few carefully graded, nearly dead-levels of commonplace. The terraces upon which women stood had several elevations which were largely conventional, artificial. They differed in rank, in position, in wealth, in influential connections which gave distinction; not that they differed little in cultivation or in obvious personal ability. In a terraced vineyard, the vines on a lower level may be more thrifty and beautiful than those higher up. In the old days middle-class womanhood, and that at the very foot of all the other social terraces, was liable to achieve more real individual merit, and the distinction which that conferred, than the apparently much more favorably situated. This was largely because it was not thought proper or ladylike to be inconsistently recognized for anything personal or conspicuous. Every woman thrust into one of the modest violet order, could bloom and beautify the one private niche which had appropriated her, but she herself and all of her friends believed that it would be little less than desecration to lavish this brightness and loveliness upon the unappreciated public. We have learned that a woman need not lose her modesty, her private worth of her homely virtues because she has gained a wider outlook, and because she has learned that her field of work may be as broad and helpful as she can make it in the service of any human interest. It used to be said that women were not entertaining to each other, the staple conversation was too limited. Were such women entertaining to men, except in flirtation or as admiring listeners to literal outpourings of masculine wisdom? I would not depreciate earlier care and beautiful days. Thousands of admirable women were unselfish in life, gracious in bearing, long suffering in sweet and patient amiability, but we can no more return to their surroundings, pursue their work, or assume their character than a full-grown chestnut tree can put itself back into the chestnut burr in which it was once inclosed. But we of our generation are not the full-grown tree. We are still in the green and
juicy state of the young twig, easily bent away and made to
grow into deformity. Wood, brick and mortar may be oddly
jumbled into the misshapen, hollow blocks which we christen houses;
these may be utilized and have some beauty. They are landmarked,
but if enough of them are scattered nearly at random over
the country, each largely a copy of its neighbor, they all
become commonplace. Why need we each adopt the far from perfect
current manners, customs and opinions of our nearest surround-
ings as resignedly as children may accept mumps, whooping-
cough and measles as rapidly as the tree toad takes an color
of the surface upon which it happens to rest? Why should our
prejudices, our politics and our religion follow as closely
in the wake of our fathers as sea foam follows in the wake of
the ship? We inherit features, tendencies; no one can inherit
characters. It is time women make that a deliberate personal
formation. To be shaped and molded without our consent has no
better justification than Aaron’s apology for helping to make
the golden calf. He explains: “They meth unto me, make us gods which shall go before us, for as for
this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of
Egypt, we wit not what has become of him. Then I cast this
(the gold) into the fire and there came out this calf.” In the
midst of a great clutter of opinions women cast their brightest
jewels — the power of testing and proving all things for them-
selves — into the fire which tries all opinions; but to each
there generally comes out the traditions nearest to her hand.

The real test is evaded. Thus the men have eaten sour grapes;
it is the woman’s teeth which are set on edge. In every heart
there are ideals which wait to be realized, if the god tarnished
and dim, these ideals are often wrapped in a dark mind-rust.
They are so obscured that they are quite unknown to their pos-
essor. If another will burnish them with the light of his
vivid perceptions, the possessor is amazed to find such rare
gems hidden in the forgotten chambers of his being. He knows
little about his untold, unmeasured wealth.

Every human being is an undeveloped wonder. There is no
other like him in the universe. Whoever will make it the end
of life to embody the vast wealth of hope, truth, beauty and good-
ness which he can find within himself, to give form and ex-
pression to his own highest ideals, such a one will become a
glorious landmark at which many will gaze reverently with ad-
miration and emulation.

How pitiable, then, that women who are but just learning what
some one assured the poor little Hindu widows — that the
world was made for women, too — are still content to be so lar-
gely the weak imitators of the more than questionable methods
already too prominently in vogue? Successful men and women are
taken as models to be imitated both in their lines of work
and in their manner of work. Imitation leaves only a dim,
weak copy. Its defects are as glaring as those of the multi-
les of a good solid handwriting imprinted on poor thin paper by machine pressure. Such reproductions of merely verbal documents are convenient, but for any human being to ape another instead of bringing out the best genuine character still undeveloped within himself is suicidal. Nature, who makes no two leaves nor two blades of grass precisely alike, has given also to every woman her own strength, her own symmetry of possibilities. If these can be steadily unfolded from within, a sweet, wholesome and useful character will certainly be evolved. Such a one may not develop into a high or striking landmark; she will become an altogether admirable oneward which every eye will turn with approval.

"Men have craved greatness where the fates withstood,
Not in this life can all be greatly wise;
But all who strive to may be greatly good,
For in effort the attainment lies."

The fable of the birds who agreed that whoever could fly the highest should become their king is very suggestive. The feeble bat tucked himself under a feather of the eagle's wing, so light a weight that the eagle did not even know he was there. When the strong wing of the royal bird was weary, and the kingly eagle was compelled to descend, the bat spread his skinny wings and fluttered up another few feet beyond all of the others, then down he floated leisurely, wings but half closed, to receive admiring congratulations and the acclamation. But pitiable little king! he had never dared to face the daylight since, lest his real weakness and his grand should be discovered. Borrowed plumes are always dangerous. Mishaps are liable to intervene under such conditions. Too often the homely old proverb is illustrated, "Up like a rocked and down like a stick." Parchment wings are no better than the thin membrane of the bat; but to rely on our own resources, utilized by one's self, means an unending increase of power.

I rejoice that women have not proved themselves to be preeminently given to the class of methods. But if no progressive woman would descend even in the least degree to these unworthy, pitiable, political but really most impolitic measures, the great cause of womanhood would be much more rapidly advanced, and in the end every woman would stand in her own true niche an honored approved, wholly beautiful madonna of integrity.

Men and women are the whole earth's rightful sovereigns by virtue of their intelligence and their higher appreciation of justice and equality. The physical forces wait their command, for it is intellect alone which can give them improved direction and control. The strength, the beauty, the grandeur of the world are the lawful servants of the inalienable possessions of all mankind. Many head tiny blossoms and rich fruits, divinely tinted regal lands and skies gladdest human eyes. The tall sires, the white barked quivering aspens, the hearts of oak
and cedar of Lebanon are but precious gems often in a setting
even higher than they. All these are for intelligent admiration,
but equally far more precious human uses devised through in-
genious re-adaptation. Mind alone can recreate a still newer
earth. But simple absolute truth is nature, physical and mental,
is the charming method through which all desirable transforma-
tions must be effected. In heat, light, and the power in
steam and electricity can not be enjoyed, cheated or defrauded,
so neither can that in the far more admirable mental and moral
forces. The intelligent and ethical worlds await transformations
infinitely more glorious than can ever be realized in physical
domains. Woman just entering upon their heritage of work in
that wider field which is privileged to merge self-interest in
the broader welfare of progressive humanity, are not destined
to become the simple imitators of our brothers, even as to their
best methods — certainly not as to their worst. Imitation is
the genius of commonplace; it proclaims its own insufficiency;
it's poet mediocrity. Imitation is a tone, a parsile side to
even its best attempts, as womanhood is not a copy of man-
hood but its correlate, so the ways and means of the women who
become world-workers are not be the dimmer repeated impres-
sions of the ways and means of the world-workers among men.
The monkey, like a good many queer plants and many still more
old and curious animals, is certainly one of the careless
creative joke. They are illustrative of humor, the wholesome
sense of fun and enjoyment to enliven the earnest realities of
life. They serve to impress the lesson that a laugh may
be quite as healthful as a tear. The monkeys, whimsical char-
eargers, of human beings, have imitation as their leading
characteristic mentally. They are the best illustrations, we
have of the very low plane upon which we must place all pure
imitation of every degree. The blundering attempt to do what
some one else had done is often deliciously absurd, and so far
good as laughter provocative. It has its uses when imitation
is made a light, practical gymnastics; but one can almost
fancy a leading intention in making the monkey the standing
illustration to enforce the impotency of all serious mimicry
of other e. Young children are minded of course, but one
can almost fancy a leading intention in making the monkey
express their own individuality and every woman should aim to
express something on her own ideal character in her work. She
can realize her best self in her occupations very much as a
novelist writes himself into the treatment of his characters;
we may do this voluntarily; he is impelled to do it involuntar-
ily. In the same way the life work of every woman becomes a
revelation of herself and should be made to represent the high-
est ideal, womanly self. In the beginning God made male and
female. Granite mountains joining their leaguas of cold,
rocky lands, but lifting white crowned heads upward toward light
and sunshine in all their grandeur, are not man's superiors
but his decile servants. They are the high seats from which his
penetrating eye can study limitless spaces; and the footstools
are but man's footstools. Fatherless poems have easily become
his entirely convenient highways. At human option Niagara,
earth's diadem of waterfalls, is transformed into a still more magnificent jewel in the coronet of intellect and its rational utilities. Men and women are rightfully to possess the earth and its fullness of treasures; are to recreate a new earth in which the desert will blossom as the rose. Better still, the swords must be beaten into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks. But in all intellectual and moral advancement in the consummation of applied higher rules and the moral unselfish virtues, woman everywhere must uplift her own standards and illustrate her own best achievements.
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Mrs. Gage said: This convention has assembled to discuss the subject of Woman's Rights, and form some settled plan of action for the future. While so much is said of the inferior intellect of women, it is by a strange absurdity, conceded that very many eminent men owe their station in life to their mothers. Women are now in the situation of the mass of mankind a few years since, when science and learning were in the hands of the priests and property was held by vassalage. The Pope and the priests claimed to be not only the teachers, but the guides of the people; the laity were not permitted to examine for themselves; education was held to be unfit for the masses, while the tenure of their landed property was such as kept them in a continual state of dependence.

It was but a short time since the most common rudiments of education were deemed sufficient for any woman; could she read tolerably and write her own name it was enough. Trammled as women have been by night and custom, there are still many shining examples, which serve as a beacon lights to show what may be attained by genius, labor, energy and perseverance, combined. "The longer I live in the world," says Sothea, "the more I am certain that the difference between the great and the insignificant, is energy, invincible determination, and an honest purpose once fixed, and then victory."

Although much has been of woman's unfitness for public life, it can be seen from Semiramis to Victoria, that she has a peculiar fitness for governing. In poetry, Sappho was honored with the title of the Tenth Muse. Helena Lucretia Gerano in the seventeenth century, was of such rare scientific attainments, that the illustrious persons passing through Venice, were more anxious to see her than all the curiosities of the city; she was made a doctor, receiving the title of Unalterable. Mary GACITY, of Silesia, in the sixteenth century, was one of the most able astronomers of her time, forming astronomical tables which acquired for her a great reputation. Anna Maria Schuer- man was a sculptor, engraver, musician, and painter; she especially excelled in miniature painting. Constantine Frierson, an Irish girl, of humble parentage, was celebrated for her literary acquirements, though dying at the early age of twenty-seven.
With the learning, energy, and perseverance of Lady Jane Grey, Mary and Elizabeth, all are familiar. Mrs. Cowper was spoken of by Montague as standing at the head of all that is called learned, and that every critic veiled his bonnet at her superior judgment. Joanna Baillie has been termed the woman Shakespeare. Caroline Herschell share the fame of her brothers as an astronomer. The greatest triumphs of the present age in drama, music, and literature have been achieved by women, among whom may be mentioned, Charlotte Cushman, Jenny Lind, the Misses Carey, Mrs. Stowe and Margaret Fuller. Mrs. Somerville's renown has long been spread over both continents as one of the first mathematicians of the present age.

Self-reliance is one of the first lessons to be taught our daughters; they should be educated with our sons equally with them, taught to look forward to some independent means of support, either to one of the professions or the business best fitted to exercise their talents. Being placed in a position compelling them to act, has caused many persons to discover talent in themselves they were before unaware of possessing. Great emergencies produce great leaders, by arousing hitherto dormant energies.

Let us look at the rights it is boasted women now possess. After marriage the husband and wife are considered as one person in law, which I hold to be false from the very laws applicable to married parties. Were it so, the act of one would be as binding as the act of the other, and wise legislators would not need to enact statutes defining the peculiar right of each; were it so, a woman could not legally be a man's inferior. Such a thing would be a veritable impossibility. One half of a person can not be made the protection or direction of the other half. Blackstone says "a woman may indeed be attorney for her husband, for that implies no separation from, but rather a representation of her lord. And a husband may also bequeath anything to his wife by will; for it can not take effect till the coverture is determined by his death." After stating at considerable length, the reasons showing their unity, the learned commentator proceeds to cut the knot, and show they are not one, but are considered as two persons, one superior the other inferior, and not only so, but the inferior in the law of state is acting from compulsion.
We hear many fears expressed in regard to the danger of "centralised power," and the growing tendency of the nation toward it. The people have been told that through this tendency their liberties were endangered. The truth is just the contrary. "State rights" has from the very commencement of this Government been the rock on which the ship of the nation has many times nearly run aground, and from which it is to-day in great danger. The one question of the hour is, Is The United States a Nation with full and complete National powers, or is it a mere thread upon which States are strung as are the beads upon a necklace?

Let us look back a hundred years. The War of the Revolution commenced merely as a rebellion of the colonies against the Nation to which they belonged. Though all were located on the continent of America, each colony was under its own charter, separate and distinct from every other one. Each colony resisted what it seemed to be acts of oppression against itself. Therefore, the War of the Revolution began as the resistance of individual colonies, but with the progress of this resistance grew up a feeling of united interests, and in 1774 eleven of these colonies, and a portion of the twelfth, connected themselves under certain articles of association. The colonies still considered themselves as belonging to the British Empire, and in these articles avowed their allegiance to His Majesty, George the Third. Although we date the birth of our nation two years later, our nationality actually dates back to these articles of association, for the colonies bound themselves as one in regard to the non-importation and non-exportation, and non-consumption; the first two pledges having National bearing as regarded commerce, and the last one regulating internal affairs in a National manner. This course of the colonies made them one, and has had a bearing on our every step since, even up to this day of grace, January 17, 1873. Resolutions of independence and freedom from all control of Great Britain were introduced into the Colonial Congress in June 1776, and the committee which was then appointed to draft a declaration of independent government was required to base it upon the first resolution of the June declaration of rights, which said, "These United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent," etc. The veriest school-boy needs not to be told the date of this instrument, which we are fond of terming the "Great Charter of our Liberties" yet even preferred
statesmen, from that day to this, have seemingly forgotten that this declaration was agreed to, and signed by the already United Colonies in their Congress assembled, and issued as the act of "one people." No new Congress met, the declaration was not the act of single colonies, or states, but the act of already united colonies, or states, in this instrument we first find our National name.

The members of Congress did not sign this declaration of New Yorkers, or Virginians, or New Englanders, but as Americans; nor was it referred to different colonies for approbation, but on that very Fourth of July, 1776, Congress, with already National authority, flung to the world the announcement that these united colonies were a Nation, and ordered that copies of the declaration should be sent to the several colonial assemb- lyes, conventions, councils of safety, and to each of the commanding officers of the Continental troops, and that it should be proclaimed in each of the United States, and at the head of the army. We see, therefore, that the Declaration of Independence, in being truly National, was wholly centralising — and much more so than any act since, and is therefore the truest basis of our liberty.

Our age has annihilated space; danger lies in darkness and distance. With every newspaper, every railroad, every line of telegraph, danger from centralised National power grows less. With the newspaper, the railroad, the telegraph, the source of the government is constantly before our eyes. The reporter penetrates everywhere, the lightning flashes everywhere, and before plans are scarceley formed here in Washington, the miner of California, the lumberman of Maine, and the cotton-grower of Caroline are passing opinions and interchanging views upon them with their neighbors. The increase of education in the common schools, and the vast private correspondence of the country, too, help to put the proceedings of the government under the cognizance of the whole people. Our danger lies elsewhere, and to clearly see it we must still look back to the early history of our Nation. For a few months after the Declaration of Independence, our new-born republic worked under a common sentiment, for a common interest; but ultimately self-interest prompted the claim of "State Rights." This doctrine was, by wise men, seen to be utterly destructive to the government, and in the second year of our independence it became necessary to fight this State-right doctrine, and the second step was taken in centralisation, by the Articles of Confederation, which were declared to make the Union perpetual, and States were forbidden to coin money, establish their own weights and measures, their own post-offices, and forbidden to do many other things, which, by right, belong to independent self-controlling states.

So anxious was the Nation to set its own power upon a firm basis, entirely over and above that of the States, that back in
these articles of confederation we find the term "private privileges and immunities," that vast phrase in the present discussion. In the fourth article, the inhabitants of each State were declared to be entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens of the several States, etc. These articles, unlike the declaration, were made dependent upon ratification by the legislatures of the several States, which was not fully accomplished till 1781.

For awhile all went merry as a marriage bell. Power had been further centralized, and the Nation felt secure. But there had been left a little loop-hole, which was destined to create State claims in defiance of the general government. Congress soon found that under the articles of confederation the limitation of States was more theoretical than practical. It found that though, in a general way, the United States possessed national powers, as over boundaries, peace and war, the issue of money, the establishment of post-offices, etc., yet in the very necessary matter of revenue, and the regulation of trade and commerce, it was powerless against the States. The old form of the confederation was found insufficient to secure the full independence of the United States as a Nation, and in the very years that the articles were fully adopted, and before the last State had given its adherence (1781), a member of Congress from New Jersey moved a recommendation to the States to invest Congress with additional means of paying the public debt and prosecuting the war of the Revolution, by laying duties on imports and prize-goods.

This proposition at once aroused opposition, and it is well to remember that it did not first come from a Southern State. "State rights" is not a peculiar Southern doctrine. South Carolina was not the original nullifying State. It was Rhode Island, which then, as today, set at defiance national authority, and asserted her right to control her own internal affairs. The New England States, which claim to lead the Union in all that is grand and good, must be made to bear the shame of the evils into which they have also led. Even John C. Calhoun learned his first State rights lessons in Connecticut and Massachusetts of the most eminent men; of President Dwight when a student in Yale College, and Theophilus Parsons, with whom he read law in Massachusetts of the most eminent. When Rhode Island, in 1781, refused to comply with the recommendations of Congress in regard to levying duties on imports and prizes, she looked only at her own interests as a seacoast State. The address of her assembly to Congress, through Hon. Mr. Bradshaw, gave reasons of purely local self-interest for her refusal, but her State selfishness was seen by the patriots of the hour not to be even that of an enlightened State-interest, and Congress at once declared there "could be no general security, no confidence in the Nation, at home or abroad, if its actions were under the constant revival of thirteen different deliberations."
It therefore became necessary to take another step in the centralization of power, and let it be remembered that every such successive step we have traced was taken in the interests of liberty, and for the benefit of the whole people. The Nation has acted in the defense of its citizens against the tyranny of States. We are not first citizens of Rhode Island, or South Carolina, but, if we belong to the Nation at all, we are first parts of the Nation. I am first a citizen of the United States, then a citizen of the State of New York, then a citizen of Onondaga county, in that State, and then a citizen of the town of Manlius, and lastly, a citizen of the village of Fayetteville. That every person born or naturalized in the Nation, is first a citizen of the Nation, must be borne in mind, for upon that depend the liberties of every man, woman and child in the Nation, black or white, native or foreign. Although Rhode Island led in State rights, she had many followers, as only four States complied with the recommendation of Congress to invest that body with more powers for collecting the revenue and prosecuting the war. This non-compliance let to active debate. In regard to the public debt it was said, "That it must, once for all, be defined and established on the faith of the States, solemnly pledged to each other, and not revocable by any, without a breach of the general compact." If a feeling of insecurity existed in regard to the property interests of the Nation when but thirteen legislative bodies assumed their control, how much greater is the insecurity of our personal interests if they are, as is assumed, under the control of thirty-seven separate legislative bodies, and subject to their constant revision?

The controversy soon based itself upon the security of human rights. It was said that it "had ever been the pride and boast of America that the rights for which she contended were the rights of human nature," that "the citizens of the United States were responsible for the greatest trust ever confided to a political society," and that it was for "the people of the United States, by whose will and for whose benefit the Federal Government was instituted, to decide whether they would support their rank as a Nation." Virginia and New York ultimately led in the proceeding which caused the formation of the Constitution; New York, through her Legislature, declaring that the radical source of the government embarrassments lay in the want of sufficient power in Congress, and she suggested a convention for the purpose of establishing a firm National government. Out of this agitation grew the Constitution of the United States, which was the third great step in the centralization of power. The pride and boast of this country has been more fully centered, if possible, on the Constitution that on the Declaration, and yet the Constitution was not framed until eleven years after our existence as a Nation — not ratified by the whole of the original States until about fourteen years after we had taken rank as a free and an independent people — Rhode Island being the last State to give her adherence — and it was expressly
framed and adopted in order to centralize power, and to destroy
the State rights doctrine.

Washington himself, in transmitting, as President of the Conven-
tion, the Constitution to Congress, said: (quotations omitted),
and in the deliberations of the Convention upon the subject,
they kept steadily in view that which appeared to them "the
greatest of every true American — the consolidation of our
Unions, in which is involved our prosperity, safety, and, per-
haps, our National existence." Thus we see not only the desire
of the originators of the Constitution to strengthen the National
power by that instrument, but we also have the views of Wash-
ington himself in regard to the necessity of consolidating pow-
er in the Nation.

The various amendments to the Constitution have been adopted
with the intent of further defining and securing National pow-
er. The first ten, which were called the conciliatory amend-
ments, were suggested in the conventions of a number of the
States at the very time of adopting the Constitution. The first
Congress which met thereafter proposed twelve amendments, of
which ten were adopted in 1791, only two years after the full
adoption of the Constitution. These ten amendments secured
religious freedom, freedom of speech, the right of people to
be secure in their houses, trials by jury, etc. All of them
centralizing the power in the National hands, and at the same
time securing broader liberty to the people. These amend-
ments were passed at the first session of the First Congress.
An eleventh amendment was proposed by the Third National Congress
in 1794, and declared ratified in 1798, thus making eleven amend-
ments to the Constitution in the short space of seven years.
In 1803 a twelfth amendment was proposed by the Eighth Con-
gress, and ratified in 1804.

We pass now over quite a space of time, in which the National
power and State power retained their relative positions to each
other. Perhaps in no better place can I mention two constantly
existing, yet diverse tendencies in the people of the United
States, which are well-defined in the minds of but few persons.
There are two kinds of centralized power, one dangerous to lib-
erty, and the other fortifying and securing liberty. The
dangerous is that which has grown to such dimensions in the
various States, multiplying legislation and regulating each
petty local concernment within its borders, down to a village
cemetery. This has led to that destruction of liberty — a
multiplication of statutes which have so rarely been recorded
are a second legislative body has annulled them. Each State
has, in fact, been an immense centralized power; and as bitter
as has been the South against centralized National power, we
have in it seen a most imperious, tyrannical exercise of cen-
tralised power under the spacious name of State rights. The evil
such is a constantly increasing one under the constitutions,
that they are being revised in many States with special intent
to check this centralizing tendency. New York has not a com-
mission sitting, and Pennsylvania a convention in session, for
the purpose of revising their constitutions, and attention has been especially directed to this dangerous feature of State centralisation. The new constitution of Illinois limits the passage of special laws by its legislature to certain specified subjects, leaving all local interests in the hands of local corporations. The need of the hour — and, in fact, I may say the new fundamental issue of the day — is toward diffused power within the limits of States in matters pertaining solely and entirely to their small or local interests.

The centralisation that fortifies and secures liberty is national centralisation, which we have traced through six steps since 1776, and which has, within the last ten years, received a new impetus of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth Amendments, and which, as they successively followed each other at short intervals, may be termed the seventh, eighth, amendments the Nation fortified and enlarged its powers in reference to personal rights. It defined citizenship; it secured the use exercise of the ballot — and we can not fail to see that in these last three centralising steps, it more broadly than ever before enlarged the bounds of liberty. The protection of citizens of the Nation, by the Nation, is the national duty.

This is the second tendency of which I spoke. Most persons who have been awake to the evils of State centralisation, have applied the same rules of judgment to National centralisation. The two are dissimilar as are darkness and light. State centralisation is tyranny; National centralisation is freedom. State centralisation means special laws; National centralisation means general laws. The continued boundaries brought to the surface the "State rights" theory which precipitated upon us our civil war. States had become so absolute in themselves that out of it grew the feeling of absoluteness in regard to the Nation. But is it not found strange that after the late sad experience there can still be found people so absolute as not to see that the security of individual citizens of the National matters pertaining to their personal political rights, does lie, and in the very fact of our Nationality must lie, in National power superior to State power? The corner-stone of our Nation is political equality. Our ancestors came here for civil and religious freedom. To secure political freedom they formed themselves into a Nation; if the United States has no power to protect its citizens, it is not a Nation.

The eighth step in centralisation, the fourteenth Amendment, specifically declares that "all persons born or naturalised in the United States, are citizens of the United States, and of the States in which they reside." Notwithstanding this plain language — notwithstanding the corner-stone of this Nation is political equality — notwithstanding the chief right of citizenship is a right to share in making its laws — notwithstanding the Constitution and laws of the United States which shall
be made in pursuance thereof then, are declared to be the sup-
reme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be
bound thereby, anything in the constitution or law of any State
to the contrary notwithstanding, yet 10,000 naturalized cit-
izens of the United States have during this session of Congress,
petitioned that body for protection of their rights as citi-
sens of the United States against the State in which they live.

"State rights" is again rearing its head. Rhode Island is
again raising her hand against National power. She again
assume to be superior to the United States. All foreign-born
citizens of that State, not possessed of a freehold estate
of $134 value, or property amounting to an annual rental of
$7, are, by State law, forbidden to vote. These men were
naturalized under a law of the United States, not under a
law of Rhode Island. The United States not only made them
citizens, but expressly in the Fourteenth Amendment declared
them to be citizens, and yet little Rhode Island presumes to
be stronger than the United States.

Here again arises what I have shown to be the question of the
hour. Is the United States a Nation? If it does not possess
powers to protect its own citizens it is not a Nation. Cit- 
sens of the United States are entitled to protection, whether
they are robbed of their liberties in a Spanish dungeon, or
in the State of Rhode Island or New York. The Judiciary Com-
mittee of Congress has reported adversely on the petition
of the 10,000 disfranchised men of Rhode Island, foreshadows
the course of Congress in regard to the great class of citi-
sens now knocking at its door. Women claim National protec-
tion as citizens of the Nation.

The original Constitution in its fourth article touches upon
State control, for it declares that the Constitution shall
guarantee to every State a republican form of government. The
"shall" is imperative. It shall! Even as long ago as 1787
it was declared that the people of the States should no longer
be dependent upon State caprice for their rights, but the
general government took upon itself the authority and duty of
enforcing in each State a republican form of government. Eith-
er this article is a mere sounding phrase, or the Constitution
has such power, although until the Fourteenth Amendment the real
status of citizenship had not been settled. People thought of
themselves as first citizens of the States, then of the United
States, but now such a position can not be taken. The eighth
step in centralization settled that point; "every person, not
every male person — but "every person born or naturalized in
the United States" — "is a citizen of the United States, and
of the State in which he resides." First, entitled to national
protection, and through the Nation to State protection. More-
ever, (quotation omitted)
Is the Constitution supreme in the case of 10,000 naturalized citizens of Rhode Island, whose petition the honorable Judiciary reported adversely upon, the 12th of December?

The naturalized citizens of our country should rise en masse against his attack upon their liberties. If Rhode Island can say that a naturalized citizen shall not vote unless possessed of a certain amount of property, any State can, with equal justice, enact a law declaring that only those naturalized citizens who live in brick houses shall vote; a law, equally as binding as the present property qualification in Rhode Island, can be enacted, the only foreign-born citizens who come over in a Cunarder shall vote. Why not? If a State has a right to deprive one class of citizens of its vote for one cause, it has a right to deprive any other class of its vote for any reason.

The power and mischief do not stop here. If a State has power over the political rights of a naturalized citizen of the United States, it has like power over the native-born citizen. If a State has power over the franchise of the women citizens of the United States, it also has power over the men citizens. Unjust laws, like curses, go home to rest; they can always be made to plague their enactors. When the rights of one class of citizens are ascended, a blow is struck against the rights of all. The danger to individual liberty lies in special laws. If States are powerful enough to weaken the National constitution, then we are weak indeed. The safety of the citizen lies in a strong National constitution; it lies in a National centralization of power that shall override the State in their attempt to destroy individual rights.

If the National government has not power over the ballot in the several States, where did the United States Commissioner get his authority to institute proceedings against Miss Anthony for voting in the State of New York? If the ballot is in the control of the States, then is the United States guilty of a high-handed outrage against New York, in the case of the fourteen women who are now bound over for trial in Rochester for voting at the last election. If the control of the franchise is the right of each State as sovereign, then the National law of 1870 in regard to frauds in voting was an unauthorized interference of the United States in a matter belonging solely to the respective States. On the contrary, if the question as to who may vote in any State — exclusive of black men, over whom it is conceded the nation has thrown this magic of protection — is one of the National control, how does it happen that the Judiciary Committee of the present Congress reported adversely upon the petition of the 10,000 naturalized citizens of Rhode Island? If, then, voting is a matter of State control alone, what authority had the United States to prosecute Susan B. Anthony? One of two things is plainly true. Either the United States authorities had no right to prosecute Miss Anthony in
the State of New York, or, if they had, then they had the right
to regulate suffrage in Rhode Island. If the general govern-
ment could not extend suffrage to Irishmen in Rhode Island,
it could not abolish it for women in New York.

The time has passed when men can take their choice between "State
sovereignty" and "centralized power." What State of the thirty-
seven has power to make a treaty, to form an alliance, to de-
clare war? No one, because not one of them is a sovereign
State. An attempt would be treason against the Nation. If the
general government can not be secure with a diversity of laws in
regard to personal rights; in regard to the elective franchise,
the vital principle of our government.

This government does not stand today on free trade, or tariff,
or the war-power, or its right to manage post-offices, or to
coin money, or to make treaties. Not one of these singly, nor
all collectively, form the ground plan of this Nation. This
Nation stands upon the ballot, the self-governing power; it
stands upon the right of every person governed by the Nation
to share in the election of its rulers.

How can statesmen believe the Nation secure unless personal
rights are held inviolate? The National Government has con-
trol over money, currency, and national banks. It will not
trust its question of finance to individual States; shall it
trust the personal political rights of its citizens unless it
can not its money? Is it not an anomaly, that the lesser rights
shall be held by the Nation, the greater by the States?

In the case of the 10,000 naturalized citizens of Rhode Island,
and that of Susan B. Anthony and other women of New York and
elsewhere, who try to vote, there is one great dissimilarity.
The suffrage of the 10,000 is only regulated. As soon as each
one secures real estate to the small value of one hundred and
thirty-four dollars, he votes; but there are women who can not
simply because they are women. Property amounts to nothing;
education amounts to nothing; even native-born citizenship
amounts to nothing; the ballot for them is not regulated but
prohibited because they are born women instead of men. Con-
gress would quietly waken up to an appreciation of its power
over the ballot, if under pretense of "regulating" suffrage, all
the male citizens of a State were denied the ballot simply
because they were men. The Nation would lose no time in deci-
ding that a regulation of a character not possible to overcome
was not a regulation, but a prohibition destructive of every
natural right. The word "deny" would be elucidated by able
lawyers and lexicographers. We should then be told that to
deny pre-supposes an existing right; that only positive rights
can be denied, and force of arms would be invoked to maintain
the existence of those rights.

The battle for suffrage is narrowed down to the meaning of
"privileges and immunities." Those who believe the consent
of the governed to be the fundamental principle of the Nation, define "privileges and immunities" as the right of voting, which is the only "consent." Thaddeus Stevens went so far as to affirm that "inalienable rights" in the Declaration meant the ballot. Persons who thus define "inherent rights" belong to the true national, patriotic class. But others, deeply tinctured with belief in the supreme right of States, declare "privileges and immunities" to comprehend anything and everything except the ballot. Even some good Republicans, contrary to the principles indorsed and sustained by them in the war amendments, led by their prejudices against acknowledging woman's right to self-government, have declared that "privileges and immunities" merely signify civil and legal rights, but not political. Such was the groundwork of the argument of the Hon. Matt. Carpenter in the Myra Bradwell case. What a farce! It declared at an early day that the United States possessed the greatest trust ever committed to a "political society." "Political society" is a foundation of our nation, and our political trust is the ballot.

It has been said by a member of the present Congress that no man in that body doubts that the Constitution authorizes women to vote, precisely as it authorizes trial by jury and many other rights guaranteed to the citizens of the United States, but that in order to give them practical force there must be legislation; that these guaranteed rights are not self-executing; all laws require enforcement. It may be said that the Ten Commandments are not self-executing; yet though given to Moses, not only as the underlying constitution of the Jewish nation and all nations, they contain self-executing provisions, bearing the penalties of their infraction within themselves. By their simple statement they carry within themselves the authority for their enforcement. The provisions that the sun shall each day rise and run its accustomed rounds is a self-executing provision, until some Joshua votes this divine right of the sun.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and no difficulty should be found in its provisions. But while, as aimed against the exercise of arbitrary power, we have no objection to the passage of a declaratory law which shall make plain to every United States judge, and to the most obtuse inspector of election, that women are voters, we still claim that the recent "Act for enforcing the Amendment" should protect women in the exercise of her rights of self-government.

Although the States ratified the XIII., XIV. and XV. Amendments by the requisite two-thirds vote, they still find it difficult to realize the fact that these amendments have actually strengthened the National power. The Enforcement Act, and the previous law in regard to frauds in voting, may be called definitions of these last centralizing steps, but as yet neither amendments nor definitions are fully comprehended. A
Rhode Island lawyer astutely said: (quotation omitted). Opposition and struggles have already gone, and will continue to arise, but legislators may beat their brains as they will, the fact of new National centralisation still remains. Though State power dies never so hard, die it must, as only through reorganised National power can the political rights of citizens of the United States be protected.

"Citizen suffrage" is today the battle-ground of "State Rights," and the denial of woman's constitutional right to vote, and of National protection in voting, is the weapon it uses against the Nation. The question of citizen suffrage is not a woman question alone, but it is a question of citizen suffrage affecting every man in this wide land. Let us, then, as the supreme political power of citizens of the United States to be the plaything of thirty-seven petty legislatures, of thirty thousand ambitious demagogues. Without this, our National experiment is a failure; with this, we are not freemen, but slaves; without this, we are neither protected nor self-protecting; without this, centralised State power, under the specious name of "State rights," will continue to be a many-headed monster, impossible to overcome. Elect the President direct by the people, and for a single term, if you will; take from him his immense official patronage; base senator-ship upon population, not upon State sovereignty through legislative gift; limit the power of the judiciary; these steps must come; make the people in reality what they now are in theory — sovereigns, not first of States, or the Nation, but of themselves, possessing in themselves all rights, all powers, whose exercise is only delegated to the Nation as their servant.
Chief Justice Waite, in rendering the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Minor vs. Happersett case, she was an appeal from the Supreme Court of Missouri, on the question of woman's right to vote under the provisions of the XIV. Amendment, decided against this right. The court maintained that the United States Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage on any person, and that he matter is regulated by State Constitutions, and that when provision is made in them extending the right of suffrage to men only, such provisions are binding. It also declared that the United States had no voters in the States of its own creation. But this assertion was false upon the very face of it.

1st. Every disfranchised male slave had the ballot assured him under the United States law — a law which anneulled all State provisions against color. At the time of ratification of the last amendments, the State of New York possessed a property qualification of $250. The moment these amendments were ratified, that law became dead on the statute book. The New York Legislature did not repeal it. The United States repealed this property prohibition, by creating a class of United States voters out of colored men. So here is one class of United States voters, and a clear mistake on the part of Chief-Justice Waite and the Supreme Court. But the United States has often exercised its power over the ballot more directly than through constitutional amendments; for,

2nd. Every Southern man disfranchised because of having taken part in the war, and who has since been granted amnesty, has again been made a voter through United States law; all such men then became United States voters. Here is a second class of United States voters, and a second mistake of Chief-Justice Waite and the Supreme Court. It may be answered that the time of this disfranchisement, and therefore under direct control of the National Government. Admitting this, we still know that general amnesty was granted after reconstruction; after State forms of government had again been organized, the nation exercised its power over the ballot by restoring thousands of men to their political rights — to citizenship. And from the general law of amnesty for the rank and file, the leaders in the rebellion were again and again, by special acts, Acts of Congress, re-endowed with the ballot. No amendment was submitted or expected. The authority of Congress thus to restore to these
3rd. The naturalized foreigner secures his right to vote under United States law, and can not vote unless he first becomes an United States citizen, or announces his intention of so becoming. In Missouri, Nebraska, and some others the declaration of such intention permits him to vote. This is a State regulation, but the fact of his United States citizenship must in some form first exist. In the naturalized man is a third class of United States voters. With one and the same hand he at the same moment picks up his naturalization papers and his ballot. It matters not what the State law may be, the foreigner secures his vote under United States law. And here is a third class of United States voters and a third mistake of Chief-Justice Waite and the supreme Court.

4th. The Thirty-ninth of Fortieth Congress took a step farther than this, passing a law that all foreigners who had served in, and been honorably discharged from, the army, should possess the right to vote, even though they had not previously filed intention of naturalization, thus again proving that Congress itself, without an amendment to the Constitution, or the authorization of States, possessed power over the ballot. It has this power of securing the use of the ballot to foreigners who have never intimated a desire to become citizens, it surely can disfranchise its own native-born citizens irrespective of sex. The denial of the ballot to all women by the Supreme Court, in the person of Virginia L. Minor, under the pretense that the United States possesses no voters in the States of its own creation is thus shown to be false assumption. But this is not all.

5th. and 6th. And eldest of all classes of United States voters are those men who vote for members of the House of Representatives, and for Presidential Electors in the several States. (Quotation from the Constitution omitted).

The United States by these articles guarantees: 1st. To every person who has a right under State action to vote for the most numerous branch of his State Legislature, the United States right to vote at a peaceable election for members of Congress. 2nd. The United States directs the appointment of Presidential Electors, and declares that Congress may not determine the time of choosing such electors, but shall also fix the day upon which such votes shall be given. The United States secures the right, merely leaving the States to prescribe the qualifications of voters. This is all, with one exception that woman asks; she demands that her right shall be recognized and secured by the United States, which shall then prohibit the States from prescribing qualifications not within the reach of all citizens.

A 7th class of United States voters are those men who having been deprived of citizenship through civil offenses against the power and majesty of the United States are afterward pardoned,

men the use of the ballot was unquestioned.
Still an 8th class over whose the United States exercises its authority are deserters from the army — military criminals. An act of Congress of March 5, 1865, imposed forfeiture of citizenship and its rights, as an additional penalty for the crime of desertion. In accordance with this act, the President issued a proclamation the eleventh of the same month, declaring that all deserters who failed to report themselves to a Provost Marshal within sixty days thereafter should be deemed to have forfeited their rights of citizenship, and should be declared forever incapable of holding any office of interest or profit under the United States. This act was passed previous to the submission of the XIV Amendment.

Thus at the time of Chief Justice Waite's decision asserting National want of power over the ballot, and declaring the United States possessed no voters of its own creation in the States (where else would it have them?), the country already possessed eight classes of voters, or persons whose right to the ballot was in some form under the control or sanction of the United States. The black man, the arrested man, the naturalized man, the foreigner honorably discharged from the Union army, voters from the lower House of Congress, voters for Presidential electors, pardoned civil and military criminals. Further research may bring still other classes to light.

Thus when woman claims that her right to use the ballot shall be secured by the United States, she has eight distinguished precedents in favor of her demand for National protection. No more inconsistent assertion was ever made than that the United States possesses no control over the suffrage. While by Circuit Court decisions, Supreme Court decisions, and decisions of the courts of lesser degree, theoretically denying its control over the suffrage, the United States in many ways beside those mentioned, practically acknowledges its possession of this right. In the case of Miss Anthony and the fourteen other women of Rochester, N. Y., who voted in 1872, the great State of New York took no action at all in the matter; it was the General Government which thrust itself forward and took up the question. If the United States has no control over suffrage then Miss Anthony's trial was a clear interference of the United States with the rights of States. And so great was this interference, it is believed the judge appointed to try her case left Washington with his verdict in his pocket already written.

Let none of my audience forget the various great trials of women's right to vote under the XIV Amendment, especially that of Mrs. Virginia L. Minor, who prosecuted the Inspector of Election in St. Louis for refusing to receive her vote, and whose case, coming finally for adjudication to the Supreme Court of the United States, decision was rendered against her on the plea that the ballot was under control of the respective States, and that the United States has no voters in the States of its own
creation; which I have shown to be an ignorant, imbecile, and false plea. Neither let them forget that of Susan B. Anthony, decided against her on the ground that she was a woman at the time she voted. If States have the sole control of the suffrage, there was interference in the rights of the State of New York by her trial; and if the United States citizens of any class have a right to be protected in the use of the ballot, then the United States very flagrantly and tyrannously interfered in Miss Anthony’s individual right as a citizen of the United States.

In the near future these trials of women under the Amendment will be looked upon as the great State trials of the world; trials on which a republic, founded upon the acknowledged rights of all persons to self-government, through its courts decided against the right of one half of its citizens on the ground that sex was a barrier and a crime.

Then let us look at the territory of Wyoming. Much has of late been said in regard to women not making use of the ballot there; I care little about that statement one way or the other, as long as her right to vote is met interfered with. It will be time to require all women to vote when we have such a law for men; until then let each voter refrain from voting at his or her own option; it is not the vital question. But there is a point connected with women voting in Wyoming that is well worthy of our consideration. That is, the interference of the United States with the concomitants of the right. For a time the women of Wyoming sat upon juries, and the fact was heralded over the country that thieves, gamblers, murderers fled the territory rather than fall into the hands of these women jurors. The first conviction for a murder in that territory, not committed in self-defense, came from a mixed jury.

But of late we have ceased hearing of women jurors. And why? Because that sacred right has been interfered with by the United States. The Marshal of the Territory, an officer appointed by the United States Government, has absolutely refused to place the names of women on the jury lists. Consequently the women of Wyoming are denied the exercise of this right by United States power. Whether the Marshal has been ordered by the National Government to omit the names of women, we do not know, and it does not signify. The duty of the United States is none the less clear; the territories are in an especial way the wards of the nation, and should be protected in all territorial rights. The Territory of Wyoming having secured to women the exercise of their right to vote, it is the duty of the General Government to protect them in the exercise of all concomitant rights, of which the jury is one.

This deprivation of jury rights in Wyoming is not only an United States interference with woman’s political rights, but also an interference with her industrial rights. It is a well-known fact that the women earned their first independent dollar
by sitting in the jury box. And whatever interferes with woman's
industrial rights helps to send her down to those depths
where want of bread has forced so many women into the gutters
of shame. This is a question of morality as well as of indus-
trial and political rights. Every infringement of a man poli-
tical rights, touches a hundred other rights adversely, let
us show you one good that has come to woman through her ballot
in Wyoming. The payment of men and women teachers has been
equalized by direct statute, for political power always bene-
fits the parties holding it.

Let us look at a few other ways in which the United States has
touched the rights of women whose protection has been secured
her by legislation outside of itself. One instance that has
come to my knowledge since I have been in your city, is in
the case of pensions for colored women. The United States not
only secured the ballot to the black male citizen outside of
State authority, but it has touched the family relation with its
powerful hand. It has assumed that the woman with whom a col-
ored soldier was living at the time of his death was his wife,
notwithstanding he may have lived for many years in recognized
married relation with another woman, and became the father of
children by her during this period. In one case coming under
the cognizance of our Washington lawyer, Mrs. Leckwood, a pen-
sion was, by United States authority, thus granted to a woman liv-
ing with such colored soldier at the time of his death, although
she had no other claim upon it. This soldier, during the period
of slavery, had been married in his master's house to another
woman by a regularly ordained clergyman, and by that wife had
become a father of five or six children. This woman was his
lawful widow, according to State and church law. These child-
ren were his lawful children, according to the State and church
law, but the United States stepped in and made this married
woman an outlaw, and left her children in the world with
the brand of illegitimacy. The women of the Territories of Wy-
oming and Utah are not secure in their political rights, because
the women of the Nation have none. Scarcely a session of Con-
gress but some politician introduces a bill to disfranchise the
women of these territories.

In regard to the religious aspects of this Utah question, I
see for it only so far as it touches woman's political rights,
although I do not know that woman's political wrongs and her
religious wrongs have been very closely intermingled in the past.
I recall a Papal Bull of Urban II., in the 11th century, which
compelled priests to discard their wives, making the thousands
of women in England, wives who were not wed of children off-
spring who had not recognized father. We do the National Woman
Suffrage Association have nothing to do with the religious rights
of women in Utah, except in so far as they intermingle with
and touch woman's political rights. But the Utah question, which
now comes up again, is not simply a religious question. The Sove-
reignty is continuously striving to destroy the political rights
of the women of this Territory. Its Governor is a United States
officer, and in his last report to the Secretary of the Interior, he so far transcended the duties of his office as to suggest the disfranchisement of Utah women. Almost every session of Congress sees some bill of similar import introduced.

The General Government did not confer this right, did not secure even the exercise of it. The territorial legislature, the same as in Wyoming, secured to women the exercise of the right of suffrage; the United States, according to its own theory, has no authority to interfere with this right, because, according to that theory, it has nothing at all to do with the suffrage question. Yet it proposes to disfranchise those women as a punishment for their religious belief; it proposes to make social outcasts of them, as it has already done with the wives of some of its black soldier voters.

Looking back through history we find no act of the Roman Church more vile than that which compelled its priests to disown their wives and legitimate children—none which so utterly demoralized society, and destroyed its tens of thousands of women. And although, as a body of reformers, I again say we do not touch religion except where it, and politics together, infringe upon the rights of women, I do not hesitate to say for myself individually, that I have no faith in any form of religion, be it what it may, Christian, Mohammedan, Buddhist, that receives revelation only through some man; or farther than that, I will say, I have no faith in any form of religion that does not place man and woman on an exact equality of religious rights. Two forms of religion on the present day which have risen through women, or as revelations to her, namely the Shaker and the Spiritual, do give us equality of religious rights, for man and woman. But I call your attention to the inconsistency of United States laws, and their especial injustice to women by interference with those rights secured them by State or territorial laws, as in case of the colored Soldier's wife; as in case the assumption that the United States had a right to prohibit the exercise of the suffrage by a woman in New York, although New York itself did not interfere; as in case of the virtual prohibition by the United States of jury rights to the women of Wyoming; as in case of the presumptuous suggestion of the Governor of Utah that its women should be disfranchised; as in case of such bills so often introduced in Congress.

I know something of the opinion of the women of the Nation, and I know they intend to be recognised as citizens secure in the exercise of all powers and rights of citizens. If this security has not come under the XIV. Amendment, it must come under a XVI., for woman intends to possess "equal personal rights and equal political privileges with all other citizens." She asks for nothing outside the duty of the United States to secure.
Politicians may as well look this fact squarely in the face and become wise after the wisdom of the world, for in just so far as they ignore and forget the women of the country, in just so far will they themselves be ignored and forgotten by future generations.
No Title So Proud as American Citizen


Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee -- You have heard the general argument for woman from Mrs. Stanton, but there are women here from all parts of the Union, and each one feels that she must say a word to show how united we stand. It is because we have respect for law that we come before you to-day. We recognize the fact that in good law lies the security of all her rights, but as woman has been denied the constitutive rights of the declaration and constitution, she is obliged to ask for a direct recognition in the adoption of a sixteenth amendment.

The first principle of liberty is a division of power. In the country of the czar or the sultan there is no liberty or thought or action. In limited monarchies power is somewhat divided, and we find larger liberty and a broader civilization. Coming to the United States we find a still greater division of power, a still more extended liberty -- civil, religious, political. No nation in the world is as respected as our own; no title so proud as that of American citizen; it carries with it abroad a protection as large as did that of Rome two thousand years ago. But as proud as it is, this it brings with it only shame and humiliation to one-half of the nation. Woman has no part nor lot in the matter. The pride of citizenship is not for her, for woman is still a political slave. While the forms of our government seem to include the whole people, one-half of them are denied a right to participate in its benefits, are denied the right of self-government. Woman equally with man is a responsible being.

It is said women are not fit for freedom. Well, then, secure us freedom and make us fit for it. Macaulay said many politicians of his time were in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition that no people were fit to be free till they were in a condition to use their freedom; "but," said Macaulay, "this maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story, who resolved not to go into the water till he had learned to swim. If men (or women) are to wait for liberty till they become good and wise in slavery, they may indeed wait forever."

There has been much talk about precedent. Many women in this country vote upon school questions, and in England at all municipal elections. I wish to call your attention a little further back, to the time that the Saxons first established free government in England. Women, as well as men, took part in the Witens-gegente, the great national council of our Saxon ancestors in
England. When Ethelred, king of Kent, in the seventh century, assembled the national legislature at Ashhamstead to enact a new code of laws, the queen, abbess, and many ladies of quality signed the decrees. Also, at Beasenfield, the abbess took part in the council. In the reign of Henry III. four women took seats in parliament, and in the reign of Edward I. ten ladies were called to parliament and helped to govern Great Britain. Also, in 1253, Henry left his queen Elinor as keeper of the great seal, or lord chancellor, while he went abroad. She sat in the Aula Regia, the highest court of the kingdom, holding the highest judicial power in Great Britain. Not only among our forefathers in Britain do we find that women took part in government, but, going back to the Roman Empire, we find the Emperor Heliogabalus introducing his mother into the senate, and giving her a seat near the counsels. He also established a senate of women, which met on the Collis Quirinalis. When Aurelian was emperor he favored the representation of women, and determined to revive this senate, which in time of war had fallen to decay. Plutarch mentions that women sat and deliberated in councils, and on questions of peace and war. Hence we have precedents extending far back into history.

It is sometimes said that women do not desire freedom, but I tell you the desire for freedom lives in every heart. It may be hidden as the water of the never-frozen, rapid-flowing river Neva is hidden. In the winter the ice from Lake Lagoa floats down till it is met by the ice setting up from the sea, when they unite and form a compact mass over it. Men stand upon it, sledges run over it, splendid palaces are built upon it; but beneath all the Neva still rapidly flows, itself unfrozen. The presence of these women before you shows their desire for freedom. They have come from the North, from the South, from the East, from the West, and from the far Pacific slope, demanding freedom for themselves and for all women.

Our demands are often met by the most intolerable tyranny. The Albany Law Journal, one of the most influential legal journals of the great State of New York, had the assurance a few years ago to tell Miss Anthony and myself if we were not suited with "our laws" we could leave the country. What laws did they mean? Men's laws. If we were not suited with these men's laws, made by them to protect themselves, we could leave the country. We were advised to expatriate ourselves, to banish ourselves. But we shall not do it. It is our country, and we shall stay here and change the laws. We shall secure their amendment, so that under them there shall be exact and permanent political equality between men and women. Change is not only a law of life; it is an essential proof of the existence of life. This country has attained its greatness by ever enlarging the bounds of freedom.
In our hearts we feel that there is a word sweeter than mother, home, or heaven. That word is LIBERTY. We ask it of you now. We say to you, secure to us this liberty -- the same liberty you have yourselves. In doing this you will not render yourselves poor, but will make us rich indeed.
Mrs. Matilda Joslyn Gage

Speech before Committees of Senate and House of Representatives on the District of Columbia at the House of Representatives in 1877.

Taken from the "History of Woman Suffrage," Vol. III, pp. 10-13

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee: On behalf of the National Association, which has its officers in every State and territory of the Union, and which numbers many thousands of members, and on behalf of the Women's Franchise Association of the District of Columbia, we appear before you, asking that the right of suffrage be secured equally to the men and women of this District. (Quotation from Constitution omitted).

Congress is therefore constitutionally the special guardian of the rights of the people of the District of Columbia. It possesses peculiar rights, peculiar duties, peculiar powers in regard to this district. At the present time the men and women are alike disfranchised. Our memorial asks that in forming a new government they may be alike enfranchised. It is often said as an argument against granting suffrage to women that they do not wish to vote; do not ask for the ballot. This association, numbering thousands in the United States, through its representatives, now ask you, in this memorial, for suffrage in this District. Petitions from every State in the Union have been sent to your honorable body. One of these, signed by thirty-five thousand women, was sent to Congress in one large roll; but what is the value of a petition signed by even a million of an unrepresented class?

The city papers of the national capital, once bitterly opposed to all effort in this direction, now fully recognize the dignity of the demand, and have ceased to oppose it. One of these said, editorially, today, that the vast audiences assembling at our conventions, the large majority being women, and evidently in sympathy with the movement, were proof of the great interest women take in this subject, though many are too timid to openly make the demand. The woman's temperance movement began two years ago as a crusade of prayer and song, and the women engaged therein have now resolved themselves into a national organization, whose second convention, held in October last, numbering delegates from twenty-two States, almost unanimously passed a resolution demanding the ballot to aid them in their temperance work. We who make our constant demand for suffrage, knew that these women were in process of education, and would soon be forced to ask for the key to all reform.
The ballet says yes or no to all questions. Without it women are prohibited from practically expressing their opinions. The very fact that the women of this district make this demand of you more urgently than men proves that they desire it more and see its uses better. The men of this District who quietly remain disfranchised have the spirit of slaves, and if asking for the ballet is any proof of fitness for its use, then the women who do ask for it here prove themselves in this respect superior to men, more alive to the interests of this District, and better fitted to administer the government. Women who are not interested in questions of reform would soon become as if they possessed the ballet. They are now in the condition we were when we heard of the famine in Persia two years ago. Our sympathies were aroused for a brief while, but Persia was far away, we could render it no certain aid, and the suffering of the people soon passed from our minds.

Our approaching centennial celebration is to commemorate the Declaration of Independence, which was based on individual rights. For ages it was a question where the governing power rightfully belonged; patriarch, priest and monarch each claimed it by divine right. Our country declared it vested in the individual. Not only was this clearly stated in the Declaration of independence, but the same ground was maintained in the secret proceedings upon framing the constitution. The old confederation was abandoned because it did not secure the independence and safety of the people. It has recently been asked in Congressional debates, "What is the grand idea of the centennial?" The answer was, "It is the illustration in spirit and truth of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the constitution." These principles are:

First — The natural rights of each individual.
Second — The exact equality of these rights.
Third — That rights not delegated are retained by the individual.
Fourth — That no person shall exercise the rights of others without delegated authority.
Fifth — That non-use of rights does not destroy them.

Rights did not come new-born into the world with the revolution. Our fathers were men of middle age before they understood their own rights, but when they did they compelled the recognition of the world, and now the nations of the earth are this year invited to join you in the celebration of these principles of free government.

We have special reason for asking you to secure suffrage to the women of the District of Columbia. Woman Suffrage has been tried in Wyoming, and ample testimony of its beneficial results have been furnished, but is a far distant territory, and those not especially interested will not examine the evidence. It has been tried in Utah, but with great opposition on account of the
peculiar religious belief and customs of the people. But the District of Columbia is directly under the eye of congress. It is the capital of the nation, and three-fifths of the property of the District belongs to the United States. The people of the whole country would therefore be interested in observing the practical workings of this system on national soil. With 7,318 more women than men in this District, we call your special attention to the inconsistency and injustice of granting suffrage to a minority and withholding it from a majority, as you have done in the past. If the District is your special ward, then women, being the majority here, have a peculiar claim upon you for a consideration of their rights. The freedom of this country is only half won. The women of today have less freedom than our fathers of the revolution, for they were permitted local self-government, while women have no share in local, state, or general government.

Our memorial calls your attention to the Pembina debate in 1874, when senators from eighteen States recognized the right of self-government as inhering in women. One senator said: "I believe women never will enjoy equality with men in taking care of themselves until they have the right to vote." Another, "that the question was being considered by a large portion of the people of the United States." When the discussion was concluded and the voting was recorded their votes for woman suffrage in that distant territory. During the debate several senators publicly declared their intention of voting for woman suffrage in the District of Columbia whenever the opportunity was presented. These senators recognize the fact that the ballot is not only a right, but that it is opportunity for women; that it is the one means of helping her to help herself. In asking you to secure the ballot to the women of the District we do not ask you to create a right. That is beyond your power. We ask you to protect them in the exercise of a right.
MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE
A Decision of the Supreme Court

Given at the House of Representatives, January, 1880. Taken from "History of Woman Suffrage," Vol. II, pp. 167-9

It is necessary to refer to a remarkable decision of the Supreme Court. The case of Virginia L. Minor, claiming the right to vote under the fourteenth amendment, was argued before the Supreme Court of the United States, October term 1876; decision rendered adversely by Chief-Justice Waite, March 1875, upon the ground that "the United States had no voters in the States of its own creation." This was a most amazing decision to emanate from the highest judicial authority of the nation, and is but another proof how fully that body is under the influence of the dominant political party.

Contrary to this decision, I unhesitatingly affirm that the United States has possessed voters in States of its own creation from the very date of the Constitution. In Article I, Sec. 2, the constitution provides that: (quotation omitted).

The persons so designated are voters under State laws; but by this section of the national constitution they are made United States voters. It is directed under what conditions of State qualification they may cast votes in their respective States for members of the lower house of congress. The constitution here created a class of the United States voters by adoption of an already voting class. Did but this single instance exist, it would be sufficient to nullify Chief-Justice Waite's decision, as Article VI, Sec. 2, declares: (quotation omitted).

This supreme law at its very inception created a class of United States voters. If in the Minor case alone, the premises of the Supreme Court and Chief-Justice Waite were wrong, the decision possesses no legal value; but in addition to this class, the United States, by special laws and amendments has from time to time created other classes of United States voters.

Under the naturalisation law citizenship is recognised as the basis of suffrage. No State can admit a foreigner to the right of the ballot, even under the United States laws, unless he is already a citizen, or has formally declared his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States. The creation of the right here is national; its regulation, local.

Men who commit crimes against the civil laws of the United States forfeit their rights of citizenship. State law cannot re-habilitate them, but within the last five years 2,500 such
men have been pardoned by congressional enactment, and thus
again been made voters in States by United States law. Is it
not strange that with a knowledge of these facts before him
Chief-Justice Waite could base his decision against the fight
of a woman to the ballot, on the ground that the United States
had no voters in the States of its own creation?

Criminals against the military law of the United States, who
receive pardon, are still another class of voters thus created.
A very large body of men, several hundred thousand, forfeited
their rights of citizenship, their ballot, by participation
in the rebellion; they were political criminals. When gen-
eral amnesty was proclaimed they again secured the ballot. They
had been deprived of the suffrage by United States law and it
was restored to them by the same law.

It may be replied that the rebellious States had been reduced
to the condition of Territories, over whose suffrage the gen-
eral government had control. But let me ask why, then, a large
class of men remained disfranchised after these States again
took up local government? A large class of men were especially
exempted from general amnesty and for the restoration of their
political rights were obliged to individually petition congress
for the removal of their political disabilities, and these men
then became "voters in States," by the action of the United
States. were, again, the United States recognized citizenship
and suffrage as synonymous. If the United States has no voters
of its own creation in the States, what are these men? A
few, the leaders in the rebellion, are yet disfranchised, and
no State has power to change this condition. Only the United
States can again make them voters in States.

Under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments the colored men
of the South, who never had possessed the ballot, and those col-
ored men of the North over whom some special disqualification
hung, were alike made voters by United States law. It required
no action of Delaware, Indiana, New York, or any of these
States in which the colored man was not upon voting equality with
the white men, to change their constitutions or statutes in
order to do away with such disqualification. The fourteenth
amendment created another class of United States voters in
States, to the number of a million or more. The fourteenth
amendment, and the act of Congress extending it, in
that case, recognizes it to be superior to State law — abrogating
and repealing State constitutions and State laws contradictory
to its provisions.

By an act of Congress March 3, and a presidential proclamation
of March 11, 1865, all deserters who failed to report themselves
to a provost marshall within sixty days, forfeited their rights
of citizenship as an additional penalty for the crime of de-
sertion, thus losing their ballot without possibility of its
restoration except by an act of congress. Whenever this may be done collectively or individually, these men will become State voters by and through the United States law.

As proving the sophistry used by legal minds in order to hide from themselves and the world the fact that the United States has power over the ballot in States, mention may be made of a case which, in 1886, came before Justice Strong, then a member of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, but since a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. For sophistical reasoning it is a curiosity in legal decisions. One point made by Judge Strong was, that congress may deprive a citizen of the opportunity to enjoy a right belonging to him as a citizen of a State even the right of voting, but cannot deprive him of the right itself. This is on a par with saying that congress may deprive a citizen of the opportunity to enjoy a right belonging to him as an individual, even the right of life, but cannot deprive him of life itself.

A still more remarkable claim of United States voters than any yet mentioned, exists. Soon after the close of the war congress enacted a law that foreigners having served in the civil war and have been honorably discharged from the army, should be allowed to vote. And this, too, without the announcement of their intention of becoming citizens of the republic. A class of United States voters were thus created out of a class of non-citizens.

I have mentioned eight classes of United States voters, and yet not one of the States has been deprived of the powers necessary to local self-government. To States belong all matters of strictly local interest, such as the incorporation of towns and cities, and the settlement of county and other boundaries; laws of marriage, divorce, protection of life and property, etc. It has been said, the ordaining and establishing of a constitution for the government of a State is always the act of a State in its highest sovereign capacity, but if any question of nationality ever existed, it was settled by war. Even State constitutions were found unable to stand when in conflict with a law of the United States or an amendment to its constitution. All are bound by the authority of the nation.

This theory of State sovereignty must have a word. When the Union was formed several of the states did not even frame a constitution. It was in 1818 that Connecticut adopted her first State constitution. Rhode Island had no constitution until 1843. Prior to those years the government of these States was administered under the authority of royal charters brought out from England.

Then where was their State sovereignty? The rights even of suffrage enjoyed by citizens of these States during these respective periods of forty-two and sixty-six years, were either secured
them by monarchical England or republican United States. If by the latter all voters in these two States during these years were United States voters. It is a historical fact that no State save Texas was ever for an hour sovereign or independent. The experience of the country proves there is but one real sovereignty. It has been said, with truth.

"There is but one sovereign State on the American continent known to international or constitutional law, and that is the republic itself. This forms and the United States should be so called."

I ask for a sixteenth amendment because this republic is a nation and not a confederacy of States, and I ask it because the United States not only possesses inherent power to protect its citizens but also because its national duty to secure all its citizens the exercise of their rights of self-government. I ask it because having created classes of voters in numberless instances, it is most flagrant injustice to deny this protection to woman. I ask it because the Nation and not the State is supreme.
Mrs. Jago: To me, one of the most notable things connected with this Council has been the almost universal unanimity with which the delegate, both ministerial and lay, invocation and speech, have ignored the feminine in the Divinity. So notable has this non-recognition been, that the morning when I presided over its proceedings I was in some little trouble to find the woman far enough advanced in theology to recognize the divine motherhood, but eventually, in Isabella Beecher Hooker, I secured such person for the invocation with which the programme of the Council demands all proceedings should be opened. The almost total ignoring of the Divine Motherhood of God by those who have in any way referred to the Supreme Power, has been to me a subject of profound surprise and astonishment.

All thoughtful persons, and foremost among them should be the women here represented, must be aware of the historical fact that the prevailing religious idea in regard to woman has been the base of all their restrictions and degradation. It underlies political, legal educational, industrial, and social disabilities of whatever character and nature. The word "God," which simply means good, has everywhere been interpreted by the Christian Church, especially for the last hundreds of years, as well as by the later theocracy, as of but one gender — the masculine; and it has been the occasion for the priesthood of both dispensations to ignore the feminine principle everywhere. Inasmuch as history teaches us that the rack, the torture, the destruction of human will, the degradation of woman for the past eighteen hundred years, as well been dependent upon masculine interpretation of the Bible, based upon belief in a purely masculinized divinity, this Council has been to me a dangerous evidence of woman's ignorance upon this most important of questions. It was the teaching of Aristotle which the church endorsed under penalty of punishment — for heresy that the supreme effort of nature was always for the masculinum, she only producing the feminine when balked of her intention.

And even when the great naturalist, Linneaus, of whom it has been said he made the frozen plains of Lapland blossom like fairy fields, first made known his wonderful sexual system of plants, the basis of all modern investigation in botany, he was shunned as one who had degraded nature and insulted the Most High.

It is especially surprising that the advocates of social purity fail to recognize the femininity of the divine — of God; that they alike fail to see, to speak of, and to address the
Divine Mother, when the fact of this ignoring by the church and by man has resulted in the creation of two codes of morals, everywhere recognised in society, the lax for man, and the strict for woman. Had it not been for this theory which has grown out of the doctrines of the church in regard to the masculinity of God and the supreme wickedness of woman, the world would not now be filled with the grossness and moral wrong which, because of her higher nature, are everywhere made to fall with supreme force upon woman.

In all ancient nations we find goddesses seated everywhere with gods, in many instances regarded as superior to them, and of greater influence in the affairs of the universe. Not had this idea quite died out at the advent of Christianity. To the majority of the Christian world the early history of the church is entirely unknown, but the student can glean enough to show that the equal feminine nature of the divine was accepted by the church.

The fact that upon his baptism by John, the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus in the form of a dove, is sufficient to prove this were another testimony wanting, the dove among all ancient nations symbolising the feminine principle. It is also remarkable that the Hebrew possesses no masculine gender for dove. Not until after his baptism, when the spirit, or feminine principle of divinity, rested upon and united itself with Him, did Jesus take up his ministry. As spirit in the Hebrew answers to all genders, and in Greek to the feminine alone, it is easy to see the false beliefs engendered by church teachings as to the masculinity and fatherhood along of God. Our records of the first three Christian centuries prove that even the early and oft-quoted fathers of the church regarded the third person of the Trinity as feminine.

One of the most revered ancient scriptures of that period, "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," in use during the second century, and of great authority, taught this. Origen, in the third century (A.D. 230), quoting from it. This Gospel was believed to have been compiled from still older manuscripts; one entitled "The Oracles and Sayings of Christ," a second "The Gospel Preaching and Doctrines of Peter." The great Biblical scholar, Tischendorf, to whom the world is indebted for the renowned Vatican Codex, hidden so many years in the Vatican palace at Rome, endorses the authenticity of this Gospel, believing it to have been in use by Justin, one of the earliest Christian fathers, whose birth is placed at A.D. 70.

Another canonical book of the New Testament, now lost, was known as "The Everlasting Gospel," and was also called "The Gospel of the Holy Ghost." In this Jesus is represented as saying: "My mother, the Holy Ghost, took me." The Gnostics, that early philosophical division of the church which claimed possession
of the only true Christianity, denominated this feminine principle, Sophia, i.e., wisdom. With the Kabalists, the feminine signified those who possessed a knowledge of secret things, especially of a divine character. The "Divine Spirit" was conceded to be the feminine Jehovah, or the feminine principle of the Godhead. This spirit is not along the comforter; it is the animating power—the life. A recent article upon the Esoteric or interior meaning of the gospels refers to spirit in this wise: "One is she, the spirit of the Elohim of life."

The primary sense of spirit, as given by Webster, is to drive, to rush. This recalls the Day of Pentecost, when the Spirit descended as a mighty rushing wind, visible as tongues of fire. Fire possesses the same radical sense as spirit, signifying to rush. Either as spirit or as fire, this principle of the divinity denotes activity, animation, vigor, force, and is equivalent to life itself—the creative principle. In this Council there have been frequent references to the creation. Let me present the subject on the same Biblical basis, but from a different interpretation.

God, that is Father-Mother, said: "Let us make him in our image, after our likeness." So God, Father-Mother, created man, male and female created He-She, them, and called their name Adam, a generic term signifying "red; or, as has been interpreted, "the one who blushes." In addition, the woman possessing the feminine attributes of the Divinity, received a specific name, significative of spirit, of life: Eve in our translation, Zoe in the Greek, both signifying life, the one who holds or gives life, the life-giver, the creative principle, in which respect the woman possesses superiority over the man.

The Old Testament, falsely translated as it has been, full of mistakes and interpolations as it is known to be, is pronounced in its recognition of a feminine principle in the Divinity. The word Jehovah, too holy to be spoken by the Jew, was formed by the union of Jah-Eve, signifying both the masculine and the feminine, while El Shaddai, translated "The Almighty," is used only when some action of the Divine nature expressive of the feminine is required. Its external signification is purely feminine.

During the lapse of ages and growing materiality of the world the femininity of the Divine was forgotten, its holiness, or wholeness, lost, and until again recognized humanity mourns. Various bodies, material and mystical, lament the lost name, among them the Masons, the inner meaning of whose rites, not understood by themselves, is based upon it. Through ignorance, prejudice, and fraud, the feminine having been lost, God has presented to both Jew and Christian as solely masculine. The wholeness of the Divine name will not be restored until the
the feminine is again recognised as a component part of the Divinity.

The Lord's Prayer, "Hallowed be Thy name," is an entreaty for the restoration of the "wholeness of his name — for a recognition of the feminine in this name. It lies within the power of each person uttering this prayer to answer it himself — herself; and the remaining portions, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done as in heaven so on earth," depend upon a restoration of the wholeness of the Divine name by a recognition of the feminine in the Divinity.

By no external miracle is the world to be taught truth. The kingdom of heaven lies within; each person can hasten to advent for himself, herself. There is abundant proof that even under this partial recognition of the motherhood of femininity of God women were officially recognised in the early ministraions of the Christian church. They were ordained to the ministry, officiated as deacons, administered the rites of baptism and the Lord's supper, promulgated tenets, interpreted doctrines, and founded sects to which even their names were given. From Marcellina, in the second century (A.D. 160), a body of the church took its name. Her adherents were called Marcellinians, the same as the followers of Russ, Luther, Wesley, Calvin, and Swedenborg, at a later period, have been known as Russities, Lutherans, Wesleyans, Calvinists and Swedeborgians. Although the writings of Marcellina have shared the fate of many opponental books, having been lost, her memory has descended to us fragrant with the deeds of a good life. As Deborah was the only Jewish ruler whom the sacred scribes, historians, and prophets passed by unrebuked, so we find the memory of Marcellina free from calumny and reproach. Her life and her doctrines were in accord.
SPEECHES OF LUCY STONE

I Am. Anti-Slavery Convention 1853
II Woman and Temperance 1853
III Speech at New England Anti-Slavery Convention 1853
IV Speech at Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Convention 1854
V Woman Suffrage in New York 1867
To my mind it does not need the poet’s utterance to give woman a claim to speak on an anti-slavery platform, while there are "Casseys" scattered by thousands all over this broad land; for, so long as their wail comes to the ear of woman, how it is possible for her to keep silent? Whether we find in the pen of the poet, or any other source, an endorsement in the great promptings of our nature, which we cannot, if we would, hush.

The Anti-Slavery Anniversary, as it recurs year by year, brings to those who are engaged or interested in it, a survey of what has come to give us cheer in the year that is gone, and also what has come to show us the strength and purpose of the Slave Power. Within the last year, much to make the heart beat with highest hope has come clustering in the way of abolitionists. We have had new voices speaking, and fresh and friendly heart heating. 'Uncle Tom's Cabin', strong and true, has gone before the length and breadth of the world, winning hearts that did not before feel one throb of pity, calling forth deep gushings of sympathy that we hope will never die out. Other causes of rejoicing have come to us; but I purpose rather, in the brief space of time I occupy, to look at some of the manifestations of pro-slavery. And I will not make an apology for speaking of political parties, from the fact that I am a woman. I need to make no apology. I believe in the political right of everybody, man or woman, not only to think but to speak on this question, if all political party puts itself in the way of the slave, then let anybody and everybody, disfranchised or not, speak in re-buke of what is done.

Our Chairman remarked, that since our last anniversary, the Baltimore platforms had been put forth. Yes, and not only put forth, but they have been adopted, when the Democratic Convention of Baltimore had written out its creed — a creed so infamous that I never attempt to describe it, for I have no language that is adequate — when it had put forth the platform, pledging itself plainly and unmistakably to return the fugitive slave and when Franklin Pierce, in accepting the nomination, said 'I accept it, not because it harmonised with my convictions', and when he had pointed to his career in Congress, glorying in
deeds that ought to have been his shame, to prove that his sentiment were in harmony with that platform, then the people rose up like a cloud over the length and breadth of the land, and give their suffrage to that man and for that party, knowing well what it is. The people who are not chattels, into whose souls the iron of slavery has not passed, know as far as the language can speak it; what slavery is; and those who acted with the political parties know it. And yet, with their eyes wide open, they wend and pledged themselves to return the panting fugitive.

In that month of June, when the Convention met, there were fleeing from the Republic, so named, and a model Republic too, a mother and her little child, a babe sleeping in her bosom. As she passed across the State of Indiana, having got half way through it, she dreamed that, having passed so far from that line that divides the non-slaveholding from the slaveholding States, it might do for a woman, seeking her liberty and the liberty of her little one, to walk at midway; and so, with the sun above and the green earth under her, she went on, hoping she was safe. At midday, she was startled by the loud cry of the kidnapper behind her, demanding that she should stop, and, if she did not, threatening that she should be shot on the instant. That mother, instead of pausing at the bidding of those who were pursuing her in harmony with the Fugitive Slave Law, in harmony with the platform of the Democratic party, in harmony with the convictions of Franklin Pierce, took her baby from her bosom, placed it on her shoulders, and as she grasped its little hand with hers, she ran with all the speed that fear could lend to her feet. The kidnapper, who cared not whether they brought her back dead or alive, drew his pistol, and shot as deliberately as though the game before him had been a deer. Ay, ay was dear in more senses than one. He fired, the ball went through the head of that infant, and through the ear of its mother, leaving the scattered brains and blood upon the cheek of that mother, who, when she perceived that the little one had found its freedom with God, let go her grasp of its hands, not to stop, as you, mothers, when your little ones die, to dress their bodies neatly for the grave, to lay them where you can plant flowers and go to weep over the treasure of the love they gave you — not to stop, I say, but leaving it all unburied on the plains of Indiana, that mother fled for liberty dearer than her life — and found it, thank God, on the shores of Canada; no thanks to the Baltimore platform for it.

Such facts were being written in letters of blood all over the Union, and the Democratic party knew it. They knew what was the root of the evil. They knew what it was that caused the helpless mothers to flee out of this Union. They knew it all; and yet Franklin Pierce and his party said, 'The Fugitive Slave Law shall be sustained, and we will resist all agitation on the subject.' They virtually declared, 'No man, or woman, or child,
shall open the lip against it: they shall be dumb; the heart shall cease to beat, and the infernal system shall be allowed to continue. And when the people know that such deeds are constantly being done, did (less) not they rush to ratify what their leaders had done. The voters of New York city rushed to the polls, and cast their ballots for Franklin Pierce by an overwhelming majority.

Men, fathers, Democrats! how could you do it? You, who are proud to take your own little boys and girls on your knees, and know that you are backed and protected by law which is strong enough to guard you in any emergency, when you knew that millions of fathers and mothers who have no protection are hunted like partridges on the mountain, how could you do it? How could you go and give your suffrages for candidates that pledged themselves that every such father's heart should bleed, and every such mother should have her soul wrung with intense anguish? How could you do it? You know why you did it; I know why you did it. Will your children's children not find their cheeks tingling with shame at the remembrance of the deeds their fathers have done?

The Whig party did just what the Democratic party did. They had a platform just like the Democrats. Nobody knew what belonged to which, they were so alike in spirit. The Whigs, what there were of them, and General Scott, freely gave their adherence to the platform, and went as far as they able to accomplish the same infamous purpose that the Democratic party accomplished, not coming into power, the Whig party escaped the necessity of being used as the tool of the Slave Power to do whatever it was bid. The Whig party was not ignorant, any more than the Democratic Party, of what slaveholding was and is.

A slave fugitive father and mother, with their two children, came to the Ohio river last summer. It was during the very time of the campaign. The father and mother had borne in their own persons all the cruelties that slavery inflicts. They had endured, and perhaps would have continued to endure, its inflictions, had there not woke in their souls a new-born love of the little ones as they looked with mournful forebodings over the future of those children. They saw that there was not a single ray of sun-light to gladden that future. They looked upon that future, not as you look on the future of your children, knowing that some place of usefulness, of honor, or of profit, may be theirs. To that slave father and mother, the future was one pit of blackness. There was no school-house for their children. Into the very presence-chamber of the Eternal, they would be obliged to go without a single ray of light to guide them there. With their children they attempted to make their escape from your model Republic. They came trembling down the Ohio bank, on the Northern side. A man with tones of kindness told them if they were fugitives, they need not tremble so.
They were on the soil of Ohio, and God's clear sunlight was looking down upon them, and yet they trembled, guilty of no crime, charged with none, unless it be a crime that there swells in the human soul that love of liberty which neither waters nor floods can quench. The man said, 'you need not tremble so; if you want to hide, here is an old boat under which you can go.' The father and mother and little ones went and hid themselves under that boat till the sun should go down, and the North Star come out. Very soon after they were concealed, a man, who, in mockery of his Maker, claimed ownership in the body and soul of his brother, came. The villain that told them where to hide, had told the owner where they were hidden. He came, uplifted the boat, revealed the poor victims trembling before his gaze, and demanded their surrender. The father came out of his hiding place, and did as most of yourselves would have done. He put his wife behind him, and one little one, and taking the other on his arm, with the other he fought with all the desperation that a man could, knowing that on the issue of that hour were hung not merely life to him and to his, but liberty and life. He drove back his assailants. The men went over the river, procured helpers, and, with bowie-knives and pistols in their hands, they came back and attacked him, still standing with his babe in his arms. The pistol-shots riddled the body of that father and his child, they were literally a clot of gore. The father fell, exhausted by the loss of blood, the man-hunters pounced upon him and his, and while we are here in the city of New York speaking for outraged humanity, the poor man is where no tongue can speak for his defense. While this very deed was being done, and thousands like it, the Whig and Democratic parties were going up and down the length of the land, urging everybody -- except women, -- to give their votes for men who were pledged that just such deeds as that should be done, and done perpetually, and that we should not have Ohio, Indiana, nor one single state where a slave father or slave mother can stand and take their children by the hand, and say, 'They are mine.' And when the leaders of the Whig and Democratic parties were saying that, the men of the party were assenting and giving their sanction to platforms that they knew were ready to bind, hand and foot, and bury in eternal night, the last spark of liberty that should glow in the soul of any slave; and not only that, but to gag the mouths of any who dared to speak a word for downtrodden humanity, if they could hinder it. Thank God, they could not.

And while the political parties were doing this, the Church was lending itself an ally to the parties all over the land. In my own State of Massachusetts, the Congregational ministers met in that very month of June. Of how many deeds of infamy were committed in that month of June? The ministers of all the Congregational churches in Massachusetts met in the Association at Lowell, and there came up to that body a man who had just returned from the meeting of the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church at Charleston, South Carolina.
They had met there before them and all around them was to be heard the sound of the slave-ship, and there were to be seen the auction-block and the slave pen. They had sat there to talk about what? Those who help God's poor and oppressed? About imitating Him who came 'to preach deliverance to the captives'? No. They sat there to talk about 'church extension'. The slave-gang marched before their face, and they had no protest; and when they at last adjourned, they appointed as a delegate to go and attend the Association of Congregational ministers, the Rev. Mr. Pitch. The ministers of Massachusetts, from Barnstable to Berkshire, met in Lowell; and the Associations were represented; and when they came to have their communion, according to their custom -- when they spread their table and put on it the bread and wine to commemorate the death of Him who came to 'break every yoke and let the oppressed go free', and when they wanted some one to assist at the breaking of the bread and pouring of the wine, they chose this very delegate, who had come with his lips all gory from that communion with slaveholders. And there he stood among the ministers, and performed his part, and there was not a clergyman there at that meeting who made any protest. And when I read in the Congregationalist the account of their meeting, I hoped to find in some part of it a protest; but there was none. And then I listened to Massachusetts pulpits, to hear if there should not come from some one of them, some earnest condemnation of his Christian character, or the Christian character of those who came from that union of slaveholders, but listened in vain. And as we stood back, looking at the sacrament with horror and asked, 'Just God and holy, are these they who minister at this altar -- is this the church which lends strength to the spoilers?' and as we beheld them joining hands with each other and with religionists all over the country, and asked if you could be the church of God, they said, 'You are infidels'. But I can say to them, as Sallie Holley said, 'Let them call us infidels, if they please; but, Of don't let them call themselves Christians'.

There is not time to look over the religious phase of what has come to us the past year. The support of slaveholding has been so open, that none of you can fail to see it. But while the Church and the Government take hold of hands with each other, and only here and there a pulpit remembers the slave, not the less shall we remember him. Let them brand us as infidels, if they please, we can afford to hear it. The works that we do bear witness of us, and, without abating one jot of our hope, we take hold on one side of the hand of Him from whom the Higher law comes, and on the other, the hand of the slave, and we shall not let go the one or the other. It does not matter to us if we are driven from one city, and find no refuge in another. We will still find human hearts to which we can speak, and hearts that can feel. We will sit down by the mother in her little country home, and, while she holds her infant in her lap, we will wake up in her soul a sympathy for the mother whose baby is not here. And when the father who lives back in
the woods looks proudly upon his daughter, we will tell him of the father who cannot take care of or protect his daughter, and we will solder anew the link in that father's heart which binds him to every other father, and his arm shall be moved to be a co-worker with us in this cause, which needs the consecrated energies of every son of Adam.

Lamartine said of Wilberforce, that 'he went up to the throne of God with millions of broken fetters in his hands as evidence of a life well spent.' If we would give evidence of a life well spent, if we would be sure to do those things that will comment on us to Him who is 'of purer eyes than to behold iniquity,' let it be our business to take in our hands the broken fetters, and stand in the great day alongside of the slave, before our common Father, and let him bear testimony there, that to our faithful efforts was due to the loosening of the fetters from his limbs, and from his spirit too.
Lucy Stone, of Brookfield, who presented a review of the proceedings of certain male Delegates at the meeting held in the Brick Church Chapel on Thursday morning, May 13, by which the regularly appointed Delegates of an efficient State Temperance Society were rejected because they were Women. Miss Stone spoke substantially as follows:

The speaker who preceded me said he did not dream, coming up from a slave-holding state, that, when we met in Brick Church Chapel the other morning, to call a World's Temperance Convention, that any such issue would take place. It is not for me to say what I dreamed of, or thought of. We were there as those who have a deep interest in the cause of Temperance. We went there without any claim beyond that allowed us by the call; and when a noble man nominated noble women to serve on a Committee, throughout the audience were heard cries of "order!" and motions to adjourn. Women, they said, had no business there. Women! the sisters of those who were the wives of drunkards. Women! the sisters who were the daughters of drunkards. Women! the sisters of those who, by all natural ties, were bound to men who despised them, and had involved them in ruin; these Women were there, and were told by Doctors of Divinity that it was no place for them! We didn't meet the question of Women's Rights; we simply asked that when the whole world came together Women should be recognized as part of the world and have a right to meet in council with our brothers there. And one grey-haired Minister, the Rev. Dr. Hewett, who, if he is present, will not be ashamed to have me repeat, what he said, if he was not ashamed to say it, began discussing the question of Woman's Rights — and said, it was "improper," etc., for women to take part in these proceedings; quoted Paul — said, that all usage was against us; that it was not easy for an old man, who has not kept his soul open to God's sunshine and raindrops to change. But if he did not believe we had any right, there he should not in the call, have invited ALL FRIENDS OF TEMPERANCE to come together. On the Committee for Credentials, was Rev. Mr. Higginson, of Massachusetts. And when I say this gentleman has been the warmth to the heart and the guide to the head of the Temperance cause there, its friends will not feel that I do him any discredit. He came there at the call, but declined to serve on a committee that could not recognize his SISTER as well as himself. Mr. Higginson is a "manly man" — a man, who, when a parish were displeased at his faithful preaching, and he knew
he was right, gave up his charge, and left the place, scorning pulpit and salary rather than relinquish his principles to the will of the people. He had learned that there is more than place and honor in human existence. He knew that to abide by the Right was the truest wealth. He declined to serve on the committee. A man, whose name I did not learn, said he hoped the reason of his declining would not be entered in the Secretary's Report. There is hope for that man; for, when a man has SHAME life, there is a string that may be pulled by which he may be reclaimed.

Rev. Mr. Thompson, of Mass., moved that Lucy Stone serve on that committee; to which Mr. Baretow, of Providence, immediately said — "I won't put such a motion — I will not preside over such a meeting!" I hope he is here tonight to see that I am telling the truth. Mr. Thompson insisted, but was ruled down. The committee did not think it was within the call of the Convention to allow women to be heard. Mr. Higginson said that he wrote the resolution that called the meeting together, and he would never have put his pen to the paper if he had dreamed that women were to be excluded. But he was not allowed to proceed; was ruled out of order, and gagged down, as was every one who claimed equal rights for delegates, irrespective of sex. The Committee on Credentials was then appointed by the Chairman, entirely from those known to be on one side, contrary to the universal usage of legislative bodies, and giving no chance for a minority report. That committee, after having received the credentials of women as well as men, reported that it was not the intention of the signers of the call to admit women as delegates, and they would not be received, when it was manifestly such as they could call only A SEMI-World's Convention, and that no justice could be had at their hands. Mr. Higginson entered his protest against the unworthy proceedings in the name of us all, and invited those who were in favor of a whole World's Convention — a convention that should know neither sex nor color, neither sex nor kindred nor tongue nor nation, to meet at Dr. Trall's and make arrangements for it. Accordingly, next September that convention shall be held. From the decision of the Brick Church Chapel, we appeal to the world; and we can wait for their verdict. After we left the Brick Church, Mr. Baretow, who said we were "out of our place", proved the truth of this (if the papers reported him correctly), by using language which he should have been ashamed to have spoken in the ears of decency. The next evening at Metropolitan Hall, he said: "God has placed woman in the moral world where he has the sun in the physical world, to enlighten, regulate and cheer." And when we went to this meeting, instead of recognizing her "sun light," he only called her a candle, and put his bushel over it. "Woman," said he, "is the sun, to regulate, enlighten, and cheer." And when you come to look at the fact, to see what kind of "regulation" he means, it is the regulation subject to his order. One man said: "we value woman,
and we could not do without her." When we went to Metropolitan Hall, I found HOW they value us — namely, just as they value their horses, or their oxen, for the work they can get out of us. At that convention, when there came to be a resolution voted upon, Dr. Fatten said, that he hoped gentlemen and LADIES would all vote. Yes, they valued us there, because we could give strength to their resolutions. And we were also told that our CONTRIBUTIONS "were highly praised! So after having voted us out of the Brick Church — after having insulted every man's mother and sister — they came to Metropolitan Hall, and asked ladies to contribute in their behalf! Yes, this is the way they value us, to raise funds to pay their salaries — and what other bills I don't know. Mr. Barstow seemed desirous of giving credit to Rhode Island, for the noble manner in which she received Roger Williams, after his banishment from Massachusetts; but, Mr. Barstow, who admired toleration, would gag the mouths of half the world; he builds the tombs of the old prophets, and digs the graves of the new. Mr. Hewett tried to prove from the Bible when the "scum" was gone, for so they called us, although they sometimes tell us we are angels — he tried to prove that women should not speak or engage in the work of men. Whatever is fit for anybody to do, is not fit for women to do; and whoever can do it well has God's certificate to do it. I presume I look upon no person here who has not seen the face of the drunkard's wife or daughter, who, when the fire had gone out on her heartstone, the light of hope in her soul presented indeed a spectacle for the pity and sympathy of the world. I saw the wife of a drunkard, who was so cruelly beaten by her husband, that she was blackened all over with blows; that woman, when telling her said tale of woe to a friend, in spite of herself, found the big tear drops rolling down her cheeks, and the great grief of her heart in vain endeavoring to find utterance. This woman, and others in her circumstances, comes to the Brick Church, and asks to be saved from this brutal treatment, from these cruel blows; but Mayor Barstow says, in reply to her, you cannot sit in this body; and Dr. Hewett tells her she is out of her place. The daughter of the drunkard, in the person of her representative, comes to that convention, and says, as one drunkard's daughter did say! — (poem omitted) And many drunkard's daughters with hearts like this, send Susan B. Anthony to plead her cause; but Mr. Fowler says, shall women pursue us everywhere? and he taunts her because she would speak of the wrong she has suffered. In this city, last summer, a little boy was induced by the enemy of his mother, to enter one of those numerous groggeries that are to be found in the Eleventh ward, and was made so drunk that life was not able to keep its place in the body. The mother took her boy in her arms, watched its life as it ebbed away — that mother robbed of her son by the demon of intemperance, sent Emily Clark here to ask, that, when the world met together, she might be allowed to do something to save her young children; but the meeting at the Brick Church said, we won't have women among us. No matter,
let her child die before her eyes; let her be the wife or daughter of a drunkard, she has no right there. But the whole meeting did not say that; the Rev. Mr. Thompson spoke in favor of equal rights, and I am glad to mention that and many other honorable exceptions. Neal Dow says that if the question had been brought up in Maine, our admission would have been certain. The delegate from New Brunswick said that if we were excluded, it would be only a Half World's Convention. I am glad to see, by this applause, that you disapprove of the calumnies there are heaped upon us. They talked there to be sure, something about the conscience, and said their conscience would not permit them to admit Woman. This puts me in mind of the Indian's conscience. He was asked what he meant by conscience. "Oh!" said he, laying his hand on his breast, "there is something right in here that say, I won't." The Mayor of Providence said he thought as much of women as most men do. If that is not a slander upon you, gentlemen, I am sorry. And yet these men who exclude women are perpetually exclaiming they think much of Women; most men do -- yet, they tell us we have no business to meddle in this cause, and will not accept our assistance; and still they will tell you that they are Temperance men. Now suppose this Tabernacle were on fire to-night, and that a woman on the outside discovers the fire, and puts a ladder up to the windows, with real earnestness and sincerity, to save us inside, A D.D. steps up and tells her it is a very unwomanly, and tumbles down the ladder. Now, must he not be a crazy man who would prevent her from saving the building and the precious lives it contains? I say when a man sees thirty thousand drunkards go down to an unhonored grave every year; when he sees their wives and children; when he sees a society like ours, endeavoring to do away with these evils, and he says, "No, let the widow wail on, and the child shall remain the child of a drunkard." what do you think of the sincerity of such a man? Whoever is the friend of a cause is glad to secure aid from any source, and he who is true to his convictions as a temperance advocate, will even accept the aid of children. He who is a real friend of the cause, will say welcome, thrice welcome to those who come to put out the fire that burns in the distillery, and destroys the lives of our husbands and brothers. Why this opposition, then, to women? Does it not come from those who are opposed to reform, and who would stay the progress of the race. They say that there is no precedent for Woman's interference in public affairs. We are to have nothing but what we have a precedent for? There was a time when we had no precedents for steam or railroads; and, certainly, as there was no precedent from the discoveries in her time, Isabella was a naughty fool to have assisted Columbus -- for, had she not, America might never had been discovered, nor should we be disputing about precedents in a land which was discovered against all precedent. My soul is not a palace of the past; I have no fear of what is called for by the instinct of the race." Whoever opens his ears, hears everywhere the cry for reform; it comes over the ocean from every village and hamlet of the Old World; the news-
paper is scarcely dry, before the reform it records is followed
on its heels by another; and while every reform is rendering
woman more free, she shall not come to the World's Convention
as a helper, if Mayor Baratow, who thinks "more of women than
most men," can prevent her. I know there are men who are will-
ing to ignore the existence of women and her rights, making them
inferior to their own; but they are not men who act in that way,
and we will appeal from them to those who are willing to treat
us justly, and to whom we shall not appeal in vain, when we
shall that there are sad hearts to be comforted, and erring minds
to be reformed. Nor, I say, men and women of New York or from
whatever quarter of the world you come, whether you like it or
not -- whether you say "God bless" or "God curse" -- whether
you give us the right hand of fellowship, or turn your back
in scorn -- whether you write us down as unwomanly women, and
unfit to live, or what you please; so long as there is one
mother that leads by the hand a drunkard, and the child of a
drunkard; so long as one tear-drop comes from her eye; so long
as one man cannot feel enough reverence for his own soul to
stay away from the wine cup, so long will we, in season and out
of season, in the highways and byways, in public and private
places, wherever we can find an ear to hear, we will there
speak; and no man, or set of men, no woman or set of women
shall ever hinder us. We reverence the opinions of age; we
know the force of old customs; and while we bow before the gray-
haired man, with deeper reverence do we bow before Him from
whom came the golden rule, and to whom old age is accountable;
and because we reverence Him, we are able to plant our feet
upon that golden rule, and are not ashamed when you tell us it
is a shame. A world's convention -- not half a world's con-
vention -- recognising alike all that belong to the human fam-
ily -- that knows neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free,
will meet in this city next September, and we know the city of
New York will show itself large enough to recognise the whole
world, and show who it is that makes the world.
If I were to obey my own feelings, this evening, I surely
should not speak a word. I would far rather, when on this
platform, listen than speak. But yet, if, by any word I shall
say, the day of deliverance for the slave shall come by one
moment sooner, I am willing to offer that word — glad to of-
fer it, too.

I listened today, as I always listen, with great interest, to
the discussion in regard to the character of the Constitution
of the United States, and the support given to the system of
slavery in that direction; I have listened to the charges that
are made against the Church — of her recency of truth and
duty — I know they are all true; but yet, whenever I listen to
a discussion on these topics, there always comes to me the
thought, that, if the government and the Constitution remain
just as they are — if the Church remains with the same creed
that it has today, slavery would be in the land, not for these
reasons, — not because we have such creeds, but it would be
in the country because we are not ourselves a free people. I
mean, that we who are here in Boston, here in New England, and
everywhere North of Mason and Dixon's line, are ourselves so
much enslaved, that be the civil institutions of the country
what they may, the fault lies more in ourselves than in them.
The slave may clank his chains all over the length and breadth
of the land: — he who can tell the slave's sad story best may
stand to tell it in every street, in every dwelling, and by
every highway, and though it may go into the ear of the people,
and perhaps reach its heart, yet, after all, he who tells the
slave's story, tells it in the ears of those who are themselves
in bonds; and though the eye of the listeners may look down
below him to the slave still lower than himself — bound, bruis-
ed and beaten — he yet cannot go to help him, because he is
not himself in freedom. Men and women creep cowardly over
God's footstool, and by their very cowardice, they allow the sys-
tem of slaveholding to run riot over the land.

I mean what I say. The slave is held in his bonds because there
is not, in the souls of men and women, a great courage, which
dares abide by the truth. When we would settle the question
of right or wrong, we always stop to ask — 'But what will
people say?' Does Squire Smith agree with that? — or does
Mrs. Jones agree with that? — and then, having ascertained
the opinion of Squire Smith and Mrs. Jones, the question is set-
I say, there are few — 0, very few! — who dare to do what is unpopular, no matter how holy it is. To illustrate what I mean; I went, a short time ago, to lecture in a town in this State, where the kind of anti-slavery represented on this platform is so odious, that, though there are meeting-houses, and halls and school-houses in the place — all unoccupied on the week-day, and some of them unoccupied on the Sabbath, too -- no halls, no meeting-house, no school-house could be obtained for our meeting. So exceedingly odious is this kind of anti-slavery that, those who are in friendly terms could all be counted on the fingers of a single hand. But we found a little hillock, beautifully overgrown with trees, whose thick covering gave us a shade from the sun above, and there we went and held our meeting. In that town, we found there were many who would have been glad to attend our meeting, if they had dared to do so. One woman, -- and I think she was a fair representative of her sex — said, *If I were only a mouse in the wall, I would go to their meeting.* She was not afraid of His eye who never slumbers, but she could not bear that her neighbors should know that she went to a meeting that was held in so low esteem. She would have been glad to have heard us, but she was afraid of the laugh of those who did not think it proper to go there. I believe she represents a vast majority of the women of the land. We are not so mindful of the opinion of Him, whose eye, if waking or sleeping is always upon us, — we are not so mindful of what He thinks, of the cognizance He takes of our actions, as we are of that of our frail fellow-mortal, whose breath is in his nostrils. We are always inquiring, as of the last importance, what will this one or that one say. And when we know that their opinion is against our sense of right, we bury the truth in our own souls, and cover it up and keep it there, never allowing it to get before the eyes of others; at least, not until it has been so far recognized by them that we can do it without loss of reputation.

I do not want you to understand me as expressing the belief that men have any more bravery than women. I have seen as much cowardice among men as among the other sex. I went, not long ago, to speak in a place where there was a great deal of Orthodoxy, and where, too, there was a religion preached, which as one of the parishioners told me, was only "the dried husks of Orthodoxy." Five hundred people gather there, from Sunday to Sunday, hungering and thirsting after the bread and water of life, and they have only these miserable husks. When we went there to hold an anti-slavery meeting, I was stupid enough to suppose that he would attend. But, no; he went where the other swine did eat, and partook of the husks that were there, because
he was hoping for place and preferment, which he feared he should fail to obtain, were it known that he had the least shadow of a shade inclination towards us. I believe he represents the majority of men.

Again: I went, a short time ago, to attend a meeting in a Massachusetts town, in behalf of a cause equally unpopular with this. A certain man there, on being invited to attend the meeting, replied — 'No! I will not go to hear a crazy woman; and she must be crazy, or she would not be alluding to such subjects.' Well, a few days after, I went to a city in New York State, to speak on the same subject, and there, strange to say, was this very man before my face, he having paid a quarter of a dollar to hear the speaker at whom he had flung so unmanly a sneer when at home! After the lecture, — which seemed to have been acceptable to the audience, — while the friends were crowding around the lecturer to express their sympathy and pleasure, the same man came up to the platform, also, to give me his hand.

The cowardice, that such a little incidents shadow, are to my mind indicative of what lies at the root. Tell such a man that there are 'Uncle Tom's' scattered all over the South-land, tell him of the weight of woe that sweeps in resistless tide over the souls of those three millions of slaves, and you might as well whisper the tale in the 'dull, cold ear of earth'; his own hands are bound; he has no courage and no freedom, and before he can come and take hold of 'Uncle Tom's hand, and raise him up, and give Casey the word of cheer she needs, he must make for himself a Declaration of Independence; and when he has achieved that, and becomes a man among men, — when he himself has no shackles on his spirit, and dares to love what is true, and can listen to the word of truth, — then, becoming over from his place of power, he can take 'Uncle Tom' by the hand, and recognize him as a little lower than the angels.'

After all, it seems to me that the first thing that is needed for our cause is a great lesson of courage. We want such men and women as will not 'flatter Neptune for his trident, nor Jove for his power to thunder.' We want such men and women, who if you

'Tempt them with bribes, you tempt in vain;
Try them with fire, you find them true.'

When men and women of this character are more numerous than now, then, and not till then, can the slave leap out of the charnel-house where he now is, and find the recognition of that manhood which God gave him as his birthright.

It is my present conviction, that were I to go out and speak to the people on this great subject, wherever I went, from town to town, and from house to house, it should be my business to make the people understand that they were cowards; and I would
prove it, to every man's face, and to every woman's, also, from the facts that I would learn them in twenty-four hours; and I would entreat them to reverence themselves, and spurn the bonds that are on the spirit of man. It should be my business to search out a manhood that could wear itself like a glorious crown, enabling men and women to give their aid to every cause that needs their aid, not stopping to ask, 'Shall I get to office and power?' but only, 'What is the right?'

We blame the clergy. I have heard, until my ear was pained by listening, the story of their recreancy; and I have blamed them, and I do blame them, and they deserve to be blamed. But the people, who hold them in their control, are more to be blamed than they, for their cowardice. But when a clergyman comes to learn to scorn his place, and his parish, and his salary, choosing rather the want of place, and of parish and of salary, with the privileges that they give, and keeping only his integrity of purpose and action, -- when he comes to know that there is a wealth that thieves cannot steal, -- the approval of his own conscience, -- and that is more to him than the approval of all whose breath is in their nostrils, -- then he will not stop to ask whether this man, who helps pay his salary, or another, will be pleased if he opens his lips to the dumb; he will come up here, away from the circles of fashion with which he has been connected, and labor with us for the deliverance of them that are in bonds.

I know it cost something to be free -- I have learned it. Its cost is great even in the least things. Dare to differ from the fashion and custom and opinion of those about you, and just so surely you are made to smart -- from those, too, who ought to be larger than to do it. The world may sneer at the nobleness of soul it cannot imitate; friend may rebuke that which they cannot comprehend; and even affection may be blind to the deep mysteries and high and noble purposes of life; but the consciousness of rectitude is its own exceeding great reward. The soul, animated with a holy purpose, is able always to trample under its feet all of opprobrium, or of ridicule that malice and meanness can throw in its way; the soul that has a holy purpose, strengthened by that purpose, is able to pass by these petty meanesses, only with a feeling of pity that circumstances have so belittled human beings everywhere, that they are not capable of receiving and using the reward which comes from freedom of mind and body.

I say again, it costs something to be free; but then, in freedom itself there is that richness, that treasure of wealth, which will ample repay all that can be lost otherwise. Take a true position, and by your earnest and faithful life, be understood as having taken it for conscience and the truth's sake, and the grand old soul, the true and noble-hearted, will rally to your side, and round your brow.

'Through rifted clouds and parted,
Stream down the smile of God;"
and in that smile, and with it, it does not matter who of flesh may frown.

If I were asked what should be the first help to emancipate the slave, and the second, and the third, I should say to the first, Courage; and to the second, Courage; and COURAGE to the last! Courage! Rather freedom, each man for himself, each woman for herself, and then use it for the good of all. Spurn the bond of servitude that keeps us now always asking what this great world, with its little fractions of men and women, is going to say, rather than trying to find answer to the great questions of truth and duty.

I am ashamed of a people which stoops to carry favor with a nation like this, a nation, which as Stephen Foster says, 'steals babies and whips women'; asking privileges of bab-stealers, and of those who, if they are not, wield the cowhide over their fellows, stand by those who do! Why, if they be mean men who drive their fellow beings like cattle, and sell them in shambles, and steal from the mother her baby, how mean must those be who go and cringe to such men, and ask their favor! I have no word that can speak the contempt I feel for it; and yet, that poor fawning is everywhere, and men act upon their knowledge of it. The poor miserable man in the Assembly at Albany, who introduced a bill which aimed to make the great State of New York a hunting-ground for the slaveholder, he did that foul, mean deed, because he understood that he was surrounded by craven and cowards. The deed never would have been done, only so there had been a noble manhood about him; but there was not, and so he was able to offer what he did. Dr. Fuller came to Massachusetts from Baltimore, and boasted that he held his fellow-beings in bondage; and Dr. Sharp invited him to his pulpit here in Boston, and stood there by the side of this man who stole babies and whipped women! He would never have done this shameful thing, had those whom he served, and the community about him, been manly and courageous men.

This cowardice is everywhere; in Congress, in the pulpit, in the press, in the church, — everywhere. There is no one who does not feel the taint of it, none more or less. It would seem that the tales which are told of the wrongs of the slave would startle to life the manhood of the nation; but they do not, and cannot, until we ourselves are freer than we are.

Men! abolitionists! who have gathered here from all parts of New England, carry back to Maine, to the White Hills of New Hampshire, to the Green Mountains of Vermont, to Connecticut, to Rhode Island, — carry in your minds and hold fast in your hearts, and always give to the people, the idea, that among the first things that true love and sympathy for the slave requires, in order to make that sympathy effective, is to obtain for themselves that freedom which shall make them dare to do the deed.
they know needs to be done for the slave, -- to abandon, if need be, the church in which both their father and mother and themselves have grown up, -- even though it makes their foes those of their own household, and the men they have been wont to call friends grow cold towards them. What we need is, a heroic faith in justice, benevolence, truth and right, going up over our hills and vallies; and against this, sustained by earnest deed, the Slave Power cannot stand. The base are always cowards; and when they find the sturdy stand of an earnest manhood and womanhood arrayed against them, the slaveholders will feel that the day of their triumph is over. But now, they make you hunt down their fugitive slaves, and taunt you with being meaner than those on the plantation. Throw off from your spirit the fetter that makes you stop to ask, 'What will people say?' Do not ask that question, friends. It does not make any difference. Do not ask whether anybody is going to laugh at you for being true to yourself. Nobody was ever hurt by being laughed at -- if there was, he deserved to be; but simply ask and strive faithfully to know the right, and then, if the heavens fall, DO IT! Then will the slave come out of his prison-house-- and not till then.
I cannot, for the life of me, understand the love of the Union which the voters of this country everywhere profess. If I were in a position where I could exercise the right of franchise, I am sure I could be no lover of this Union. Why does any man north of Mason and Dixon's line wish to cling to a Union that only brings his disgrace and shame? A Union in which, if Northern man dares in a particular latitude to utter sentiments of freedom, his life is endangered! A Union in which, if he finds a fellow-man south of a certain line with the yearnings of liberty in his breast, and helps to rescue him from the clutches of the worst of tyrants, he is not only branded as a traitor, but risks his own liberty and life. And yet, professed liberty-loving politicians cry out, let us cling to the Union! If we will smother all our holiest aspirations, stay quietly in our places and submit to slaveholding dictation, we may be in fellowship with this fraternity, and call it a Union. I do not know of any such a Union. It is like the legal bondage of man and wife, who hate each other, and tear each other's eyes out. Southern members of Congress, with the flag of the Government waving over their hearts, taunt Northern men with being their pliant tools. What is such a Union as that? An abolitionist is not tolerated in the South. It is true, I went into the State of Kentucky, and was not molested; but it was simply because of the gallantry and chivalry of the State towards a woman. They threaten in their newspapers that if abolition schoolmasters or peddlers come into the region where the Declaration of Independence emanated, they will enrich the soil with their blood. The South are glad to have us pay their post-office bills, and help them keep the slaves down, and finding us ever ready to do their bidding, they threaten to bring their slaves under the very shadow of Bunker Hill monument. When Burns was seized in Boston, and the streets were crowded with earnest men, who were utterly powerless to save him, it was not the liberty of Anthony Burns, alone, but also that of the people of Massachusetts, that was concerned. This is the kind of Union the South seeks.

But I know the hope that lives in the breasts of political abolitionists, that they will be able to do something by political action. The greatest part of them believe in doing a little evil
that good may come. They do not consider that the adoption of such a principle debauches public confidence, until there can be no confidence between man and man. If you can do little evil, tell a little bit of a lie, and swear to little wrong to accomplish a great good, and others can do the same, where is there any faith in the integrity of man? Why cannot you trust God? I cannot comprehend this utter want of faith in God. We all know that when God established the great principles of truth and right, he consulted the great human weal, and that the highest happiness must be found in conformity to truth and righteousness. We ought to feel the same confidence in trusting in God as the little child feels on the bosom of its mother. God, who sees the end from the beginning, has certainly made it safe for us to trust him.

"We see dimly in the future what is small and what is great, slow of faith how weak an arm may turn the iron helm of fate."

Our friend Moyer rejoices in the fact that so large a majority has been cast in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other States against the Nebraska iniquity. I could not help thinking, when I heard of the 80,000 majority in Ohio, that in that issue the voters of Ohio ignored the Fugitive Slave Law; they did not dare to say one word against the law when they brought the issue before the people. And with all their opposition to slavery in Kansas, they have not a word to say about slavery in Carolina. The tendency of political action is to whittle a principle down to the smallest point, and then to whittle the point itself away. It must get a certain number of voters to accomplish a particular purpose, and so it leaves off every other issue that is just as vital to freedom. It takes the one that is nearest the popular level. There is now a popular cry against the Nebraska iniquity, and the politician takes it as an issue, and sweeps the whole board with it. Men, who, in Congress, have not the courage to demand freedom for all, have no manhood that is worth being worn; they are down to deep in mud to get our terra firma.

It seems to me that the pecuniary loss, if nothing else, which the North is suffering by union with the South, ought to open its eyes. But that is by no means the greatest loss; it is the blinding of our moral sense. A man who steals is ordinarily rated a vile man, but not a man-thief; on the contrary, the patronage of the Government is oftener given to him than to others. I do think that if there ever was a time when we should demand a Northern Republic, it is now. It seems to me that under such a republic, the strength, wealth and growth of the North would spring forth beyond all precedent. Slavery has been consuming our wealth to support its poverty and aggrandize its pretensions. It seems very sad that the energy and resources of the North should be spent, in a great part, in keeping together a union which is an everlasting disgrace, when we might have a Northern Republic that would be a model republic indeed, and not a subject of ridicule and scorn to Europeans. I see no
glory nor beauty in this Union. I see what might be glorious and beautiful but for its being covered by these plague spots which are just as certain to cover the whole body, and annihilate the little liberty that is left you and me, as they are not removed. The power is in the hands of the South, and she rules us with a rod of iron, slavery sets at nought the precepts of Jesus, and all the requirements of his religion.

I do not know but this Union will go to atoms, and despotism itself go down with it. I do not know but the American churches will go to ruin with it. I hope they all will, for with the ruin of the one and of the other, truth which is imperishable, will remain. The idea that if the Church is destroyed, goodness will die with it, is a mistake. Goodness can never die, for it is a part of God. And when the crash shall come which shall rend this Union in twain, upon the basis of that ruin we shall rear a government which shall recognize the equal rights of humanity, irrespective of race or condition.

There are different opinions about the true interpretation of the Constitution, some very excellent people interpreting it in favor of freedom, and others in favor of slavery. An instrument that can by any possibility be construed in favor of slavery is not a safe thing to trust liberty to. It should be perfectly clear that the ingenuity of lawyers cannot give it the least bias in favor of slavery. The American Constitution has always been construed in favor of oppression, and that, if there were no other reason, is enough to condemn it. We need a revolution that shall shake it to pieces, and reduce another unmistakably in favor of right — one that knows, no sex, color or condition. Let us, then, repudiate the present Constitution, and early and late, in season and out of season, work for its overthrow. When I was in Kentucky, some lawyers said to men, 'We don't care much about voting abolitionists, because we believe they are just like other politicians, to be bought and sold, but the movement that Garrison has begun is one that has got hold of the conscience of the people.' They acknowledged that slavery was an evil, that it was a curse upon the State; but how are we going to get rid of it? they asked. I told them that men who tied up their own hands ought to be able to find out a way to untie them — the same power that made the laws could unmakem them. They asked what our method was. I said we were demanding the dissolution of the Union. 'If it makes you poor,' said I, 'and if you will keep your slavery, you must stagger alone under the curse.' The Southerners generally deny being abolitionists when they come here.' I tell you the South feels afraid of this conscience of ours, and they tremble when they see it aroused. They see in it a power stronger than can be manifested by votes. They understand that this is an advantage ground
where one can chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to
fight. Let us, then, make a common rallying cry of 'No Union
with Slaveholders.'
Gentlemen of the Committee:

Grateful for the hearing so promptly accorded, I will proceed without preliminary to state the object of the petition and to urge its claim.

Women ask you to submit to the People of New Jersey amendments to the Constitution of the State, striking out respectively the words "white and male" from Article 2 Section 1, thus enfranchising the women and the colored men, who jointly constitute the majority of our adult citizens. You will thereby establish a republican form of government.

I am to speak to you of Suffrage. In any other country, it would be necessary to show that political power naturally vests in the people. But here the whole ground is granted in advance. When our fathers came out of the war of the Revolution, made wiser by those seven years of suffering, they affirmed these truths to be self-evident: "Governments are institution among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

The Declaration of Independence, affirming these self-evident truths, was unanimously adopted by the representatives of the thirteen United States. The descendants of those representatives have held these principles in theory ever since. We have called "The Immortal Declaration." It was and has been read in every State, on every Fourth of July, since 1776. We have honored its authors and the day that gave it utterance, as we honor no other day and no other men. Not only we but, the wide world round, men suffering under hoard despotisms, by a quick instinct turn their longing eyes to this country, and know that in the realization of our self-evident truth lies the charm by which their own bonds shall be broken.

New Jersey, in her State Constitution, in the very first Section of the first article affirms that, "all men are, by nature, free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness." Again Article 2. That, (quotation omitted)
Gentlemen will see it is no new claim that women are making; they only ask for the practical application of admitted, self-evident truths. If "all political power is inherent in the people," why have women, who are more than half the entire population of this State, no political existence? Is it because they are not people? Only a madman would say a congregation of negroes, or of women, that there were no people there. They are counted in the census, and also in the representation of every State, to increase the political power of white men. Women are even held to be citizens with the full rights of citizenship, but to bear the burden of "taxation without representation," which is "tyranny."

Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Not of the governed white men, nor the governed married men, nor the governed fighting men; but of the governed. Sad to say, this principle, so beautiful in theory, has never been fully applied in practice!

What is Suffrage? It is the prescribed method whereby, at a certain time and place, the will of the citizens is registered. It is the form in which the popular assent or dissent is indicated, in reference to principles, measures and men. The essence of suffrage is rational choice. It follows therefore, under our theory of government, that every individual capable of independent rational choice is rightfully entitled to vote.

The alien who is temporarily resident among us is excepted. He is still a citizen of his native country, from which he may demand protection and to which he owes allegiance. But if he becomes a permanent resident and renounces allegiance to foreign potentates and powers, then he is admitted to all the rights of citizenship, suffrage included.

The minor is excepted. He is held an infant in law. He has not attained mental maturity. He is under guardianship, as being incapable of rational choice. He cannot legally buy, nor sell, nor make valid contract. But when the white male infant arrives at years of discretion, he may do all these things and vote also.

Idiots and lunatics are excepted, because they are incapable of rational choice and cannot vote.

None of these cases conflict with the principle. But when a person is disfranchised because he is a negro, the principle individual choice is violated. For the negro possesses every human faculty. Many colored persons are wiser and better than many white men. During the late war, the negroes were loyal to the union. Neither threats nor bribes could induce them to join their enemies and ours. They freely shared the poverty of their small cabins with our sick and wounded soldiers, tenderly offering the cooling cup to their fevered lips, and, again and again, at great personal peril guided them to our
Two hundred thousand colored soldiers wore the blue uniforms of the United States and fought bravely in the Union ranks. Their blood was mingled with ours on many a hard-fought field. Yet this class, so loyal and patriotic, have no vote in the loyal State of New Jersey!

So, too, when a woman is disfranchised because she is a woman, the principle is violated. For woman possesses every human faculty. No man would admit, even to himself, that his mother is not capable of rational choice. And if the woman he has chosen for a wife is a fool, the fact lies at least as much against his ability to make a rational choice as against hers, and should accordingly put them both in the class of excepted persons.

The great majority of women are more intelligent, better educated, and far more moral than multitudes of men whose right to vote no man questions.

Women are loyal and patriotic. During the late war, many a widow not only yielded all her sons to the cause of freedom, but strengthened their failing courage when the last good-bye was said, and kept them in the field by words of hearty cheer and the hope of a country really free.

An only son, crowned with the honors of Harvard University, living in elegance and wealth, with every avenue to distinction open before him, was offered the Colonelcy of a regiment of colored volunteers. His mother, with pulses such as thrilled the proud mother of the Gracchi when she called her sons her jewels, hailed the son's acceptance of the offer of fellowship with the lowliest for his country's sake. And when he fell, murdered at Fort Wagner, and was "buried with his negroes," her grief for his loss was more than equaled by the high satisfaction she felt that that young life, so nobly lived, was so nobly given back to Him from whom it came. That mother is classed politically with madmen and fools. By her side stand ten million American women who are taxed without representation and governed without consent. Women are fined, imprisoned, hanged and to no one of them was ever granted a trial by "a jury of her peers."

Every Fourth of July gentlemen invite women to "reserve seats for the ladies," and then read what these women too well knew before, that governments are just only when they obtain the consent of the governed. Strange to say, men do not seem to know that they read condemns their practice.

But it may be said, "the consent of the governed is only a theory, a 'glittering generality'"—that, in fact, the governed do not consent and never have consented. Yet this theory is the "golden rule" of political justice. The right of the citizen to participate in making the laws in government is the sole
foundation of political morality. As Mr. Lincoln said of slavery — if a government without the consent of the governed is not wrong, nothing political is wrong. Deny this and you justify despotism. On the principle of limited suffrage, aristocracy is blameless and republican institutions are impossible. You can believe that when God established an immutable code of morals for the individual, he left society without a moral code — a mere battle-ground of force and fraud? The men who deny political rights to the negro and the woman can show no title to their own.

Now, as there can be no argument against a self-evident truth, so none has been ever attempted. But ridicule, without stint or measure has been so heaped upon those who claim political equality, that many women have been induced to desist that they desire to rest "the world's dread laugh," which few can bear, should burst upon them as unsexed viragoes, "strong-minded women who wish to drive men to the nursery while they take the rostrum." As, in the days of the Revolution, Tory priests sought to weaken the bands of our fathers by the Scripture, iterated and reiterated, "Honor the King," so now the haters of human liberty hurl texts at women and do not know that the golden rule, "Whatever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," — that central truth around which all other divine utterance revolves — would settle this question in favor of women.

We are asked in triumph: "What good would it do women and negroes to vote?" We ask: What good does it do white men to vote? Why do you want to vote gentlemen? Why did the Revolutionary fathers fight seven years for a vote? Why do the English workingmen want to vote? Why do their friends — John Bright and Thomas Hughes and the liberal party — want the suffrage for the women to vote, just as men do, because it is the only way in which they can be protected in their rights. To men, suffrage stands for "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work." The workingmen of England do not get that because they have had no vote. Negroes and women in America do not get it, because they have no vote.

In the teachers of the public schools, male and female, united last spring in a petition for an increase of salary. So $20 was added to the salary of each man, and only $13 to that of each woman. The women, indignant at the injustice, wrote an ironical letter of thanks to the Board of Education for their very large liberality. There upon the Board required them to retract the letter, and coupled the demand with a threat of dismissal if the teachers did not comply. A part, driven by necessity, succumbed. A part, who preferred their own self-respect and a poorer crust, refused. Would those women have been thus treated, either in regard to salary or dismissal, if, as voters, they could have had a voice in the election of the Board for the following year?
It is said that women are now represented by their husbands, fathers, brothers or sons. Would men consent to be represented by their wives and sisters? If it were possible for any class to legislate well for another, it might be supposed that those who sustain to each other these tender relations, could do so. But we find, on the contrary, that in every State, the laws affecting woman as wife, mother and widow, are different from and worse than those which men make for themselves as husbands, fathers and widowers.

I will quote a few laws to show how women are represented in New Jersey.

A widower is entitled to the life use of all his deceased wife's real estate, but a widow is entitled only to the life use of one-third of her deceased husband's real estate.

A widower succeeds to the whole of his deceased wife's personal property, whether she will, or not, with the right to administer on her estate without giving bonds. But a widow has only one-third of her deceased husband's personal property (or one-half of it if he leaves no children), but none at all if he choose to will it to any one else, and if she administer on his estate she must give bonds.

A mother inherits the whole of her deceased child's estate only when that child leaves no brothers, nor sisters, nor children or brothers or sisters, and no father. But a father inherits the whole property of such a child when all these survive. In this State, where my child was born, a father has the sole custody of the children. The law provides (see Revised Statutes, page 915, sec. 9) that "Any father, whether he be of age, or not, by a deed executed in his life-time or by a last will, may dispose of the custody of his child, born or to be born—and such disposition shall be good against the child's mother and against every other person. And if the mother, or any other person, shall attempt to acquire the custody of the child, she, or they shall be subject to an action for ravishment, or trespass." Thus, the minor, whom the law holds incompetent to make any valid contract, whose written promise to pay even is worthless, who is not old enough to vote, is empowered by law to come to her side, whose wild strife with death and agony is ushering their child to life, to seize the newborn being and will it from her sight forever. The successful attempt on her part to recover her God given right, the law calls "ravishment." The only woman in this State who is legally entitled to her child is the unhonored mother whose baby is a bastard!

By the law of New Jersey the sole definition of an orphan is "a fatherless child." And yet, in contempt, we are asked "why do women want to vote?" There are women, too, who say they have all the rights they want!
When any husband and wife live in a state of separation, and have minor children, the Chancellor, the Supreme Court, or any justice of said Court, may, if the children are brought before them by habeas corpus, make an order for the access of the mother to her infant child, or children, as such times and under such circumstances as they may direct, and if the child, or children are under seven years of age, shall make an order to deliver them to the mother, until they are seven. And then still just as much in need of a mother's love, they must go back to the custody of the father. (Statutes page 361)

Thus she has no legal right to her children, whose precepts blessed their baby lips whose tender care soothed their baby sorrows, whose hand guided their first tottering footsteps, and whose love for these who are "the bone of her bone and the flesh of her flesh" will last when all other love but the love of God shall fail.

"A widow may live forty days in the house of her deceased husband without paying rent, or even longer if her dower has not, within that time, been set off to her." But when the dower is assigned, this home, made by the mutual toil and thrift of husband and wife, this roof under which her children were born and where her husband died, hallowed by association of their early love and of her recent ills, can no longer give her shelter, unless she pay rent. The very crops, which would have been her food if the strong arm of which she leaned were not cold in death, are no longer hers. Appraisers have searched cupboard, closet and drawer, have set a market value upon article of which no money could pay the price to her;—a sale is made, and this woman is houseless, as well as widowed.

But if death had chosen for her for its victim, instead of her husband, the widower could remain in undisturbed possession of house and property, could gather his unmothered children around the still warm hearth-stone, desolate indeed, but not robbed.

"A husband" can sell his real estate and make a valid deed subject only to the wife's right of dower. But a wife can neither sell her personal property, nor her real estate nor make a valid deed, without her husband's consent.

A husband can make a will of everything he possesses, except the dower, and so all these above quotations show how women are now represented. They prove the truth of the old adage, "If you don't want your business done, send another; and if you want it done do it yourself."

And still men object: "Women and negroes don't know enough to vote." As though it were possible for us to do worse for ourselves than they have done for us. Do they fear we shall return evil for evil? This ben objection comes with an ill grace from
those who welcome to the polls voters of every degree of ignorance, so only they be white men. When a white man comes of age, it is never asked whether he knows enough to vote. He may not know the first letter of the alphabet. He may be an habitual drunkard, a haunter of a gambling houses and brothels. But he belongs to the “white male” aristocracy, and so is prepared, without his asking, by which he shall take his place with the self-constituted sovereigns, to whose law-making power women and negroes must bow in silent submission. All such men think that “women don’t know enough to vote.” Will intelligent men rank with their wives politically lower than these?

It is said that “if women vote it will make domestic discord.” On the contrary we always find that those who wish to secure the votes of others are extremely polite to them. Witness any election. “My dear fellow, I reply on your invaluable aid.” “In this emergency, America expects every man to do his duty; let me treat you”. “Here is a five dollar bill.” “How is your good wife?” “Are the children well?” And straightway the deluded voter goes after him to vote, perhaps against his own interest, and that of the state.

But seriously, does any man mean to say that if his wife has a different political opinion for his own and dare to express it, he will quarrel with her? Will he make his own narrowness and ill-temper a reason why his wife should not exercise a God-given right? If so, the argument is against him and not against her. A husband and wife often hold different religious opinions, respect their differences, and go quietly to their respective churches. It will be so in politics among decent men. But the unfortunate woman who has married a brute needs a vote all the more. With or without a vote, he will p0wer her all the same.

It is said that “if will demoralize women to vote.” On the contrary, the presence of women would purify politics. Why is the political meeting which admits women an orderly assemblage, while that excludes them is boisterous? If the wives and daughters of ignorant and intemperate men are not demoralized by daily association with them, it is scarcely possible that going once or twice a year to vote would do so. Are women demoralized by going to the market, or the post-office? But experience has already proved the contrary. Women now vote in Michigan, Kentucky, and Canada upon school questions. In Holland, women who are property holders vote. In Sweden they do the same. In Austria, women who are Nobles in their own right, are members of the Diet.

But we have an example nearer home. In new Jersey, women and negroes voted from 1776 to 1807, a period of thirty-one years. The facts are all as follows:

In 1709, a Provincial law confined the privilege of voting to “male freeholders having one hundred acres of land in their own right, or 160 current
right, or $50 current money of the province in real and personal
estate," and during the whole of the Colonial period these qual-
ifications continued unchanged.

But on the 2nd of July, 1776, (two days before the Declaration
of Independence) the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, at Burl-
ington, adopted a Constitution, which remained in force until
1844, of which Sec. 4 is as follows: (quotation omitted.)

Section 7 provides that the Council and Assembly jointly shall
elect some fit person within the Colony, to governorship.
This Constitution remained in force until 1844.

Thus, by a deliberate change of the terms, "male freeholder," to
"all inhabitants," suffrage and ability to hold the highest
office in the State, were conferred both on women and negroes.

In 1790 a committee of the Legislature reported a bill regulat-
ing election, in which the words "he or she" are applied to
voters, thus giving legislative endorsement to the alleged
meaning of the Constitution.

In 1779 the Legislature passed an act to regulate elections,
containing the following provisions: (quotation omitted)

Women voted. Yet no catastrophe, social or political, ensued.
Women did not cease to be womanly. They did not neglect their
domestic duties. Indeed the noble character and exalted patri-
ction of the women of New Jersey all through the Revolution
have been the subject of historical eulogy. There is no evi-
dence that the women and free negroes abused nor neglected their
political privileges. It is said that "women don't want to
vote." Yet, in New Jersey, when they were allowed to vote,
they manifested a growing interest in public affairs. Mr.
Mr. A. Whitehead, of Newark, an opponent of female suffrage,
expressly states that at time elapsed "the practice extended," and that "in the President election of 1800, between Adams and
Jefferson, females voted very generally throughout the State and
such continued to be the case until the passage of the
act (1807) excluding them from the polls. At first the law
had been so construed as to admit single women only, but, as
the practice extended, the construction of the privilege,
became broader and was made to include females 18 years old,
married or single and even woman of color; at a contested
election in Hunterdon County, in 1802, the votes of two or
three such actually electing a member of the legislature.
But, unfortunately, New Jersey remained a Slave State. And, like
all communities cursed with slavery, she had no efficient system
of free schools. Her soil proved less fertile than the newer
States of the West, and the more enterprising class of emi-
grants passed on. The later settlers of New Jersey were far
inferior to the original Quaker and Puritan elements which con-
trolled the Constitutional Convention of 1776. Society retro-
Slavery smothered the spirit of liberty. In the spring of 1807 a special election was held in Essex County to decide upon the location of a Court House and Jail — Newark and its vicinity struggling to retain the County Buildings, Elizabeth-town and its neighborhood striving to remove them to "Day's Hill."

The question excited intense interest as the value of every man's property was thought to be involved. Not only was every legal voter, man or woman, white or black brought out, but on both sides gross frauds were practised. The property qualifications was generally disregarded; aliens and minors participated, and many persons "voted early and voted often." In Aquascananook Township, thought to Contain about 300 legal voters, over 1800 votes were polled, all but seven in the interest of Newark.

It does not appear that either women or negroes were especially implicated in these frauds than the white men. But the affair caused great scandal and they seem to have been made the scapegoats.

-------------- * * * --------------

Since women are individual citizens, this resolution pledges the Republicans of Connecticut to "universal suffrage," without distinction of sex or color. The same party in Rhode Island has recently adopted a similar resolution. Bills have been introduced into the Legislatures of Maine, Ohio, and other States, this winter, to strike out the word "male" as well as the word "white." Tennessee has struck out the word "white." The Missouri Legislature has adopted an amendment striking out the word "male," and have submitted these two separate propositions to the people, and have also submitted separately, an educational qualification. The vote upon these will take place in another month. Thus, Kansas, the gallant young State which fought the ballot for free soil in the beginning, leads off in the battle for free suffrage.

Last week, the Senate of New York, by a vote of 20 to 4, agreed to submit the election of delegates to the coming Constitutional Convention, to the people, irrespective of sex, or color.

The Senate of the United States have this winter devoted more entire days to the discussion of woman's right to vote. Many Senators ably supported our right, and declared themselves willing to vote for it as a separate measure. Among others, Wade of Ohio, Gratz Brown of Missouri, Wilson of Massachusetts, Anthony of Rhode Island, and Foster of Connecticut; and nine Senators gave their vote for woman Suffrage.
In view of the rapid growth of public sentiment, and inasmuch as amendments can only be submitted to the people of New Jersey once in five years, let me respectfully suggest that you do as they have done in Kansas, propose to strike out the word "white" and the word "male", as separate propositions, and submit both to the people for their verdict.

In this solemn hour of our National Reconstruction, each State owes it to the Country and to God to establish its institutions on the immutable principles of the Declaration of Independence. All questions of mere personal and party interest should be forgotten, while men of all parties make common cause for the general good of the Republic.

But let no man dream that National prosperity and peace can be secured by merely giving suffrage to 800,000 freedmen, while that sacred right is denied to eight millions of American women. That scanty shred of Justice, good as far as it goes, is utterly inadequate to meet the emergency of this hour. The problem of American statesmanship today is how to embody in our institutions a guarantee of the rights of every citizen. The solution is easy. Base government on the consent of the governed, and each class will protect itself. Put this great principle of universal suffrage, irrespective of sex, or color, into the foundations of our temple of Liberty and it will rise in fair and beautiful proportions, without the sound of a hammer, or the noise of any instrument, to stand at last perfect and entire, wanting nothing. Omit it, and only He, who sees the end from the beginning, knows through what other national woes we must be driven, before we learn that the path of Justice is the only path of peace and safety.
MRS. ELIZABETH Cady Stanton
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1854

From "History of Woman Suffrage," Vol.II

"The thinking minds of all nations call for change. There is a deep-lying struggle in the whole fabric of society; a boundless, grinding collision of the New with the Old."

The tyrant, Custom, has been summoned before the bar of Common-sense. His majesty no longer awes the multitudes — his sceptre is broken — his crown is trampled in the dust — the sentence of death is pronounced upon him. All nations, ranks and classes, have in turn, questioned and repudiated his authority; and now, that the monster is chained and caged, timid, woman, on tiptoe, comes to look him in the face, and to demand of her brave sires and sons, who have struck blows for liberty, if, in this change of dynasty, she, too, shall find relief. Yes, gentlemen, in republican America, in the nineteenth century, we, the daughters of the revolutionary heroes of '76, demand of your hands the redress of our grievances — a revision of your State Constitution — a new code of laws. Permit us then, as briefly as possible, to call you attention to the legal disabilities under which we labor.

1st. Look at the position of woman as woman. It is not enough for us that by your laws we are permitted to live and breathe, to claim necessaries of life from our legal protectors — to pay the penalty of our crimes; we demand the full recognition of all our rights as citizens of the Empire State. We are persons, native, free-born citizens; property-holders, tax-payers; yet are we denied the exercise of our right to the elective franchise. We support ourselves, and, in the part, your schools, colleges, churches, your poor-houses; jails, prisons, the army, the navy, the whole machinery of government, and yet we have no voice in your councils. We have every qualification required by the Constitution, necessary to the legal voter, but the one of sex. We are moral, virtuous, and intelligent, and in all respects quite equal to the proud white man himself, and yet by your laws we are classed with idiots, lunatics, and negroes; and though we do not feel honored by the place assigned us, yet, in fact, our legal position is lower than that of either; for the negro can be raised to the dignity of a voter if he possesses himself of $350; the lunatic can vote in his moments of sanity, and the idiot too, if he be a male one, and not more than nine-tenths a fool; but we, who have guided great movements of charity, established missions, edited journals, published works on history, economy, and
statistics; who have governed nations, led armies, filled the professor's chair, taught philosophy and mathematics to the savants of our age, discovered planets, piloted ships across the sea, are denied the most sacred rights of citizens, because, forsooth we came not into this republic-crowned with the dignity of manhood! Woman is theoretically absolved from all allegiance to the laws of the State. Sec. 1, Bill of Rights 2 R. S. 301, says that no authority can, on any pretence whatever, be exercised over the citizens of this State but such as is or shall be derived from, and granted by the people of this State.

Now gentlemen, we would fain know by what authority you have disfranchised one-half the people of this State? You who have so boldly taken possession of the bulwarks of this republic, show us your credentials, and thus prove your exclusive right to govern, not only yourselves, but us. Judge Hurlburt, who has long occupied a high place at the bar in this State, and who recently retired with honor from the bench of the Supreme Court, in his profound work on Human Rights, has pronounced your present position rank usurpation. Can it be that here, where we acknowledge no royal blood, no apostolic descent, that you, who have declared that all men were created equal — that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, would willingly build up an aristocracy that places the ignorant and vulgar above the educated and refined — the alien and the ditch-digger above the authors and the poets of the day — an aristocracy that would raise the sons above the mothers who bore them? Would that the men who can sanction a Constitution so opposed to the genius of this government, who can enact and execute laws so degrading to womankind, had sprung, Minerva-like from the brains of their fathers, that the matrons of this republic need not blush to their sons!

***************000***************

2nd. Look at the position of woman as wife. Your laws relating to marriage — founded as they are on the old common law of England, a compound of barbarous usages, but partially modified by progressive civilisations — are in open violation of our enlightened ideas of justice, and of the holiest feelings of our divine nature. If you take the highest view of marriage, as a Divine relation, which love alone can constitute and sanctify, then of course human legislation can only recognize it. Men can neither bind her nor loose its ties, for that prerogative belongs to God alone, who makes man and woman, and the laws of attraction by which they are united. But if you regard marriage as a civil contract, then let it be subject to the same laws which control all other contacts. Do not make it a kind of half-human, half-divine institution, which you may build up, but can not regulate. Do not, by your special legislation for this one kind of contract, involve yourselves in the grossest absurdities and contradictions.
So long as by your laws no man can make a contract for a horse or piece of land until he is twenty-one years of age, and by which contract his is not bound if any deception has been practised, or if the party contracting has not fulfilled his part of the agreement — so long as the parties in all mere civil contracts retain their identity and all the power and independence they had before contracting, with the full right to dissolve all partnerships and contracts for any reason, at the will and option of the parties themselves, upon what principle of civil jurisprudence you do permit the boy of fourteen and the girl of twelve, in violation of every natural law, to make a contract more momentous in importance than any other, and then hold them to it, come what may, the whole of their natural lives, in spite of disappointment, deception, and misery? Then, too, the signing of this contract is instant civil death to one of the parties. The woman who but yesterday was sued on bended knee, who stood so high in the scale of being as to make an agreement on equal terms with a proud Saxon man, today has no civil existence, no social freedom. The wife who inherits no property hold about the same legal position that does the slave on the Southern plantation. She can own nothing, sell nothing. She has no right even to the wages she can earn; her person, for them, alas! is no higher law than the will of man. Hence behold the bjeated conceit of those Petruchios of the law, who seem to say: (poem omitted)

How could man ever look thus on woman? She, at whose feet Socrates learned wisdom — she, who gave to the world a Savior, and witnessed alike the adoration of the Magi and the agonies of the cross. How could such a being, so blessed and honored, ever become the ignoble, servile, cringing slave, with whom the fear of man could be paramount to the sacred dictates of conscience and the holy love of Heaven? By the common law of England, the spirit of which has been but too faithfully incorporated into our statute law, a husband has a right to whip his wife with a rod not larger than his thumb, to shut her up in a room, and administer whatever moderate chastisement he may deem necessary to insure obedience to his wishes, and for her healthful moral development! He can forbid all persons harboring or trusting her on his account. He can deprive her of all social intercourse with her nearest and dearest friends. If by great economy she accumulates a small sum, which for future need she deposits, little by little, in a savings bank, the husband as guardian has a right to draw it out, as his option, to use it as he may see fit.

There is nothing that an unruly wife might do against which the husband has not sufficient protection in the law. But not so with the wife. If she has a worthless husband, a confirmed drunkard, a villain, or a vagrant, he has still all the rights of a man, and husband, and a father. Though the whole support of the family be thrown upon the wife, if the wages she earns be paid to her by her employer, the husband can receive them again. If, by unwearied industry and perseverance, she can earn for her-
self and children a patch of ground and a shed to cover them, the husband can strip her of all her hard earnings, turn her and her little ones out in the cold northern blast, take the clothes from their backs, the bread from their mouths; all this by you laws may he do, and has he done, oft and again, to satisfy the capacity of that monster in human form, the rum-seller.

But the wife who is so fortunate as to have inherited property, has, by the new law in this State, been redeemed from her lost condition. She is no longer a legal nonentity. This property law, if fairly construed, will overturn the whole code relating to woman and property. The right to property implies the right to buy and sell, to will and bequeath, and herein is the dawning of a civil existence for woman, for now the "femme covert" must have the right to make contracts. So, get ready, gentlemen; the "little justice" will be coming to you one day, dead in hand, for your acknowledgment. When he asks you "if you sign without fear or compulsion," say yes, boldly, as we do. Then, too, the right to will is sure. How what becomes of the "tenant for life"? Shall he, the happy husband of a millionaire, who has lived in yonder princely mansion in the midst of plenty and elegance, be cut down in a day to the use of one-third of this estate and a few hundred a year, as long he remains her widower? And should he, in spite of this bounty or celibacy, ill-impeled by his affections, marry again, choosing for a wife a woman as poor as himself, shall he be thrown penniless on the cold world — this child of fortune, enervated by ease and luxury, henceforth to be dependent wholly on his own resources? Poor man! He would be rich, though, in the sympathies of many women who have passed through just such an ordeal. But what is property without the right to protect that property by law? It is mockery to say a certain estate is mine, if, without my consent, you have the right to tax me when and how you please, while I have no voice in the making of the tax-gatherer, the legislator, or the law. The right to property will, of necessity, compel us in due time to the exercise of our right to the elective franchise, and then naturally follows the right to hold office.

3rd. Look at the position of woman as widow. Whenever we attempt to point out the wrongs of the wife, those who have us believe that the laws can not be improved, point us to the privileges, powers, and claims of the widow. Let us look into these a little. Behold in yonder humble house a man and woman, by their hard days' labor for long years lived together alone. Those few acres of well-tilled land, with the small, white house that looks so cheerful through its vines and flowers, attest the honest thrift and simple taste of its owners. This man and woman, by their hard days' labor, have made this house their own. Here they live in peace and plenty, happy in the hope that they may dwell together securely under their own vine and fig-tree for a few years that remain to them, and that under the shadow of the trees, planted by their own hands,
and in the midst of their household goods, so loved and famil-
ian, they may take their last farewll of earth. But, alas for
human hopes! the husband dies, and without a will, and the strik-
en widow, at one fell blow, loses the companion of her youth,
her house and home, and half the little sum she had in the bank.
For the law, which takes no cognizance of widows left with
twelve children and not one cent, instantly spies out this wid-
ow, takes account of her effects, and announces to her the
startling intelligence that but one-third of the house and lot,
and one-half the personal property, are here. The law has oth-
er favorites with whom she must share the hard-earned savings
of years. In this dark hour of grief, the coarse minions of the
law gather round the widow's hearth-stone, and, in the name of
justice, outrage all natural sense of right; mock at the sac-
redness of human love, and with cold familiarity proceed to
place a moneyed value on the old arm-chair, in which, but a few
brief hours since, she closed the eyes that had ever beamed
on her with kindness and affection; on the solemn clock in
the corner, that told the hour he passed away; on every garment
with which his form and presence were associated, and on every
article of comfort and convenience that the house contained,
even down to the knives and forks and spoons — and the widow
saw it all — when the work was done, she gathered up what the
law allowed her and went forth to seek another home. This is the
much-talked-of dower. Behold the magnanimity of the law in
allowing the widow to retain a life interest in one-third the
landed estate, and one-half the personal property of her hus-
band, and taking the lion's share to itself! Had she died
first, the house and land would all have been the husband's
still. No one would have dared to intrude upon the privacy of
his home, or to molest him in his sacred retreat of sorrow. How,
I ask you, can that be called justice, which makes such a dis-
tinction as this between man and woman?

By management, economy, and industry, our widow is able, in a
few years, to redeem her house and home. But the law never
loses sight of the purse, no matter how low in the scale of
being its owner may be. It sends its officers round every
year to gather in the harvest for the public crib, and no
widow who owns a piece of land two feet square ever escapes this
reckoning. Our widow, too, who has now twice earned her home,
has her annual tax to pay also — tribute of gratitude that she
is permitted to breathe the free air of this republic, where
"taxation without representation," by such worthies as John Han-
cock and Samuel Adams, has been declared "intolerable tyranny."
Having glanced at the magnanimity of the law in its dealings
with the widow, let us see how the individual man, under the
influence of such laws, doles out justice to his help-mate.
The husband has the absolute right to will away his property
as he may see fit. If he has children, he can divide his pro-
erty among them, leaving his wife her third only of the landed
estate, thus making her a dependent on the bounty of her own
children. A man with thirty thousand dollars in personal pro-
erty, may leave his wife but a few hundred a year, as long as
The cases are: without number where women, who have lived in ease and elegance, at the death of their husbands have, by will, been reduced to the bare necessities of life. The man who leaves his wife the sole guardian of his property and children is an exception to the general rule. Man has ever manifested a wish that the world should indeed be a blank to the companion whom he leaves behind him. The Hindoo make that wish a law, and burns the widow on the funeral pyre of her husband; but the civilized man, impressed with a different view of the sacredness of life, takes a less summary mode of drawing his beloved partner after him; he does it by the deprivation of the flesh, and the humiliation and mortification of the spirit. In bequeathing to the wife just enough to keep soul and body together, man seems to lose sight of the fact that woman, like himself, takes great pleasure in acts of benevolence and charity. It is but just, therefore, that she should have it in her power to give during her life, and to will away at her death, as her benevolence or obligations might prompt her to do.

4th. Look at the position of woman as mother. There is no human love so strong and steadfast as that of the mother for her child; yet behold how ruthless are your laws touching this most sacred relation. Nature has clearly made the mother the guardian of the child; but man, in his inordinate love of power, does continually set nature and nature's laws at open defiance. The father may apprentice his child, bind him out to a trade, without the mother's consent — yea, in direct opposition to her most earnest entreaties, prayers and tears.

He may apprentice his son to a gamester or rum-seller, and thus cancel the debts of honor. By the abuse of this absolute power, he may bind his daughter to the owner of a brothel, and by the degradation of his child, supply his daily wants; and such things, gentlemen, have been done in our very midst. Moreover, the father, about to die, may bind out all his children wherever and to whomsoever he may see fit, and thus, in fact, will away the guardianship of all his children from the mother. The Revised Statutes of New York provide the "every father, whether of full age or a minor, of a child to be born or of any living child under the age of twenty-one years, and unmarried, may by his deed of last will, duly executed, dispose of the custody and tuition of such child during its minority, or for any less time, to any person or persons, in possession or remainder."

3 R.S., page 150, sec. 1. Thus, by your laws the child is the absolute property of the father, wholly at his disposal in life or at death.

In case of separation, the law gives the children to the father; no matter what his character or condition. At this very time we can point you to noble, virtuous, well-educated mothers in this
State, who have abandoned their husbands for their profligacy and confirmed drunkenness. All these have been robbed of their children, who are in the custody of the husband, under the care of his relatives, whilst the mothers are permitted to see them but at stated intervals. But, said one of these mothers, with a grandeur of attitude and manner worthy the noble Roman matron in the palmiest days of that republic, I would rather never see my child again, than be the medium to hand down the low animal nature of its father, to stamp degradation on the brow of another innocent being. It is enough that one child of his shall call me mother.

If you are far-sighted statesmen, and do wisely judge the interests of this commonwealth, you will so shape your future laws as to encourage woman to take the high moral ground that the father of her children must be great and good. Instead of your present laws, which make the mother of her children the victims of vice and license, you might rather pass laws prohibiting to all drunkards, libertines, and fools, the rights of husbands and fathers. Do not the hundreds of laughing idiots that are crowding into our asylums, appeal to the wisdom of our statesmen for some new laws on marriage — to the mothers a this day for a higher, purer morality?

Again, as the condition of the child always follows that of the mother, and as by the sanction of your laws the father may beat the mother, so may he the child. What mother can not bear me witness to the untold sufferings which cruel, vindictive fathers have visited upon their helpless children? Who ever saw a human being that would not abuse unlimited power? Base and ignoble must that man be who, let the provocation be what it may, would strike a woman; but he would lacerate a trembling child is unworthy the name of man. A mother's love can be no protection to a child; she can not appeal to you to save it from a father's cruelty, for the laws take no cognizance of the most grievous wrongs of the mother. Neither at home nor abroad can a mother protect her son. Look at the temptations that surround the paths of our youth at every step; look at the gambling and drinking saloons, the club rooms, the dens of infamy and abomination that infest all our villages and cities — slowly but surely sapping the very foundations of all virtue and strength.

By your laws, all these abominable resorts are permitted. It is folly to talk of a mother moulding the character of her son, when all mankind, backed up by law and public sentiment, conspire to destroy her influence. But when woman's moral power shall speak through the ballot-box, then shall her influence be seen and felt; then, in our legislative debates, such questions as the canal tolls on salt, the improvement of rivers and harbors, and the claims of Mr. Smith for damages against the State, would be secondary to the consideration of the legal existence of all these public resorts, which lure our youth on
to excessive indulgence and destruction.

Many times and oft it has been asked us, with unaffected seriousness, "What do you women want? What you seem to aim at?" Many have manifested a laudable curiosity to know what the wives and daughters could complain of in republican America, where their sires and sons have so bravely fought for freedom and gloriously secured their independence, trampling all tyranny, bigotry, and caste in the dust, and declaring to a waiting world the divine truth that all men are created equal. What can woman want under such a government? Admit a radical difference in sex, and you demand a different spheres — water for fish, and air for birds.

It is impossible for to make the Southern planter believe that his slave feels and reason just as he does — that injustice and subjection are as galling as to him — that the degradation of living by the will of another, the mere dependence on his caprice, at the mercy of his passions, is as keenly felt by him as his master. If you can force on his unwilling vision a vivid picture of the negro's wrongs, and for a moment touch this soul, his logic brings him instant consolation. He says, the slave does not feel this as I would. Here, gentlemen, is our difficulty: When we plead our cause before the law-makers and saviors of the republic, they can not take in the idea that men and women are alike; and so long as the mass rest in this delusion, the public mind will not be so much startled by the revelations made by the injustice and degradation of woman's position as by the fact that she should at length wake up to a sense of it.

if you, too, are thus deluded, what avails it that we show by your statute books that your laws are unjust — that woman is the victim of avarice and power? What avails it that we point out the wrongs of woman in social life; the victim of passion and lust? You scorn the thought that she has any natural love of freedom burning in her breast, any clear perception of justice urging her on to demand her rights.

Would to God you could know the burning indignation that fills woman's soul when she turns over the pages of your statute books, and sees there how like feudal barons you freemen hold your women. Would that you could know the humiliation she feels for sex, when she thinks of all the beardless boys in your law offices, learning these ideas of one-sided justice -- taking their first lessons in contempt for all womankind -- being indoctrinated into the incapacies of their mothers, and the lordly, absolute rights of man over all women, children, and property, and to know that these are to be our future presidents, judges, husbands, and fathers; in sorrow we exclaim, alas! for that nation whose sons bow not in loyalty to woman. The mother is the first object of the child's veneration and love, and they
who root out this holy sentiment, dream not of the blighting effect it has on the boy and the man. The impression left on law students, fresh from your statute books, is most unfavorable to woman's influence; hence you see but few lawyers chivalrous and high-toned in their sentiments toward woman. They can not escape the legal view which, by constant reading, has become familiarized to their minds: "femme covert," "dower," "widow's claims," "protection," "incapacities," "incumbrance," is written on the brow of every woman they meet. Her time, her services are the property of another. She can not testify, in many cases, against her husband. She can get no redress for wrongs in her own name in any court of justice. She can neither sue nor be sued. She is not held morally responsible for any crime committed in the presence of her husband, so completely is her very existence supposed by the law to be merged in that of another. Think of it; your wives may be thieves, libelers, burglars, incendiaries, and for crimes like these they are not held amenable to the laws of the land, if they put them in your dread presence.

But, if, gentlemen, you take the ground that the sexes are alike, and, therefore, you are our faithful representatives — why then all these special laws for woman? Would not one code answer for all of like needs and wants? Christ's golden rule is better than all the special legislation that the ingenuity of man can devise: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." This, men and brethren, is all we ask at your hands. We ask no better laws than those you have made for yourselves. We need no other protection than that which your present laws secure to you.

In conclusion, then, let us say, in behalf of the women of this State, we ask for all that you have asked for yourselves in the progress of your development, since the Mayflower cast anchor beside Plymouth rock; and simply on the ground that the rights of every human being are the same and identical. You may say that the mass of the women of this State do not make the demand; it comes from a few sour, disappointed old maids and childless women.

You are mistaken; the mass speak through us. A very large majority of the women of this State support themselves and their children, and many of their husbands too. Go into any village you please, of three or four thousand inhabitants, and you will find as many as fifty men or more, whose only business is to discuss religion and politics, as they watch the trains come and go at the depot, or in the passage of a canal boat through a lock; to laugh at the vagaries of some drunken brother, or the capers of a monkey danc- ing to the music of his master's organ. All these are supported by their mothers, wives or sisters.
Now, do you candidly think these wives do not wish to control the wages they earn -- to own the land they buy -- the houses they build! to have at their disposal their own children, without being subject to the constant interference and tyranny of an idle, worthless and profligate? Do you suppose that any woman is such a pattern of devotion and submission that she willingly stitches all day for the small sum of fifty cents, that she may enjoy the unspeakable privilege, in obedience to your laws, of paying for her husband's tobacco or rum? Think you the wife of the confirmed, beastly drunkard would consent to share with him her home and bed, if law and public sentiment would release her from such gross companionship? Verily, no! Think you the wife with whom endurance has ceased to be a virtue, who through much suffering, has lost all faith in the justice of both heaven and earth, takes the law in her own hand, severs the unholy bond, and turns her back forever upon him whom she once called husband, consents to the law that in such an hour tears her child from her -- all that she has left on earth to love and cherish?

The drunkard's wives speak through us, they number 50,000. Think you that the woman who has worked hard all her days in helping her husband to accumulate a large property, consents to the law that places this wholly at his disposal? Would not the mother whose only child is bound out for a term of years against her expressed wish, deprive the father of this absolute power if she could?

For all these, then, we speak. If to this long list you add the laboring women who are loudly demanding remuneration for their unending toil; those women who teach in our seminaries, academies, and public schools for a miserable pittance; the widows who are taxed with out mercy; the unfortunate ones in our workhouses, poor-houses, and prisons; who are they that we do not now represent? But a small class of the fashionable butterflies, who, through the short summer days, seek the sunshine and the flowers; but the cool breezes of autumn and the hoary frosts of winter will soon chase all these away; then too, will they need and seek protection, and through other lips demand in their turn justice and equity at your hands.
Speech at the Constitutional Convention called by N. Y. Legislature
1867

Taken from "History of Woman Suffrage," Vol. II, 371-83. Mrs. Stanton spoke in Assembly Chamber on the afternoon of Jan. 33, 1867. An immense audience of judges, lawyers, members of Legislature, and ladies of fashion greeted her. Mrs. Stanton said:

Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee
and Members of the Legislature:

I appear before you at this time, to urge on you the justice of securing to all the people of the State the right to vote for delegates to the coming Constitutional Convention. The discussion of this right involves the consideration of the whole question of suffrage; and especially those sections of your Constitution which interpose insurmountable qualifications to its exercise. As representatives of the people, your right to regulate all that pertains to the coming Constitutional Convention is absolute. It is for you to say when and where the convention shall be held; how many delegates shall be chosen, and what classes shall be represented. This is your right. It is the opinion of many of the ablest men of the country that, in a revision of a constitution, the State, is, for the time being, resolved into its original elements, and that all disfranchised classes should have a voice in such revision and be represented in such convention. To secure this to the people of the State, is clearly your duty.

Says Judge Beach Lawrence, in a letter to Hon. Charles Sumner: "A State Constitution must originate with and be assented to by a majority of the people, including as well those whom it disfranchises as those whom it invests with the suffrage." And as there is nothing in the present Constitution of the State of New York to prevent women, or black men from voting for, or being elected as delegates to a Constitutional Convention, there is no reason why the Legislature should not enact that the people elect their delegates to said Convention irrespective of sex or color. The Legislatures of 1801 and 1831 furnish you a precedent for extending to disfranchised classes the right to vote for delegates to a Constitution Convention. Though the Constitution of the State restricted the right of suffrage to every male inhabitant who possessed a freehold to the value of $50 or rented a tenant at the yearly value of forty shillings, and had been rated and actually paid taxes to the State, the Legislatures of those years passed laws setting aside all property limitations, and providing that all men — black and white, rich and poor — should vote for the purpose of consid-
using the parts of the Constitution of this State, respecting the number of Senators and Members of Assembly — and also for the consideration of the 23d article of said Constitution relative to the right of nomination to office — "but with no other power or authority whatever," passed April 6, 1801. Session Laws 1801, chapter 69, page 190, sec. 2, says: (quotation omitted)

The above law was passed by the Legislature of 1801, which derived its authority from the First Constitution of the State.

The act recommending a convention of the people of this State, passed March 13, 1831. Session Laws of 1831; act 90, page 83, sec. 1. (quotation omitted.)

Extract from Sec. 6th, Act 90: (quotation omitted).

Extracts from the first Constitution of the State of New York, under and by virtue of which the Legislatures sat, which passed the acts of 1801 and 1831, from which the extracts above are taken. Sec. 7. Qualification of the electors: (quotation omitted).

By section of 17, the qualifications for voters for Governor are made the same as those for Senators.

The laws above quoted show this striking fact: Those men, black and white, prohibited from voting for members of the Assembly, were permitted to vote for delegates to said Conventions; and more than this, on each occasion they were eligible to seats in the body called to frame the fundamental law — the fundamental law from which Governors, Senators, and Members derive their existence.

The Constitutional Convention of Rhode Island, in 1842, affords another precedent of the power of the Legislature to extend the suffrage to disfavored classes.

The disfranchisement of any class of citizens is in express violation of the spirit of our own Constitution. Art. 1, sec. 1: (quotation omitted).

Now, women, and negroes are not worth two hundred and fifty dollars, however weak and insignificant, are surely "members of the State." The law of the land is equality. The question of disfranchisement has never been submitted to the judgment of their peers. A peer is an equal. The "white male citizen" who so pompously parades himself in all our Codes and Constitutions, does not recognize women and negroes as his equals; therefore, his judgment in their case amounts to nothing. And women and negroes constitute a majority of the people of the State, do not recognize a "white male" minority as their rightful rulers. On our republican theory that the majority governs, women and negroes should have a voice in the government of the
In the recent debate in the Senate of the United States, on the
question of suffrage, Senator Anthony, of Rhode Island said:
(quotations omitted).

Nor is it a fair statement of the case to say, that the man re-

depresents the woman, because it is an assumption on the part of
the man — it is an involuntary representation on the part of
the woman. Representation implies a certain delegated power,
and a certain responsibility on the part of the representative
toward the party represented. A representation to which the
represented party does not assent, is no representation at all;
but is adding insult to injury. When the American Colonies
complained that they ought not to be taxed unless they were
represented in the British Parliament, it would have been rather
a singular answer to tell them that they were represented by
Lord North, or even by the Earl of Chatham. The gentlemen on
the other side of the Chamber, who say that the States lately
in rebellion are entitled to immediate representation in this
Chamber, would hardly be satisfied if we should tell them that
my friend from Massachusetts represented South Carolina, and
my friend from Michigan represented Alabama. They would hardly
be satisfied with that kind of representation. Nor have we any
more right to assume that the women are satisfied with the re-
presentation of the men. When has been the assembly at which
this right of representation was conferred? Where was the com-
 pact made? It is wholly an assumption.

"White males" are the nobility of this country; they are the priv-
ileged order, who have legislated as unjustly for women and neg-
roes as have the nobles of England for their disfranchised class-
es. The existence of the English House of Commons is a strong
fact to prove that one class can not legislate for another.
Perhaps it may be necessary, in this transition period of our
civilization, to create a Lower House for women and negroes,
lest the dreaded example of Massachusetts, nay, worse, should be
repeated here, and women, as well as black men, take their
places beside Dutch nobility in the councils of the State. If
the history of England has proved that white men of different
grades can not legislate with justice for one another, how can
you, Honorable Gentlemen, legislate for women and negroes,
who, by your customs, creeds and codes, are placed under the ban
of inferiority? If you dislike this view of the case, and claim
that woman is your superior, and, therefore, you place her
above all troublesome legislation, to chief her by your protect-
ing care from the rough winds of life, I have simply to say,
your statute books are a sad commentary on the position. Your
laws degrade, rather than exalt woman; your customs cripple,
rather than free; your system of taxation is alike ungenerous
and unjust.

In demanding suffrage for the black man of the south, the dom-
inant party recognizes the fact that as a freedman he is no long-
as a part of the family therefore his master is no longer his representative, and as he will now be liable to taxation, he must also have representation. Woman, on the contrary, has never been such a part of the family as to escape taxation. Although there has been no formal proclamation giving her an individual existence, unmarried women have always had the right to property and wages; to make contracts and do business in their own name. And even married women, by recent legislation in this State, have been secured in some civil rights, at least as well secured as those classes can be who do not hold the ballot in their own hands. Woman now holds a vast amount of property in the country, and pays her full proportion of taxes, revenue included; on what principle, then, do you deny her representation? If you say women are "virtually represented" by men of their household, I give you Senator Sumner's denial, in his great speech on Equal Rights in the First Session of the 38th Congress. Quoting from James Otis, he says: (quotation omitted).

In regard to taxation without representation, Lord Coke says: (quotation omitted) "without their consent in person or by representation. The very act of taxing those who are not represented appears to me to deprive them of one of their most essential rights as freemen, and if continued, seems to be in effect an entire disfranchisement of every civil right; for what one civil right is worth a rush, after a man's property is subject to be taken from him without his consent?" In view of such opinions, is it too much to ask the men of New York, either to enfranchise women of wealth and education, or else release them from taxation? If we cannot be represented as individuals, we should not be taxed as individuals. If the "white male" will do all the voting, let him pay all the taxes. There is no logic so powerful in opening the eyes of men to their real interests as a direct appeal to their pockets. Such a release from taxation can be supported, too, by your own Constitution. In Art. 3, Sec. 1, you say, "And no person of color shall be subject to direct taxation, unless he be seized and possessed of such real estate as aforesaid," referring to the $250 qualification. Now, a poor widow who owns a lot worth a hundred dollars less, is taxed. Why this partiality to the black man? He may live in the quiet possession of $249 worth of property, and not be taxed a cent. Is it on the ground of color or sex, that the black man finds greater favor in the eyes of the law than the daughters of the State? In order fully to understand this partiality, I have inquired into your practice with regard to women of color. I find that in Seneca Falls there lives a highly estimable colored woman, by the name of Abby Somere, who owns property to the amount of a thousand dollars, in village lots. She now pays, and always has paid, from the time she invested her first hundred dollars, the same taxes as any other citizen — just in proportion to the value of her property, or as it is assessed. After excluding women and men of
color* not worth *§250, from representation, your Constitution
tells us what other persons are excluded from the right of suf­frage. Art. 2, Sec. 2. (quotation omitted).

How humiliating! For respectable and law-abiding women and
"men of color, " to be thrust outside the pale of political con­
ideration with those convicted of bribery, larceny, and in­
famous crime; and worse than all, with those who bet on elections
— for how lost to all sense of honor must that "white male cit­
izen" be who publicly violates a wise law to which he has himself
given an intelligent consent. We are ashamed, Honored Sirs,
of our company! The Mohammedan forbids a "fool, a madman, or
a woman" to call the hours for prayers. If this were not for
the invidious classification, we might hope it was tenderness
rather than contempt that moved the Mohammedan to excuse woman
from so severe a duty. But for the ballot, which falls like
flakes of snow upon the sod, we find no such excuse for New York
legislators. Art. 2, Sec. 3, should be read and considered by
the women of the State as it gives them a glimpse of the
modes of life and surroundings of some of the privileged class­
es of "white male citizens" who may go to the polls. (quotation
omitted).

What an unspeakable privilege to have that precious jewel —
the human soul — in a setting of white manhood, that thus it
can pass through the prison, the asylum, the alms-house, the
muddy waters of the Erie canal, and come forth undimmed to
appear at the ballot-box at the earliest opportunity, there to
bury crimes, its poverty, its moral and physical deformities
all beneath the rights, privileges, and immunities of a citizen
of the State. Just trace the motley crew of the ten thousands
den of poverty and vice in our large cities, limping, raving,
cringing, staggering up to the polls, while the loyal mothers
of a million soldiers whose bones lay bleaching on every Southern
plain, stand outside say and silent witnesses of this whole­
sale desecration of republican institution. When you say it
would degrade woman to go to the polls do you not make a sad
confession to your irreligious mode of observing that most
sacred right of citizenship? The ballot-box, in a republican
government, should be guarded with as much love and care as
was the Ark of the Lord among the Children of Israel. Here
where we have no heaven-annointed kings or priests, law must be
to us a holy thing; and the ballot-box the holy of the holiest;
for on it depends the safety and stability of our institutions.
I, for one, gentlemen, am not willing to be thus represented.
I claim to understand the interests of the nation better than
yonder pauper in your alms-house, then the unbalanced graduate
from your asylum and prison, or the popinjoy of twenty-one from
your seminary of learning, or the traveler on the tow-path of
the Erie canal. No wonder that with such voters as Art. 2, Sec.
welcomes to the polls, we have these contradictory laws and
constitutions. No wonder that with such voters, sex and color
should be exalted above loyalty, virtue, wealth and education.
I warn you, legislators of the State of New York, that you need the moral power of wise and thoughtful women in your political councils, to outweigh the incoming tide of poverty, ignorance, and vice that threatens our very existence as a nation. Have not the women of the republic an equal interest with yourselves in the government, in free institutions, in progressive ideas, and in the success of the most liberal political measures? Remember, in your last election, the republican majority in this State was only fourteen thousand, all told. If you would not see the liberal party swamped in the next Presidential campaign, treble your majority by enfranchising those classes who would support it in all just and merciful legislation.

The extension of suffrage is the political idea of our day, agitating alike the leading minds of both continents. The question of debate in the long past has been the rights of races. This, in our country, was settled by the war, when the black man was declared free and worthy to bear arms in defense of the republic, and the last remnants of aristocracy were scattered before our northern hosts like chaff in the whirlwind. We have now come to the broader idea of individual rights. An idea already debated ably in Congress and out, by Republicans, Democrats and Abolitionists, who, in common with the best writers and thinkers of the day the world over, base all rights of society and government on those of the individual. Each one of you has a right to everything in earth and air, on land and sea, to the whole world of thought, to all that is needful for soul and body, and there is no limit to the exercise of your rights, but in the infringement of the rights of another; and the moment you pass that limit you are on forbidden ground, you violate the law of individual life, and breed disorder and confusion in the whole social system.

Where, gentlemen, did you get the right to deny the ballot to all women, and black men not worth $350? If this right of suffrage is not an individual right, from what place and body did you get it? Is this right of franchise of conventional arrangement, a privilege that society of government may grant or withhold at pleasure? In the Senate of the United States, in the recent discussion on the "bill to regulate the elective franchise in the District of Columbia," Eratz Brown said: (quotation omitted).

The demand we today make, is not the idiosyncrasy of a few discontented minds, but a universal movement. Woman is everywhere throwing off the lethargy of ages, and is already close upon you in the whole realm of thought — in art, science, literature and government. Everything heralds the dawn of the new era when moral power is to govern nations. In asking you, Honorable gentlemen, to extend suffrage to woman, we do not press on you the wish and responsibility of a new step, but simply to try a measure that has already proved wise and safe the world over. So long as political power was absolute and hereditary,
women shared it with man by birth. In Hungary and some provinces of France and Germany, women holding this inherited right to confer their right of franchise on their husbands. In 1850, in the old town of Upsal, the authorities granted the right of suffrage to fifty women holding real estate, and to thirty-one doing business in their own name. The representatives of their votes elected was to sit in the House of Burgesses. In Ireland, the Court of Queen's Bench, Dublin, restored to women, in 1864, too, the government of Moravia decided that all women who are tax-payers had the right to vote. In Canada, in 1850, an electoral privilege was conferred on women, in hope that the Protestant might balance the Roman Catholic power in the school system. "I lived," says a friend of mine, "where I saw this right exercised for four years by female property holders, and never heard the most cultivated man, even Lord Elgin, to object at its results." Women vote in Austria, Australia, Holland, and Sweden, on property qualifications. There is a bill now before the British Parliament, presented by John Stuart Mill, asking for household suffrage, accompanied by a petition from eleven thousand of the best educated women in England.

Would you be willing to admit, gentlemen, that women know less, have less virtue, less pride and dignity of character under republican institutions than in the despotisms and monarchies of the old world? Your Codes and Constitutions favor such an opinion. Fortunately, history furnishes a few saving facts, even under our Republican institutions. From a recent examination of the archives of the State of New Jersey we learn that, owing to a liberal Quaker influence, women and negroes, exercised the right to suffrage in that State thirty-one years — from 1778 to 1808 — when "white males" ignored the constitution, and arbitrarily assumed the reins of government. This act of injustice is sufficient to account for the moral darkness that seems to have settled down upon that unhappy State. During the dynasty of women and negroes, does history record any social revolution peculiar to that period? Because women voted there, was the institution of marriage annulled, the sanctity of home invaded, cradles annihilated, and the stockings, like Marcy's pantaloons, mended by the State? Did the men of that period become mere satellites of the dinner-pot, the washtub, or the spinning-wheel? Were they dwarfed and crippled in body and soul, while their enfranchised wives and mothers became giants in stature and intellect? Did the children, fully armed and equipped for the battle of life, spring, Minerva-like, from the brains of their fathers? Were the laws of nature suspended? Did the sexes change places? Was everything turned upside down? No, life went on as smoothly in New Jersey as in any other state in the union. And the fact that women did vote there, created no slight a ripple on the popular wave, and made so ordinary a page in history, that probably nine-tenths of the people of this country never hears of its existence, until recent discussions in the United States Senate
brought out the facts of the case. In Kansas, women vote for school officers are themselves also eligible for the office of trustee. There is a resolution now before the Legislature of Ohio to strike the words "white male" from the Constitution of that State. The Hon. Mr. Noel, of Missouri, has presented a bill in the House of Representatives to extend suffrage to women of the District of Columbia.

I think Honorable Gentlemen? I have given you facts enough to show that you need not hesitate to give the ballot to the women of New York, on the ground that it is a new thing; for, as you see, the right has long ago been exercised by certain classes of women in many countries. And if it were a new thing, and had never been heard of before, that would be no argument against the experiment. Had the world never done a new thing, Columbus would not have discovered this country, nor the ocean telegraph brought our old enemy -- Great Britain -- within speaking distance. When it was proposed to end slavery in this country, croakers and conservatives protested because it was a new thing, and must of necessity produce a social convulsion. When it was proposed to give woman her rights of property in this State, the same classes opposed that on the same ground; but the spirit of the age carried both measures over their heads and "nobody was hurt."

***************-0000-***************

I have called your attention, gentlemen, to some of the flaws in your constitution that you may see that there is more important work to be done in the coming Convention than any to which Governor Frenton has referred in his message. I would also call your attention to the fact, that while His Excellency suflfests the number of delegates at large to be chosen by the two political parties, he makes no provision for the representatives of women and "men of color" not worth $250. I would, therefore, suggest to your honorable body that you provide for the election of an equal number of delegates at large from the disfranchised classes. But a response to our present demand does not legitimately thrust on you the final consideration of the whole broad question of suffrage, on which many of you may be unprepared to give an opinion. The simple point we now press is this: that in a revision of our Constitution, when the State is, as it were, resolved into its original elements, ALL THE PEOPLE should be represented in the Convention which is to enact the laws by which they are to be governed the next twenty years. Women and negroes, being seven-twelfths of the people a majority; and according to our republican theory, are the rightful rulers of the nation. In this view of the case, honorable gentlemen is not a very unpretending demand we make, that we shall vote once in twenty years in revising and amending our State Constitution? But, say you, the majority of women do not make the demand. Grant it. What then? When you proclaimed emancipation, did you go to slaveholders and ask if a majority of them were in favor of freeing their
slave? When you ring the changes on "negro suffrage" from Maine to California, you prove positive that a majority of the freedmen demand the ballot? On the contrary, knowing that the very existence of republican institutions depends on the virtue, education and equality of the people, did you not, as wise statesmen, legislate in all these cases for the highest good of the individual and the nation? We ask that the same far-seeing wisdom may guide your decision on the question now before you. Remember, the gay and fashionable throng who whisper in the ears of statesmen, judges, lawyers, merchants, "we have all the rights we want," are but the mummies of civilization, to be brought back to life only by earthquakes and revolutions. Would you know what is in the soul of woman, ask not the wives and daughters of merchant princes; but the creators of wealth — those who earn their bread by honest toil — those who, by a turn in the wheel of fortune, stand face to face with the stern realities of life.

"If you would enslave a people," says Cicero, "first, through ease and luxury, make them effeminate." When you subsidize labor to your selfish interests, there is ever a healthy resistance. But, when you exalt weakness and imbecility above your heads, give it an imaginary realm of power, illimitable, unmeasured, unrecognized, you have founded a throne for woman on pride, selfishness, and complacency, before which you may well stand appalled. In banishing Madame De Stael from Paris, the Emperor Napoleon, even, bowed to the power of that scepter which rules the world of fashion. The most insidious aristocracy of our women. The ballot-box, that great leveler among men, is beneath their dignity. "They have all the rights they want." So, in his spiritual supremacy, has the Pope of Rome! But what of the multitude outside the Vatican!!!!
Mr. Purvis resumed the chair, and introduced Mrs. Stanton, who spoke to the following resolutions: Resolved: That government, of all sciences, is the most exalted and comprehensive, including, as it does, all the political, commercial, religious, educational, and social interests of the race. Resolved. That to speak of the ballot as an "article of merchandise," and of the science of government as the "muddy pool of politics" is most demoralizing to a nation based on universal suffrage.

In considering the question of suffrage, there are two starting points; one, that this right is a gift of society, in which certain men, having inherited this privilege from some abstract body and abstract place, have now the right to secure it for themselves and their privileged order to the end of time. This principle leads logically to governing races, classes, families; and, in direct antagonism to our idea of self-government, takes us back to monarchies and despotisms, to an experiment that has been tried over and over again, 6,000 years, and uniformly failed.

Ignoring this point of view as untenable and anti-republican, and taking the opposite, that suffrage is a natural right — as necessary to man and to government, for the protection of person and property, as are air and motion to life — we hold the talisman by which to show the right of all classes to the ballot, to remove every obstacle, to answer every objection, to point out the tyranny of every qualification to the free exercise of this sacred right. To discuss this question of suffrage for women and negroes, as women and negroes, and not as citizens of a republic, implies that there are some reasons for demanding this right for these classes that do not apply to white males.

The obstinate persistence which fallacious and absurd objections are pressed against their enfranchisement — as if they were anomalous beings, outside all human laws and necessities — is most humiliating and insulting to every black man and woman, who has one particle of healthy, high-toned self-respect. There are no special claims to propose for women and negroes, no new arguments to make in their behalf. The same already made to extend suffrage to all white men in this country, the same John Bright makes for the working men of England, the same made for the emancipation of 22,000,000 Russian serfs, are all we have to make for black men and women. As the greater includes
the less, an argument for universal suffrage covers the whole question, the rights of all citizens. In thus relaying the foundations of government, we settle all these side issues of race, color, and sex, and class legislation, and remove forever the fruitful causes of the jealousies, dissensions, and revolutions of the past. This is the platform of the American Equal Rights Association. "We are masters of the situation." Here black men and women are buried in the citizen. As in war, freedom was the key-note of victory, so now is universal suffrage the key-note of reconstruction.

"Negro suffrage" may answer as a party cry for an effective political organization through another Presidential campaign; but the people of this country have a broader work on hand to-day than to save the Republican party, or, with some abolitionists, to settle the rights of races. The battles of the ages have been fought for races, classes, parties, over and over again, and force always carried the day, and will until we settle the higher, the holier question of individual rights. This is our American idea and a wise settlement of this question rests the problem whether our nation shall live or perish.

The principle of inequality in government has been thoroughly tried, and every nation based on that idea that has not perished, clearly shows the seeds of death in its dissensions and decline. Though it has never been tried, we know an experiment on the basis of equality would be safe; for the laws in the world of morals are as immutable as in the world of matter. As the Astronomer Leverrier discovered the planet that bears his name by a process of reason and calculation through the variations of other planets from known laws, so can the true statesman, through the telescope of justice, see the genuine republic of the future amid the ruins of the mighty nations that have passed away. The opportunity now given us to make the experiment of self-government should be regarded by every American citizen as a solemn and a sacred trust. When we remember that a nation's life and growth and immortality depend on its legislation, can we exalt too highly the dignity and responsibility of the ballot, the science of political economy, the sphere of government? Statesmanship is, of all sciences, the most exalted and comprehensive, for it includes all others. Among men we find those who study the laws of national life more liberal and enlightened on all subjects than those who confine their researches in special directions. When we base nations on justice and equality, we lift government out of the mists of speculation into the dignity of a fixed science, everything short of this is trick, legerdemain, sleight of hand. Magicians may make nations seem to live, but they do not. The Newtons of our day who should try to make apples stand in the air or men to walk on the wall, would be no more puerile in their experiments than are they who build nations outside of law, and one on the basis of inequality.

What thinking man can talk of coming down into the arena of pol-
ities? If we need purity, honor, self-sacrifice and devotion anywhere, we need them in those who have in their keeping the life and prosperity of a nation. In the enfranchisement of woman, in lifting her up into this broader sphere, we see for her a new honor and dignity, more liberal, exalted and enlightened view of life, its objects, ends and aims, and an entire revolution in the new world of interest and action where she is soon to play her part. And in saying this, I do not claim that woman is better than man, but that the sexes have a civilizing power on each other. The distinguished historian, Henry Thomas Buckle, says: (quotations omitted). And this will be her influence in exalting and purifying the world of politics. When woman understands the momentous interests that depend on the ballot, she will make it her first duty to educate every American boy and girl into the idea that to vote is the most sacred act of citizenship — a religious duty not to be discharged thoughtlessly, selfishly or corruptly, but conscientiously, remembering that, in a republican government, to every citizen is entrusted the interests of the nation. Would you fully estimate the responsibility of the ballot, think of it as the great regulating power of a continent, of all our interests, political, commercial, religious, educational, social, and sanitary?

To many minds, this claim for the ballot suggests nothing more than a rough polling-booth: where coarse, drunken men, elbowing each other, wide knee-deep in mud to drop a little piece of paper two inches long into a box—simply this and nothing more. The poet Wordsworth, showing the blank materialism of those who see only with their outward eyes, ways of his Peter Bell:

"A primrose on the river's brim
A yellow primrose was to him,
And it was nothing more."

So far our political Peter Bells see the rough polling-booth, in this great right of citizenship, and nothing more. In this act, so lightly esteemed by the mere materialist, behold the realization of that great idea struggled for in the ages and proclaimed by the fathers, the right of self-government. That little piece of paper dropped into a box is the symbol of equality, of citizenship, of wealth, of virtue, education, self-protection, dignity, independence and power — the mightiest engine yet placed in the hand of man for the uprooting of kings, popes, despotisms, monarchies and empires. What phantom can the sons of the Pilgrims be chasing, when they make merchandise of a power like this? Judas Iscariot, selling his Master for thirty pieces of silver, is a fit type of those American citizens who sell their votes, and thus betray the right of self-government. Talk not of the "muddy pool of politics," as if such things must be. Behold, with the coming of woman into this higher sphere of influence, the dawn of the new day, when politics, so called, are to be lifted into the world of morals and religion; when the polling-booth shall be a beautiful tem-
people, surrounded by fountains and flowers and triumphal arches, through which young men and maidens shall go up in joyful procession to ballot for justice and freedom; and when our election days shall be kept like the holy feasts of the Jews at Jerusalem. Through the trials of this second revolution shall not our nation rise up, with new virtue and strength, to fulfill her mission in leading all the people of the earth to the only solid foundation of government, "equal rights to all."....

Our danger lies, not in the direction of despotism in the one-man power, in centralization; but in the corruption of the people.

It is in vain to look for a genuine republic in this country until the women are baptized into the idea, until they understand the genius of our institutions, until they study the science of government, until they hold the ballot in their hands and have a direct voice in our legislation. That is the reason, with the argument in favor of the enfranchisement of women all one side, without an opponent worthy of consideration — while British statesmen, even, are discussing this question — the Northern men are so dumb and dogged, manifesting a studied indifference to what they can neither answer nor prevent? What is the reason that even abolitionists who have fearlessly claimed political, religious, and social equality for women for the last twenty years, should now with bated breath, give her but a passing word in their public speeches and editorial comments — as if her rights constituted but a side issue of this grave question of reconstruction? All must see that this claim for female suffrage is but another experiment in class legislation, another violation of the republican idea. With the black man we have no new element in government, but with the education and elevation of women we have a power that is to develop the Saxon race into a higher and nobler life, and thus, by the law of attraction, to lift all races to a more even platform than can ever be reached in the political isolations of the sexes. Why ignore 15,000,000 women in the reconstruction? The philosophy of this silence is plain enough. The black man crowned with the rights of citizenship, there are no political Ishmaelites left but the women. This is the last stronghold of aristocracy in the country. Sidney Smith says: "There always has been, and always will be, a class of men in the world so small that, if women were educated, there would be nothing left below them."

It is a consolation to the "white male," to the popinjays in all our seminaries of learning, to the ignorant foreigner, the bootblack and barber, the idiot — for a "white male" may vote if he be not more than nine-tenths a fool — to look down on woman of wealth and education, who write books, make speeches, and discuss principles with the savants of their age. It is a consolation for these classes to be able to say, "well, if women can do these things, they can't vote after all." I heard some
boys discoursing thus not long ago. I told them they reminded me of a story I heard of two Irishmen the first time they saw a locomotive with a train of cars. As the majestic fire-horse, with all its grace and polish, moved up to a station, stopped, and snorted, as its mighty power was curbed, then slowly gathered up its forces again and moved swiftly on — "be jabbers," says Pat, "those's muscle for you. What are we beside that giant?" They watched it intently till out of sight, seemingly with real envy, as if the oppressed with feelings of weakness and poverty before this unknown power; but rallying at last, one says to the others. "No matter Pat; let it snort and dash on — it can't vote after all."

Poor human nature wants something to look down on. No privileged order ever did see the wrongs of its own victims, and why expect the "white male citizen" to enfranchise woman without a struggle — by a scratch of the pen to place themselves on a dead level with their lowest order? And what a fall would that be, my countrymen. In none of the nations of modern Europe is there a class of women so degraded politically as are the women of these Northern States. In the Old World, where the government is the aristocracy, where it is considered a mark of nobility to share its offices and powers — there women of rank have certain hereditary rights which raise them above a majority of the men, certain honors and privileges not granted to serfs or peasants. In England woman may be Queen, hold office, and vote on some questions. In the Southern States even the women were not degraded below their working population, they were not humiliated in seeing their coachmen, gardeners, and waiters go to the polls to legislate on their interests; hence there was a pride and dignity in their bearing not found in the women of the North, and pluck in the chivalry before which Northern doughfaceism has ever cowered. But here, where the ruling class, the aristocracy is "male," no matter whether washed or unwashed, letter or unlettered, rich or poor, black or white here in this boasted northern civilization, under the shadow of Bunker Hill and Faneuil Hall, which Mr. Phillips proposed to cram down the throat of South Carolina — here women of wealth and education, who pay taxes and are answerable to law, who may be hung, even though not permitted to choose the judge, the juror, or the sheriff who does the dismal deed, women who are your peers in art, science, and literature — already close upon your heels in the whole world of thought — are thrust outside the pale of political consideration with traitors, idiots, negroes, with those guilty of bribery, larceny, and infamous crime. What a category is this in which to place your mothers, wives, and daughters. "I ask you, men of the Empire State, where on the footstool do you find such a class of citizens politically so degraded?" Now, now, we ask you, in the coming Constitutional Convention, to so amend the Second Article of your State Constitution as to wipe out this record of our disgrace.

"But," say you, "women themselves do not make the demand."
Mr. Phillips said on this platform a year ago, that "the sing-
ularity of this cause is, that it has to be carried on against
the wishes and purposes of its victims," and he has been echoed
by nearly every man who has spoken on this subject during the
past year. Suppose the assertion true, is it a peculiarity
of this reform?.......Ignorant classes always resist innovations.
Women looked on the sewing-machine as a rival for a long time,
years ago the laboring classes of England asked bread; but the
Cobbets, the Brights, the Gladstons, the Hills have taught them
there is a power behind bread, and today they ask the ballot.
But they were taught its power first, and so must woman be. Again
do not those far-seeing philosophers who comprehend the wisdom,
and beneficence, the morality of free trade urge this law of
nations against the will and wishes of the victims of tariffs
and protective duties? I. you can prove to us that women do
not want to vote, that is no argument against our demand. There
are many duties in life that ignorant, selfish, unthinking women
do not desire to do, and this may be one of them.

"But," says Rev. O. B. Frothingham, in a recent sermon on this
subject, "they who first assume political responsibilities
must necessarily lose something of the feminine element." In
the education and elevation of woman we are yet to learn the
true manhood and womanhood, the true masculine and feminine
elements. Dio Lewis is rapidly changing our ideas of feminine
beauty. In the large waists and strong arms of the girls un-
der his training, some dilettante gentlemen may mourn a loss
of feminine delicacy. So in the wise, virtuous, self-support-
ing, common-sense women we propose as the mothers of the future
republic, the reverend gentlemen may see a lack of what he con-
siders the feminine element. In the development of sufficient
moral force to entrench herself on principle, need a woman
necessarily lose any grace, dignity, or perfection or charact-
er? Are not those who have advocated the rights of women in
this country for the last twenty years as delicate and refined,
as moral, high-toned, educated, just, and generous as any women
in the land? I have seen women in many countries and classes,
in public and private; but have found none for more pure and
noble than those I meet on this platform. I have seen our
venerable President in converse with the highest English nobil-
ity, and even the Duchess of Sutherland did not eclipse her
in grace, dignity, the conversational power. Where are there
any women, as wives and mother, more beautiful in their home
life than Lucretia Mott and Lucy Stone, or Antoinette Brown
Blackwell? Let the freedom of the South Sea Islands testify
to the faithfulness, the devotion, the patience, the tender
mercy of Frances D. Sage, who watched over their interests,
teaching them to read and work for two long years. Some on our
Platform have struggled with hardship and poverty — been slaves
even in "the land of the free and the home of the brave", and
bear the scars of life's battle. But is a self-made woman less honorable than a self-made man? Answer our arguments. When the republic is in danger, no matter for our manners. When our soldiers came back from the war, wan, weary, and torn, their garments stained with blood — who, with a soul to feel, thought of anything but the glorious work they had done? What if their mothers on this platform be angular, old, wrinkled, and gray? They, too, have fought a good fight for freedom, and proudly bear the scars of the battle. So alone have struck the keynote of reconstruction. While man talks of "equal, impartial, manhood suffrage," we give the certain sound, "universal suffrage." While he talks of the rights of races, we exalt the higher, the holier idea proclaimed by the Fathers, and now twice baptized in blood, "individual rights." To woman it is given to save the Republic.
Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton

Address to the

First Woman's Suffrage Convention
in Washington D. C.
1869

From "History of Woman Suffrage," Vol. II, p. 348

Mrs. Stanton said:

A great idea of progress is near its consummation, when statesmen in the councils of the nation propose to frame it into statutes and constitutions; when Reverend Fathers recognize it by a new interpretation of their creeds and canons; when the Bar and Bench at its command set aside the legislation of centuries, and girls of twenty put their heels on the Cokes and Blackstones of the past.

Those who represent what is called the "Woman's Right Movement," have argued their right to political equality from every standpoint of justice, religion, and logic, for the last twenty years. They have quoted the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Bible, the opinions of great men and women in all ages; they have pleaded the theory of our government; suffrage a natural, inalienable right; shown from the lessons of history, that one class can not legislate for another; that disfranchised classes must ever be neglected and degraded; and that all privileges are but mockery to the citizen, until he has a voice in the making administering of the law. Such arguments have been made over and over in conventions and before the legislatures of the several States. Judges, lawyers, priests, and politicians have said again and again, that our logic was unanswerable, and although much nonsense has emanated from male tongue and pen on this subject, no man has yet made a fair argument on the other side. Knowing that we hold the Sibylline rock of reason on this question, they resort to ridicule and petty objections. Compelled to follow our assailants, wherever they go, and fight them with their own weapons; when cornered with wit and sarcasm, some cry out, you have no logic on your platform, forgetting that we have no use for logic until they give us logicians at whom to hurl it, and if, for the pure love of it, we know now and then rehearse the logic that is like, a, b, c, to all of us, others cry out — the same old speeches we have heard these twenty years. It would be safe to say a hundred years, for they are the same our fathers used when battling old King George and the British Parliament for their right to representation, and a voice in the laws by which they were governed. There are no new arguments to be made on human rights, our work to-day is to apply to ourselves those so familiar to all; and to teach man that woman is not an anomalous being, outside all laws and constitutions, but one
whose rights are to be taken and established by the same process of reason as that by which he demands his own.

When our Fathers made out their famous bill of impeachment against England, they specified eighteen grievances. When the women of this country surveyed the situation in their first convention, they found they had precisely that number and quite similar in character; and reading over the old revolutionary arguments of Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Otis, and Adams, they found they applied remarkably well to their case. The same arguments made in this country for extending their case, suffrage from time to time, to white men, native born citizens, without property and education, and to foreigners; the same used by John Bright in England, to extend it to a new million voters, and the same used by the great Republican party to enfranchise a million black men in the South, all these arguments we have to-day to offer for woman, and one, in addition, stronger than all besides, the difference in man and woman. Because man and woman are the complement of one another, we need of woman's thought in national affairs to make a safe and stable government.

The Republican party to-day congratulates itself on having carried the Fifteenth Amendment of the Constitution, thus securing "manhood suffrage" and establishing an aristocracy of sex on this continent. As several bills to secure Woman's Suffrage in the District and Territories have been already presented in both houses of Congress, and as by Mr. Julian's bill, the question of so amending the Constitution as to extend suffrage to all the women of the country has been presented to the nation for consideration, it is not only the right but the duty of every thoughtful woman to express her opinion on a Sixteenth Amendment. While I hail the late discussions in Congress and the various bills presented as so many signs of progress, I am especially gratified with those of Messrs. Julian and Pomeroy, which forbid any State to deny the right of suffrage to any of its citizens on account of sex or color.

This fundamental principle of our government -- the 'equality of all the citizens of the republic' -- should be incorporated in the Federal Constitution, there to remain forever. To leave this question then to the States and partial acts of Congress, is to defer indefinitely its settlement, for what is done by this Congress may be repealed by the next; and politics in the several States differ so widely, that no harmonious action on any question can ever be secured, except as a strict party measure. Hence, we appeal to the party now in power, everywhere to end this protracted debate on suffrage, and declare it the inalienable right of every citizen who is amenable to the laws of the land, who pays taxes and the penalty of crime. We have a splendid theory of a genuine republic, why not realize it and make our government homogeneous, to Maine from California, the Republican party has the power to do this, and now is its only opportunity. Woman's Suffrage, in 1878, may be as good a card for General Grant in the last election. It is said that the Republican party
made him President, not because they thought him the most desirable man in the nation for that office, but they were afraid the Democrats would take him if they did not. We would suggest, there may be the same danger of Democrats taking up Woman Suffrage if they do not. God, in his providence, may have purified that party in the furnace of affliction. They have had the opportunity, safe from the turmoil of political life and the temptations of office, to study and apply the divine principles of justice and equality to life; for minorities are always in a position to carry principles to their logical results, while majorities are governed only by votes. You may see my faith in Democrats is based on sound philosophy. In the next Congress, the Democratic party will gain thirty-four new members, hence the Republicans have had their last chance to do justice to woman. It will be no enviable record for the Fortieth Congress that in the darkest days of the republic it placed our free institutions in the care and keeping of every type manhood, ignoring womanhood, all the elevating and purifying influences of the most virtuous and humane half of the American people. I urge a speed adoption of a Sixteenth Amendment for the following reasons:

1. A government based on the principle of caste and class, cannot stand. The aristocratic idea, in any form, is opposed to the genius of our free institutions, to our own declaration of rights, and to the civilization of the age. All artificial distinctions, whether of family, blood, wealth, color, or sex, are equally oppressive to the subject classes, and equally destructive to national life and prosperity. Governments based on every form of aristocracy, on every degree and variety of inequality, have been tried in despotisms, monarchies, and republics, and all alike have perished. In the panorama of the past behold the mighty nations that have risen, one by one, of the world, but to fall. Behold their temples, thrones, and pyramids, their gorgeous palaces and stately monuments now crumbled all to dust. Behold the republics on this Western continent convulsed, distracted, divided, the hosts scattered, the leaders fallen, the scouts lost in the wilderness, the once inspired prophets blind and dumb, while on all sides the cry is echoed, "republicanism is a failure," though that great principle of a government "by the people, of the people, for the people," have never been tried. Thus far, all nations have been built on caste and failed. Why, in this hour of reconstruction, with the experience of generations before us, make another experiment in the same direction? If serfdom, peasantry, and slavery have shattered kingdoms, deluged continents with blood, scattered republics like dust before the wind, and rent our own Union asunder, what kind of a government, think you, American statesmen, you can build, with the mothers of the race crouching at your feet, while iron-heeled peasants of serfs, and slaves, exalted by your hands, tread our inalienable rights into the dust? While all men, everywhere, are rejoicing in new-found liberties, shall woman alone be denied the rights, privileges,
and immunities of citizenship? While in England men are coming up from the coal mines of Cornwall, from the factories of Birmingham and Manchester, demanding the suffrage; while in frigid Russia the 22,000,000 newly-emancipated serfs are already claiming a voice in the government; while here, in our own land, slaves, but just rejoicing in the proclamation of emancipation ignorant alike of its power and significance, have the ballot unmasked, unsought, already laid at their feet — think you the daughters of Adams, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry, in whose veins flows the blood of two Revolutions, will forever linger round the campfires of an old barbarism, with no longings to join this grand army of freedom in its onward march to roll back the golden gates of a higher and better civilization? Of all kinds of aristocracy, that of sex is the most odious and unnatural; invading, as it does, our homes, degrading our family altars, dividing those whom God has joined together, exalting the son above the mother who bore him, and subjugating, everywhere, moral power to brute force. Such a government would not be worth the blood and treasures so freely poured out in its long struggles for freedom....

2. I urge a Sixteenth Amendment, because "manhood suffrage" or a man's government, is civil, religious, and social disorganization. The male element is a destructive force, a stem, selfish, aggrandizing, war-loving, loving violence, conquest, acquisition, breeding in the material and moral world alike, discord, disorder, disease, and death. See what a record of blood and cruelty the pages of history reveal! Through what slavery, slaughter, and sacrifice, through what inquisitions and imprisonments, pains and persecutions, black codes and gloomy creeds, the soul of humanity has struggled for centuries, while mercy has beamed her face and all hearts have been dead alike to love and hope? The male carnival has run thus far, run riot from the beginning, overpowering the feminine element everywhere, crushing all the diviner qualities in human nature, until we know but little of true manhood and womanhood, of the latter comparatively nothing, for it has scarce been recognized as a power until within the last century. Society is but the reflection of man himself, untamed by woman's thought, the hard iron rule we feel alike then in the church, the state, and the home. No one need wonder at the disorganization, at the fragmentary condition of everything, when we remember that man, who represents but half a complete being with half an idea of every subject, has undertaken the absolute control of all sublunary matters.

People object the demands of those whom they choose to call the strong-minded, because they say, "the right of suffrage will make the women masculine." That is just the difficulty in which we are involved to-day. Though disfranchised we have few women in the best sense, we have simply so many reflections, varieties, and dilutions of the masculine gender. The strong, natural characteristics of womanhood are repressed and ignored in dependence, for so long as man feeds woman she will try to
please the giver and adapt herself to his condition. To keep a foothold in society woman must be as near like man as possible, reflect his ideas, opinions, virtues, motives, prejudices, and vices. She must respect his statutes, though they strip her of every inalienable right, and conflict with that higher law written by the finger of God on her own soul. She must believe this theology, though it pave the highways of hell with the skulls of new-born infants, and make God a monster of vengeance and hypocrisy. She must look at everything from its dollar and cent point of view, or she is a mere romancer. She must accept things as they are and make the best of them. To mourn over the miseries of others, the poverty of the poor, their hardships in jails, prisons, asylums, the horrors of war cruelty, the brutality in every form, all this would be mere sentimentalising. To protest against the intrigue, bribery, and corruption of public life, to desire that her sons might follow some business that did not involve lying, cheating, and a hard grinding selfishness, would be arrant nonsense. In this way man has been moulding woman to his ideas by direct and positive influence, while she, if not a negation, has used indirect means to control him, and in most cases developed the very characteristics both in him and herself that needed reression. And now man himself stands appalled at the results of his own excesses, and mourns in bitterness that falsehood, selfishness and violence are the law of life. The need of this hour is not territory, gold mines, railroads, or specie payments, but a new evangel of womanhood, to exalt purity, virtue, morality, true religion, to lift man up into the higher realms of thought and action.

We ask woman’s enfranchisement, as the first step toward the recognition of that essential element in government that can only secure the health, strength, and prosperity of the nation. Whatever is done to lift woman to her true position will help to usher in a new day of peace and perfection for the race. In speaking of the masculine element, I do not wish to be understood to say that all men are hard, selfish, and brutal, for many of the most beautiful spirits the world has ever known have been clothed with manhood; but I refer to those characteristics, though often marked in woman, that distinguish what is called the stronger sex. For example, the love of acquisition and conquest, the very pioneers of civilization, when expended on the earth, the sea, the elements, the riches and forces of Nature, are powers of destruction when used to subjugate one man to another or to sacrifice nations to ambition. Here that great conservator of woman’s love, if permitted to assert itself, as it naturally would in freedom against oppression, violence, and war, would hold all these destructive forces in check, for woman knows the cost of life better than man does, and not with her consent would one drop of blood ever be shed, one life sacrificed in vain. With violence and disturbance in the natural world, we see a constant effort to maintain an equilibrium of forces. Nature, like a loving mother, is ever trying to keep land and sea, mountain and valley, each in its place, to hush
the angry winds and waves, balance the extremes of heat and cold, of rain and drought, that peace, harmony, and beauty may reign supreme. There is a striking analogy between matter and mind, and the present disorganization of society warns us, that in the dethronement of women we have let loose the elements of violence and ruin and that she only has the power to curb. If the civilization of the age calls for an extension of the suffrage, surely a government of the most virtuous, educated men and women would better represent the whole, and protect the interests of all than could the representation of either sex alone. But government gains no new element of strength in admitting all men to the ballot-box, for we have too much of the man-power there already. We see this in every department of legislation, and it is a common remark, that unless some new virtue is infused into our public life the nation is doomed to destruction. Will the foreign element, the dregs of China, Germany, England, Ireland, and Africa supply this needed force or the nobler types of American womanhood who have taught our presidents, senators, and congressmen the rudiments of all they know?

3. I urge a Sixteenth Amendment because, when "manhood suffrage" is established from Maine to California, woman has reached the lowest depths of political degradation. So long as there is a disfranchised class in this country, and that class its women, a man's government is worse than a white man's government with suffrage limited by property and educational qualifications, because in proportion as you multiply the rulers, the condition of the politically ostracised is more hopeless and degraded. John Stuart Mill, in his work on "Liberty" shows that the condition of one disfranchised man in a nation is worse than when the whole nation is under one man, because in the latter case, if the one man is despotic, the nation can easily throw him off, but what can one man do with a nation of tyrants over him? If American women find it hard to bear the oppressions of their own Saxon fathers, the best orders of manhood, what may they be called to endure when all the lower orders of foreigners now crowding our shores legislate for them and their daughters. Think of Patrick and Sambo and Hans and Yung Tung, who do not know the fine difference between a monarchy and a republic, who can not read the Declaration of Independence or Webster's spelling-book, making laws for Lucretia Mott, Ernestine L. Rose, and Anna E. Dickinson. Think of jurors and jailers drawn from these ranks to watch and try young girls for the crime of infanticide, to decide the moral code by which the mothers of this Republic shall be governed? This manhood suffrage is an appalling question, and it would be well for thinking women, who seem to consider it so magnanimous to hold their own claims in abeyance until all men are crowned with citizenship, to remember that the most ignorant men are ever the most hostile to the equality of women, as they have known them only in slavery and degradation.

So to our courts of justice, our jails and prisons; go into the
world of work; into the trades and professions; into the tem-
ple of science and learning, and see what is meted out every-
where to women — to those who have no advocate in our courts,
no representatives in the councils of the nation. Shall we
prolong and perpetuate such injustice, and by increasing this
power, risk more worse oppressions for ourselves and our daugh-
ters? It is an open deliberate insult to American womanhood
to be cast down under the iron-heeled peasantry of the old
world and the slaves of the New, as we shall be in the practi-
cal working of the Fifteenth Amendment, and the only atonement
the Republican party can make is now to complete its work, by
enfranchising the women of the nation. I have forgotten their
action four years ago, when Article XIV., Sec. 2, was amended
by invidiously introducing the word "male" into the Federal
Constitution, where it had never been before, thus counting out
of the basis of representation all men not permitted to vote,
thereby making it the interest of every State to enfranchise
its male citizens, and virtually declaring it a crime to
disfranchise its women. As political sagacity moved our rulers
thus to guard the interests of the negro for party purposes,
common justice might have compelled them to show like respect
for their own mothers, by counting woman too out of the basis
of representation, that she might no longer swell the numbers
to legislate adversely to her interests. And this degradation
of the last will and testament of the fathers, this retrogressive
legislation for woman, was in the face of the earnest pro-
jects of thousands of the best educated, most refined and cul-
tivated women of the North.

Now, when the attention of the whole world is turned to this
question of suffrage, and women themselves are throwing off the
lethargy of ages, and in England, France, Germany, Switzerland,
and Russia are holding their conventions, and their rulers are
everywhere giving them a respectful hearing, shall American
statesmen, claiming to be liberal, so amend their constitutions
as to make their wives and mothers the political inferiors of
unlettered unwashed ditch-diggers, boot-blacks, butchers, and
barbers, fresh from the slave plantations of the South, and
the effete civilizations of the Old World? While poets and phil-
osophers, statesmen and men of science are all alike pointing
to woman as the new hope for the redemption of the race, shall
the freest Government of the earth be the first to establish
an aristocracy based on sex alone? to exalt ignorance above
education, vice above virtue, brutality and barbarism above
refinement and religion? Not since God first called light out
of darkness and order out of chaos, was there ever made so
base a proposition as "manhood suffrage" in this American Re-
public, after all the discussion we have had on human rights in
the last century. On all the blackest pages of history there
is no record of an act like this, in any nation, where native
born citizens, having the same religion, speaking the same lan-
guage, equal to their rulers in wealth, family, and education,
have been politically ostracised by their own countrymen, out-
lawed with savages, and subjected to the government of out-
side barbarians. Remember the Fifteenth Amendment takes in a larger population than the 2,000,000 black men on the Southern plantation. It takes in all the foreigners daily landing in our eastern cities, the Chinese crowding our western shores, the inhabitants of Alaska, and all those western isles that will soon be ours. American statesmen may flatter themselves that by superior intelligence and political adroitness the higher orders of men will always govern, but when the ignorant foreign vote already holds the balance of power in all the large cities by sheer force of numbers, it is simply a question of impulse or passion, bribery or fraud, how our elections will be carried. When the highest offices in the gift of the people are bought and sold in Wall Street, it is a mere chance who will be our rulers. Whither is a nation tending where brains count for less than bullion, and clowns make laws for queens? It is a startling assertion, but nevertheless true, that in none of the nations of modern Europe are the higher classes of women politically so degraded as are the women of this Republic to-day. In the Old World where the government is the aristocracy, where it is considered a mark of nobility to share its offices and powers, women of rank have certain hereditary rights which raise them above a majority of the men, certain honors and privileges not granted to serfs and peasants. There women are queens, hold subordinate offices, and vote on many questions. In our Southern States, even, before the war, women were not degraded below the working population. They were not humiliated in seeing their coachmen, gardeners, and waiters go to the polls to legislate for them; but here, in this boasted Northern civilization, women of wealth and education, who pay taxes and obey the laws, who in morals and intellect are the peers of their proudest rulers, are thrust outside the pale of political consideration with minor, paupers, lunatics, traitors, idiots, with those guilty of bribery, larceny, and infamous crimes.

Would those gentlemen who are on all sides telling the women of the nation not to press their claims until the negro is safe beyond peradventure, be willing themselves to stand aside and thrust all their interests to hands like these? The educated women of this nation feel as much interest in republican institutions, and the preservation of the country, the good of the race, their own elevation and success, as any man possibly can, and we have the same distrust in man’s power to legislate for us, that he has in woman’s power to legislate wisely for herself.

4. I would press a Sixteenth Amendment, because the history of American statesmanship does not inspire me with confidence in man’s capacity to govern the nation alone, with justice and mercy. I have come to this conclusion, not only from my own observations, but from what our rulers say of themselves. Honorable Senators have risen in their places again and again, and told the people of the wastefulness and corruption of the present administration. Others have set forth, with equal clearness, the ignorance of our rulers on the question of finance....
MRS. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON

Address to the Thirtieth Anniversary of the First Woman's Rights Convention

July 19, 1878 in Rochester, N.Y.

From the "History of Woman Suffrage," Vol II, pp. 117-9

We are here to celebrate the third decade of woman's struggle in this country for liberty. Thirty years have passed since many of us now present met in this place to discuss the true position of woman as a citizen of a republic. The reports of our first conventions show that those who inaugurated this movement understood the significance of the term "citizen." At this very start we claimed full equality with man. Our meetings were hastily called and somewhat crudely conducted; but we intuitively recognised the fact that we were deprived of our natural rights, conceded in the national constitution. And thus the greatest movement of the century was inaugurated.

I say greatest, because through the elevation of woman, all humanity is lifted to a higher plane. To contrast our position thirty years ago, under the old common law of England, with that we occupy under the advanced legislation of to-day, is enough to assure us that we have passed the boundary line—from slavery to freedom. We already see the milestones of a new civilization on every highway.

Look at the department of education, the doors of many colleges and universities thrown wide open to women; girls contending for, yea, and winning prizes over their brothers. In the working of the world they are rapidly filling places and climbing heights unknown to them before, realizing, in fact, the dreams, the hopes, the prophecies of the inspired women of by-gone centuries. In many departments of learning, woman stands the peer of man, and when by higher education and profitable labor she becomes self-reliant and independent, then she must and will be free. The moment an individual or a class is strong enough to stand alone, bondage is impossible. Jefferson Davis, in a recent speech, says: "A Caesar could not subject a people fit to be free, no could a Brutus safety them if they were fit for subjugation."

Looking back over the past thirty years, how long ago seems that July morning when we gathered round the altar in the old Wesleyan church in Seneca Falls! It taxes and weary the memory to think of all the conventions we have held, the legislatures we have besieged, the petitions and tracts we have circulated, the speeches, the calls, the resolutions we have penned, the never-ending debates we have kept in public and private, and yet to each and all our theme is as fresh and absorbing as it
was the day we started. Calm, benignant, subdued as we look on
this platform, if any man should dare to rise in our presence
and controvert a single platform, if any man should do this,
to a single position we have taken, there is not a woman here
that would not in an instant, with flushed face and flashing,
eye, bristle all over with sharp, pointed arguments that would
soon annihilate the most skilled logician, the most profound
philosopher.

To those of you on this platform who for these thirty years have
been the steadfast representatives of woman’s cause, my friends
and co-laborers, let me say our work has not been in vain.
True we have not yet secured the suffrage, but we have aroused
public thought to the many disabilities of our sex, and our
countrywomen to the higher self-respect and worthier ambition,
and in this struggle for justice we have deepened and broad-
ened our own lives and extended the horizon of our vision.
Ridiculed, persecuted, ostracised, we have learned to place a
just estimate on popular opinion, and to feel a just confidence
in ourselves. As the representatives of principles which it was
necessary to explain and defend, we have been compelled to study
constitutions and laws, and in this seeking to redress the
wrongs and vindicate the rights of the many, we have secured a
higher development for ourselves. Nor is this all. The full
fruition of these years of seed-sowing shall yet be realised,
though it may not be by those who have let in the reform, for
many of our number have already fallen asleep. Neither decade
and not one of us may be here, but we have smoothed the rough
paths for those who come after us. The lives of multitudes will
be gladdened by the sacrifices we have made, and the truths we
have uttered can never die.

Standing near the gateway of the unknown land and looking back
through the vista of the past, memory recalls many duties in
life’s varied relations we would have been better done. The past
to all of us is filled with regrets. We can recall, perchance,
social ambitions disappointed, fond hopes wrecked, ideals in
wealth, power, position, unattained — much that would be con-
sidered success in life unrealized. But I think we should all
agree that the time, the thought, the energy we have devoted to
the freedom of our countrywomen, that the past, in so far as our
lives have presented that great movement, brings us only unalloy-
ed satisfaction. The right already obtained, the full promise
of the rising generation of women more than repay us for the hopes
so long deferred, the rights yet denied, the humiliation of spir-
it we still suffer.

And for those of you who have been mere spectators of the long,
hard battle we have fought, and are still fighting, I have a
word. Whatever your attitude has been, whether as cold, indif-
ferent observers — whether you have hurled at us the shafts of
ridicule or of denunciation, we ask you now to lay aside your
old educational prejudices and give this question your earnest
consideration, substitution of reason for ridicule, sympathy for
enmies. I urge the young women especially to prepare yourselves
to take up the work so soon to fall from our hands. You have
had opportunities for education such as we had not. You hold
to-day the vantage-ground we have won by argument. Show now
your gratitude to us by making the uttermost of yourselves, and
by your earnest, exalted lives secure to those who come after
you a higher outlook, a broader culture, a larger freedom than
have yet been vouchsafed to woman in our own happy land.
The most interesting feature was the hearing before the Senate committee on Woman Suffrage which took place April 2, 1866. Mrs. Stanton made the opening address in which she took up the provisions of the Federal Constitution one by one and showed how they were violated in their application to women saying:

Even the preamble of the Constitution is an argument for self-government. "We, the people." You recognize women as people; for you count them in the basis of representation. Half our Congressmen hold their seats to-day as the representatives of women. We help to swell the figures by which you are here, and too many of you, alas, are only figurative representatives, paying little heed to our rights as citizens.

"No bill of attainder shall be passed." "No title of nobility granted." So says the Constitution; and yet you have passed bills of attainder in every State of the Union making sex a disqualification for the franchise. You have granted titles of nobility to every male voter, making all men rulers, governors, sovereigns over all women.

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government." And yet you have not a republican form of government in a single State. One-half the people have never consented to one law under which they live. They have rulers placed over them in whom they have no choice. They are taxed without representation, tried in our courts by men for the violation of laws made by men, with no appeal except to men, and for some crime over which men should have no jurisdiction.

Landing in New York one week ago, I saw 400 steerage passengers leave the vessel. Dull-eyed, heavy-visaged, stooping with huge burdens and the oppression endured in the Old World, they stood in painful contrast with the group of brilliant women on their way to the International Council here in Washington. I thought, as this long line passed by, of the speedy transformation the genial influences of equality would effect in the appearance of these men, of the new dignity they would acquire with a voice in the laws under which they live, and I rejoiced for them; but bitter reflections filled my mind when I thought that these men are the future rulers of our daughters; these will interpret the civil and criminal codes by which they will be governed; these will be our future judges and jurors to try young girls
in our courts, for trial by a jury of her peers has never yet been vouchsafed to woman. Here is a right so ancient that it is difficult to trace its origin in history, a right so sacred that the humblest criminal may choose his juror. But alas for the daughters of the people, their judges, advocates, jurors, must be men, and for them there is no appeal. But this is only one wrong among many inevitable for a disfranchised class. It is impossible for you, gentlemen, to appreciate the humiliation so suffered by women at every turn. . . .

You have now the power to settle this question by wise legislation. But if you can not be aroused to its serious consideration, like every other step in progress, it will eventually be settled by violence. The wild enthusiasm of woman can be used for evil as well as good. To-day you have the power to direct it into channels of true patriotism, but in the future, with all the elements of discontent now gathering from foreign countries, you will have the scenes of the French Commune repeated in our land. What woman, exasperated with a sense of injustice, have done in dire extremities in the nations of the Old World, they will do here. . . .

I will leave it to your imagination to picture to yourselves how you would feel if you had had a case in court, a bill before your legislature, a bill before your legislative body or a political aspiration for nearly a half a century, with a continual succession of adverse decisions, while law and common justice were wholly on your side. Such, honorable gentlemen, is our case! . . .

In the history of the race there has been no struggle for liberty like this. Whenever the interest of the ruling classes has induced them to confer new rights on a subject class it has been done with no effort on the part of the latter. Neither the American slave nor the English laborer demanded the right of suffrage. It was given in both cases to strengthen the Liberal party. The philanthropy of the few may have entered into those reforms, but political expediency carried both measures. Women, on the contrary, have fought their own battles and in their rebellion against existing conditions have inaugurated the most fundamental revolution the world has ever witnessed. The magnitude and multiplicity of the changes invoiced make the obstacles in the way of success seem almost insurmountable! . . .

Society is based on this fourfold bondage of woman -- Church, State, Capital, and Society -- making liberty and equality for her antagonistic to every organized institution. Were, then, can we rest the lever with which to lift one-half of humanity from these depths of degradation, but on "the Columbian of our political life -- the ballot -- which makes every citizen who holds it a full armed monitor!"
MRS. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON

National Woman's Suffrage Address

1890—Washington

From "History of Woman Suffrage," vol. III, p. 185-6

Preface: Mrs. E. C. Stanton, the newly-elected president of the united societies, faced a brilliant assemblage of men and women as she arose to make the opening address. Having declared that in going to England as president of the National-American Association she felt more honored that if sent as minister plenipotentiary of the United States, she spoke to a set of resolutions which she presented to the convention. After reviewing the history of the movement for the rights of woman and naming some of its brilliant leaders she said:

For fifty years we have been plaintiffs in the courts of justice; but as the bench, the bar and the jury are all men, we are nonsuited every time. Some men tell us we must be patient and persuasive; that we must be womanly. My friends, what is man's idea of womanliness? It is to have a manner which pleases him—quiet, deferential, submissive, approaching him as a subject does a master. He wants no self-assertion on our part, no defiance, no vehement arrayment of him as a robber and a criminal. While the grand motto, "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God," has echoes and re-echoes around the globe, electrifying the lovers of liberty in every latitude and making crowned heads tremble on their thrones; while every right achieved by the oppressed has been wrung from tyrants by force; while the darkest page on human history is the outrages on woman—shall men still tell us to be patient, persuasive, womanly?

What do we know as yet of the womanly? The women we have seen thus far have been, with rare exceptions, the mere echoes of men. Man has spoken in the State, the Church and the Home, and made the codes, creeds and customs which govern every relation in life, the women have simply echoed all his thoughts and walked in the paths he prescribed. And this they call womanly! When Joan of Arc led the French army to victory I dare say the carpet knights of England thought her unwomanly. When Florence Nightingale, in search of blankets for the soldiers in the Crimean War, cut her way through all orders and red tape, commanded with vehemence and determination those who guarded the supplies to "unlock the doors and not talk to her of proper authorities when brave men were shivering on their beds," no doubt she was called unwomanly. To men, "Unlock the doors" sounds better than any words of circumlocution, however sweet and persuasive; and I consider that she took the most womanly way of accomplishing her object. Patience and persuasiveness are beautiful virtues in dealing with children and feeble-minded.
adults, but those who have the gift of reason and understand the principles of justice, it is our duty to compel to act to the highest light that is in them, and as promptly as possible.

As women are taking an active part in pressing on the consideration of Congress many narrow sectarian measures, such as more rigid Sunday laws, the stopping of travel, the distribution of mail on that day, and the introduction of the name of God into the Constitution; and as this action on the part of some women is used as an argument for the disfranchisement for all, I hope this convention will declare that the Woman Suffrage Association is opposed to all union of Church and State, and pledges itself as far as possible to maintain the secular nature of government. As Sunday is the only day that the laboring man can escape from the cities, to stop the street-cars, omnibuses and railroad trains would indeed be a lamentable exercise of arbitrary authority. No, no, the duty of the State is to protect those who do the work of the world, in the largest liberty, and instead of shutting them up in their gloomy tenement houses on Sunday, to open side the parks horticultural gardens, museums, libraries, galleries of art and the music halls where they can listen to the divine melodies of the great masters.

In this way we make ourselves mediums through which the great souls of the past may speak again. The moment we begin to fear the opinions of others and hesitate to tell the truth that is in us, and from motives of policy are silent when we should speak, the divine floods of light and life flow no longer into our souls. Every truth we see is ours to give the world, not to keep to ourselves alone, for in so doing we cheat humanity out of their rights and check our own development.
CAROLINE W. H. DALL

I WOMEN DO AS MUCH AS MEN 1859
II THE OPENING OF THE GATES 1859
III DEATH OR DISHONOR 1859
IV VERIFY YOUR CREDENTIALS 1859
I have observed that all public orators labor under some embarrassment when they rise to speak. Not to be behind the dignity of my position, I labor under a double embarrassment.

The first the "embarrass des richesses." There are so many topics to touch, so many facts to relate, that it is impossible to cover them in one half hour, and the second -- perhaps you will think that an embarrassment of riches also; for it is an embarrassment of Clarke and Phillips. The orator needs no common courage who follows the one and precedes the other. It is my duty to speak of the progress of the cause; it is impossible to keep pace with it. You may work day and night, but this thought of 30d outstrip you, working hourly through the life of man. Yet we must often feel discouraged. Our war is not without; our work follows us into the heart of the family. We must sustain ourselves in that deal circle against our nearest friends; against all-pervading law, "Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther."

What have we gained since 1855? Many things, so important, that they can not be worthily treated here. I have often mentioned in my lectures, that in his first report to the French Government, Necker gave the credit of his retrenchments to his thrifty order-loving wife. Until this year, that acknowledgment stood alone in history! But now John Stuart Mill, the great philosopher and political economist of England, dedicates his "Essay on Liberty" to the memory of his beloved wife, who has been inspiration of all, and the author of much that was best in his writings for many years past. Still farther, in a pamphlet on "English Political Reform," treating of the extension of the suffrage, he has gone so far as to recommend that all householders, without distinction of sex, be adopted into the constituency, upon proving to the registrar's officer that they have a certain income -- say fifty pounds -- and "that they can read, write, and calculate."

A great step was taken also in the establishment of the Institution for the Advancement of Social Science. The sexes are equal before it. It has five departments. 1. Jurisprudence, or Law Reform; 2. Education; 3. Punishment and Reformation; 4. Public Health; 5. Social economy.

The first meeting at Liverpool considered the woman's question; and, while it was debated, Mary Carpenter sat upon the platform, or lifted her voice side by side with Brougham, Lord John Rus-
sell was in the chair. The Lord Chancellor of Ireland presided over Law Reform; the Right Hon. W. F. Cooper, over the department of Education; the Earl of Carlyle — personally known to many on this platform — over that which concerns the Reformation of Criminals; the Earl of Shaftesbury over Public Health; and Conolly and Charles Kingsley and Tom Taylor and Rawlinson bore witness side by side with Florence Nightingale.

Sir James Stephen presided over Social Economy. Isa Craig, the Burns poetess, is one of its Secretaries.

Ten communications were read at this session by women; among them, Florence Nightingale, Mary Carpenter, Isa Craig, Louisa Twining, and Mrs. Pleston. Four were on Popular Education, two on Punishment and Reformation, three on the Public Health in the Army and elsewhere, one upon Social Economy. Still another proof of progress may be seen in the examination of Florence Nightingale by the Sanitary Commission.

Do you ask me why I have dwelt on this Institution for Social Science, cataloguing the noble names that do it honor? To strengthen the timorous hearts at the West End; to suggest to them that a coronet of God's own giving may possibly rest as secure as one of gold and jewels in the United Kingdom.

I wish to draw your attention to the social distinction of the men upon that platform. No real nobleness will be imperiled by impartial listening to our plea. Would you rest secure in our respect, first feel secure in your own. If ten Bond Street lasses would go to work and take pay for their labor, it would do more good than all the speeches that were ever made, all the conventions that were held. I honor women who act. This is the reason that I greet so gladly girls like Harriet Hooper, Louisa Lander, and Marguerite Foley. Whatever they do, or do not do, for Art, they do a great deal for the cause of Labor. I do not believe any one in this room has any idea of the avenues that are open to women already. Let me read you some of the results of the last census of the United Kingdom. Talk of women not being able to work! Women have been doing hard work ever since the world began. You will see by this that they are doing as much as men now.

In 1841, there were engaged in agriculture, 66,329 women. In 1851, 138,418; nearly double the number. Of these, there are 64,000 dairy-women; women who lift enormous tubs, turn heavy cheeses, slap butter by the hundred weight. Then come market-gardeners, bee-mistresses, florists, flax producers and beaters, haymakers, reapers, and hop-pickers.

In natural connection with the soil, we find seven thousand women in the mining interest; nor harnessed on all-fours to creep through the shafts, but dressers of ore, and washers and strainers of clay for the potteries. Next largest to the agricultural is one not to be exactly calculated — the fishing interest. The Pilchard fishery employs some thousands of women. The Jersey oyster fishery alone employs one thousand. Then
follow the herring, cod, whale, and lobster fisheries.

Apart from the Christie Johnstones — the aristocrats of the trade — the sea nurtures an heroic class like Trace Darling, who stand aghast when society rewards a deed of humanity, and cry out in exploitation, "Why, every girl on the coast would have done as I did!" Then follow the kelpburners, netters and bathers. The netters make the fisherman's nets; the bathers manage the machines at the pattering places.

And, before quitting this subject, I should like to allude to the French fishwomen; partly as a matter of curiosity, partly to prove that women know how to labor. In the reign of Henry IV., there existed in Paris a privileged monopoly called the United Corporation of Fishmongers and Herringers. In the reign of Louis XIV., this corporation had managed so badly as to become insolvent. The women who had hawked and vended fish took up the business, and managed so well as to become very soon a political power. They became rich, and their children married into good families. You will remember the atrocities generally ascribed to them in the first revolution. It is now known that these were committed by ruffians disguised in their dress.

To return: there are in the United Kingdom 200,000 female servants. Separate from these, brewers, custom-house searchers, matrons of jails, lighthouses-keepers, pew-openers.

I have no time to question; but could not a Christian community offer womanly ministration to its imprisoned women? Oh, that some brave heart, in a strong body, might go on our behalf to the city jail and Charlestown! Pew-opening has never been a trade in America; but, as there are signs that it may become so in this democratic community, I would advise our women to keep an eye to that.

There are in the United Kingdom 500,000 business women, beer-ship keepers, butcher-wives, milk-women, hack-owners, and shoemakers.

As one item of this list, consider 26,000 butcher wives — women who do not merely preside over a business, but buy stock, put down meat, drive a cart even if needed — butchers to all intents and purposes. There are 39,000 shop-keepers, but only 1,743 shop-women.

Telegraph reporters are increasing rapidly. Their speed and accuracy are much praised. From the Bright Festival, at Manchester, a young woman reported, at the rate of twenty-nine words a minute, six whole columns, with hardly a mistake though the whole matter was political, such as she was not supposed to understand.

Monographic reporters also. A year ago there were but three
female phonographers in America; and to of these did not get
their bread by the work. Now hundreds are qualifying themselves,
all over the land; and two young girls, not out of their teens,
are at this moment reporting my words.

I hope the phonographers will take that clapping to themselves.
I wish you would make it heartier. (Repeat cheers). Now let us
turn to the American census. I must touch it lightly. Of fac-
tory operatives, I will only say, that, in 1845, there were
55,828 men and 75,710 women engaged in textile manufactures.
You will be surprised at the preponderance of women: it seems
to be as great in other countries. Then follow makers of gloves,
makers of glue, workers in hemp and silver leaf, hair-weavers,
hat and cap makers, hose-weavers, workers in India rubber,
lamp-makers, laundresses, leechers, milliners, morocco-work-
ers, nurses, paper-hangers, physicians, picklers, and preser-
vers, saddlers and harness-makers, shoemakers, soda-room keep-
ers, snuff and cigar-makers, stock and suspender-makers, truss-
makers, tyers and stereotypers, umbrella-makers, upholsterers,
card-makers.

Cards were invented in 1361. In less than seventy years the
gerian manufacture was in the hands of women — Elizabeth and
Margaret, at Waremberg. Then grinders of watch crystals,
7,000 in all.

My own observation adds to this list phonographers, house and
sign painters, fruit-hawkers, button-makers, tobacco-packers,
paper-box makers, embroiderers, and fur-sewers.

Perhaps I should say haymakers and reapers; since, for three
or four years, bands of girls have been so employed in Ohio,
at sixty-two and a half cents a day.

In New Haven, seven women work in with seventy men in a clock
factory, at half wages. If the proprietor answered honestly,
when asked why he employed them, he would say, "To save money;"
but he does answer, "To help our cause."

In Waltham, a watch factory has been established, whose stat-
istics I shall use elsewhere.

In Winchester, Va., a father has lately taken a daughter into
partnership; and the firm is "J. Wysong and Daughter." Is it
not a shame it should happen first in a slave State?

Then come registrars of deeds and postmistresses. We all know
that the rural post-office is chiefly in the hands of irrespon-
sible women. Petty politicians obtain the office, take the
money, and leave wives and sisters to do the work.

It is easy for women to break the way into new avenues? you know
it is not.
When I first heard that women were employed in Staffordshire to paint pottery and china -- which they do with far more taste than men -- I heard, also, that the jealousy of the men refused to allow them the customary hand-rest, and so kept down their wages. I refused to believe anything so contemptible. Now the Edinburgh Review confirms the story. Thank God! that could never happen in the country. With us, Labor can not dictate to Capital.

But the great evils which lie at the foundation of depressed wages are:

1st. That want of respect for labor which prevents ladies from engaging it.

2d. That want of respect for women which prevents men from valuing properly the work they do.

Women themselves must change these facts.

I am tired of the folly of the political economist, constantly saying that wages can never rise till the laborers are fewer. You have heard the old law in hydraulics: that water will always rise to the level of its source; but, if by a forcing-pump, you raise it a thousand feet above, or by some huge syphon drop it a thousand feet below, does the law hold? Very well, the artificial restrictions of society are such a forcing-pump -- are such a syphon. Make woman equal before the law with man, and wages will adjust themselves.

But what is the present remedy? A very easy one -- for employers to adopt the cash system, and be content with rational profits. In my correspondence during the past year, master-tailors tell me that they pay from eight cents to fifty cents a day for the making of pantaloons, including the heaviest doskins. Do you suppose they would dare to tell me how they charge that work on their slowly-paying customer's bills? Not they. The eight cents swells to thirty, the fifty cents to a dollar or a dollar twenty-five. But an end to this, and master-tailors would no longer vault into Beacon Street over prostrate woman's souls; but neither should women by them be driven to the streets for bread.

If I had time, I would show you, women, how much depends upon yourselves. As it is, we may say with the heroine of "Adam Bede," which you have doubtless all been reading: (I'm not for denying that the women are foolish. God always made 'em to match the men!)

Do you laugh? It is but a step from the ridiculous to the sublime; and Toole, who knew women well, was of the same mind when he wrote: (Quotation omitted.)
The Opening of the Gates


"To destroy daughters is to make war upon Heaven's harmony. The more daughters you drown, the more daughters you will have; and never was it known that the drowning of daughters led to the birth of sons."

This passage from the treatise of Kwei Chunk Fu, upon Infanticide, may be translated so as to apply to every Christian nation. The Chinese are not the only people who drown daughters. England, France, and America, the three leading intelligences of the world, are busy at it this moment. The cold, pure, wave of the Pacific is a sweeter draught than that social flood of corruption and depression, which, like hideous quicksand, buries your sisters out of your sight. "The more daughters you drown, the more daughters you will have." Most certainly; and if, instead of the word "daughters," you insert the words "weak and useless members of society," you will see that Kwei Fu is right. Let women starve; let them sink into untold depths of horror, without one effort to save them; and, for every woman so lost, two shall be born to inherit her fate.

Nor need the careless and ignorant men of wealth fancy that his own daughters shall escape while he continues heartlessly indifferent, though he never actively wronged a human creature. When the spoiler is abroad, he does not pause to choose his victim. The fairest and most innocent may be the first struck down; for human passions find their fitting type in the persecuted beast of the forest. It is not the hunter alone who feels his teeth cued; but the first human flesh his lawless members seize.

If these things are so, surely it is our duty to consider well this question of work, to suggest all possible modes of relief, and, while waiting for the final application of absolute principles, to help society forward by all partial measures of amelioration; for only partial I can be, so long as the present modes of thought and feeling continue. How little any one person can contribute toward the solution of our difficulties, I am well aware; yet I venture to make a few suggestions.

The "Edinburgh Review," whether prepared to recommend female preachers and lecturers or not, does propose women as teachers of Oratory; and says distinctly, that, for this purpose, they are preferred to men, as their voices are more penetrating,
distinct, delicate, and correct than those of men. I think it was a matter of surprise to American audiences, when women first came forward as public speakers, that, in so large a number of cases, the parlor tone would reach to the extremity of a large hall. Women, too, were heard at a disadvantage, because popular curiosity compelled them to speak in the largest buildings. There are a great many women, there are also a great many men, whose voices are wholly unfit for public exigencies; but, when you consider that women have been wholly untrained so far, how great do their natural advantages appear! Several female teachers of elocution in our midst prove that this is gradually perceived. These remarks should be extended so as to cover all instruction in the pronunciation of languages. There may be men capable of distinguishing the delicate shades of sound, so that a woman's voice can catch them; but such men are rare exceptions to the common incompetency. The French nasal cannot be distinguished accurately by a man's voice: the nasal tone is too broad, and the treble wavers in trying to find the middle rest. Pursue the study of Italian for years with the best teacher that Boston can furnish; and, when you first have the whole thing to learn over again. So there was never any teacher of the French language equal to Rachel, whose nimble and fiery tongue never dropped an unmeaning accent nor tone; nor of the English like Fanny Kemble, who, despite certain "stage tricks," in vogue since the days of Garrick, shows us what delicate shades of meaning lie hidden in the vowel sounds, and what power a light variation of a flexible voice confers upon a dull passage. The teachings of oratory and of language, then, should revolve upon women.

"Why," asks Ernest Legouve, — "why should not the immense variety of bureaucratic and administrative employments be given up to women?" Under this head would come the business inspection of hospitals, barracks, prisons, factories, and the like; and the decision of many sanitary questions. For all this, woman is far fitter than man. Her eye is quick; her common sense ready; she sees the consequence in the cause, and does not need to argue every disputed point. A shingle missing from the roof is a trivial thing to a man, but, the moment a woman sees it, her glance takes in the stained walls, the dripping curtains, wet carpets, sympathetic ceiling, damp beds, and very possibly the colds and illness, which this trifle involves. For this reason, she is a far fitter inspector of all small abuses than man.

Consider, then, Legouve's proposition. The Proprietor of the London Adelphi advertised, at the opening of the last season, that his box-openers, check-takers, and so on, would be all women. Throughout the whole range of public amusements, there is a wide field for the employment of girls, which this single step has thrown open.

Women are so steadily pressing in to the medical profession,
that I have no need to direct your attention toward it; But I
may say, that it is much to be wished that women should devote
themselves to the specialities of science. Until within a very
few years, a Boston physician has been expected to understand
all the ills that flesh is heir to; an eye-doctor, and an
ear-doctor, or a lung-doctor, must necessarily be a quack.
Women are entering, in medicine, a very wide field. A few
specially gifted may master every wide branch of practice; but
any will undoubted fail, from the wanted inherited habits of
hard study, of transmitted power of investigation. I wish those
who are in danger of this would apply strenuously to one branch
of practice; and a great success in any one direction would be
more for the general cause than a thousand competences earned
by an ordinary career.

I do not suppose there is a city in the United States,—
and, if not in the United States, then certainly not in the
world,—where, if you asked the name of the first physician,
you would be answered by that of a woman. I do not complain
of this; it is too soon to expect it. Colleges, schools of
anatomy, clinical courses, have not yet been thrown open; and
success, so far, has been mastered mainly by original endowment.
Genius has held the torch, and shown the way; but I want women
to remember, that, in this department, all the teachings of
nature and experience show that they are bound to excel men.
Let them, therefore, take the best way to accomplish it.

At the School of Design in New York, the other day, I pressed
upon the observation of the young wood-engravers the possibility
of opening for themselves a new career by woodcutting.
It is quite common, in old European museums, to see the stones
or plums and peaches delicately carved by woman's hand, and
set in frames of gold and jewels. Sometimes they were the
work of departed saints or cloistered nuns; and a terrible waste
of time they seem to our modern eyes. Properzia dei Rossi,
whose early history is so obscure, that nobody knows the name
of her parents; while the cities of Bologna and Modena still
dispute the honor of her birth,—Properzia began her wonder-
ful career by carving on peach-stones. One she decorated
with thirty-sarked figures, holding the stones near the eye
as to gain a microscopic power. One still in the possession
of the Rossi Family, at Bologna, she chiselled the passion of
our Lord; where twelve figures, gracefully disposed, are
said to glow with characteristic expression.

With regard to the lowest class of employed women, such as
are employed at home, we have, it seems to me, several distinct
duties to perform.

In the first place, we need a public but self-supporting Laun-
dry. By this I mean two large halls, with an adjacent area,
built at the expense of the city, and properly superintended, where, for so much an hour, women of the lower class may wash, starch, dry, and iron the clothes they take home. A bleaching-ground would be desirable; but, if it could not be had, a steam drying-room would be the next best thing. Good starch, soap, and indigo should be for sale upon the premises at wholesale prices; it not being desirable that the city should make money out of the necessities of its poor. If such an establishment could be had, a great many women would be changed from pampers to decent citizens. They are tired of seeking washing; for, in their own close room, assisted with boiling onions or rank meat, without a proper area for drying, are compelled to pay high prices for poor soap and starch, they cannot decently do the work which philanthropy soon becomes unwilling to intrust to them, and for which they are compelled to charge higher than the best private laundry. The city could buy coal, wood, soap, starch, and indigo from manufacturers and importers; prices, and so give them a fair chance for competition. I hope this project, long since partially adopted in many cities of the Old World, may find favor with my audience.

There is in Boston, no place, strange as it may seem, where plan, neatly-finished clothing can be bought ready-made. I can go down town, and buy embroidered merinos, Parish hats with ostrich feathers, and lace-trimmed, walded linen; but if I want a plain, cotton skirt for a child, whereof the calico was eight cents a yard; if I want a plain, cotton print made into a neatly fitting dress; if I want a boy's coarse apron, — such things are not to be had, or only so very badly made that no one will buy them. I do not want lace of embroidery or silk, or fine linen; but I do want my button-holes nicely turned and strong, my hems even, my gather stroked, and, however plain and coarse, the whole finish of the garment such as a mistress of the needle only would approve, such as no lady need be ashamed to wear. So do others. The reasons given to explain the non-existence of such a magazine in Boston, are, first, That our women of the middle class are, for the most part, accustomed to cut and make their own clothes; second, that there is a prevalent but mistaken idea, that clothes made for sale cannot possible fit. With regard to the first point, it may be said, that, as more and more avenues of labor are opening for women, this class perceives that it is not good economy for them to do their own sewing. Hands compelled to coarser or heavier labor cannot sew quick or well, and those training to more delicate manipulation lose practice by returning to it; so there will be a constantly-increasing class of purchasers.

As to the impossibility of fitting, that is a vulgar mistake. The human frame is quite as much the result of law as Mr. Buckle's statistics. Any comely, healthy form is a good model for all other forms of the same height and breadth. Who ever heard of a French bonnet or a bridal trosseau that did not fit? Yet these things are made by arbitrary laws. Our superintendent
could find every measure she would ever need in one of the teasing houses on Sea Street. She must take her measures from life, not books. Nor would I have the sewing done with machines, unless those of the highest cost could be procured and ably superintended. The best machine is as yet a poor substitute for the suppleness of the human hand; and many practical inconveniences must result from its use. It requires more skill and intelligence to manage man's simplest machine, than to control with a thought that complicated network of machine, than to control with a thought that complicated network of nerves, bone, and fibre which we have been accustomed to use.

Capital to start such an establishment as I refer to is all that is needed. How desirable the thing is, you can easily see. In the first place, if good, common clothing could be so purchased, mothers need not keep a large stock on hand; an accident could be readily be repaired. In the second, it would greatly simplify and expedite many a charitable task. The terrible suffering which followed the panic of November, 1857, you all remember. Purses, always open hitherto, were necessarily closed; no Sister of Charity was willing to tread on the heels of the sheriff: yet the need was greater than ever.

Many persons who had dismissed their servants were found willing to give rough, untrained girl her board; but who was to provide her with decent clothes? They could not be bought, and to make them was the work of time and strength. May I always remember the honor, as God will always surely bless, one woman possessed of wealth and beauty, who did clothes from head to foot with her own needle, in that dreadful winter, three "wild Irish girls," and took them successively into her family; training them to habits of tolerable decency, until others, less self-sacrificing, were found ready to do their part.

No people in our community suffer such inconvenience, loss, and imposition, in having their clothes made, as our servant girls. If a plentiful supply of calico sacks and skirts or loose dresses could be anywhere found, few girls would ever employ a dressmaker.

I have spoken of Public Laundry Rooms, and a Ready-made Clothing Room. There is a class of women greatly to be benefited by the establishment of a Knitting Factory. It is well known to every person in this room, especially to physicians, that no knitting done by machinery can compete with that done by the human hand, in durability, warmth, or stimulative power. Invalids are now obliged to import the Shetland jackets, which are always badly shaped; or to hire, at our fancy stores, the making of delicate and very expensive fabrics. Men's socks and children's gloves may be purchased; but the first cost from seventy-five cents to a dollar a pair, and the last are of very inferior manufacture. We cannot give out knitting to advantage, because of the dirt and grease it is liable to accumu-
Let us have a place where all kinds of female work can be sought and found; an intelligent working committee first, who know what is wanted, and how to get it, and who, most important of all, shall not be too wise to accept diplomas from experience.

Let us have a committee of five; its Quorum to be three. Let these persons hire a large, clean, airy room, and appoint an intelligent superintendent, — one who will be interested to have the experiment thoroughly successful. Let them line the walls, and screen off the room with frames, having glass covers, to look and unlock. Let one frame be devoted to cooks; another, to laundresses; another, to washerwomen, window-washers, charwomen, seamstresses, dressmakers, copyists, translators, or what you will; and under the glass the notices should be posted. Each should contain the name, age, and residence of the applicant; the situation last held, and for how long; the full address of the reference; and the date of posting. The date should be printed and movable, and semi-weekly, on the personal application of the poster. Each woman should pay five cents for the privilege of posting; should lose this privilege from misconduct, from neglect to report herself, from proved falsehood. No date should be left unchanged more than a week, and the superintendent should be responsible for the strict observance of the regulations. No woman, not even a charwoman, should be allowed to use the posting privilege, unless she has a reference. "What?" you will say, "is that kind?" Yes it is a kind; the want of it is doubly cruel. A woman who needs work can afford to offer a day's free work to get a reference; and referees should be required to tell the simple truth. A lady who once recommen-
A dishonest or incapable servant with the proper qualification should be struck off the books, not allowed to testify again there in that court.

With regard to all transient labor, it should be the duty of the superintendent to see that the references are reliable before posting, so that those who apply in haste need not be delayed.

If a dressmaker or charwoman informs the superintendent that she has worked for a, b, or c grade, let a printed circular addressed to such persons, inquiring if they can recommend her, and to what degree, be placed in her hands. To this she should bring written answer before being allowed to post.

If the institution becomes popular, books would have to be kept, corresponding to these glass cases, — one book for cooks, another for housemaids, and so on; but the cases should never be given up. There should always be as many as the room will hold. Ladies should pay a certain sum for each servant they obtain; and the servant should pay for every place she gets, at a rate proportioned to the wages received. In most intelligence offices, the servants get two places for the same fee, if they do not stay over a week on the place, and the lady gets two girls or more on the same condition. This works like a premium on the change of place. The servant should prove to the Labor Exchange, that she did not leave her place of her own will, and the lady should show that incapacity or insubordination made it impossible to keep her.

It should be a cash business, and a fee should be paid for each application. Wanting a cook, you go down to the room, and consult the proper frame. Finding, perhaps, forty posters, you select one that reads like this: —

Matilda Haynes.
Irish.
Twenty-five years of age.
Thoroughly understands plain cooking.
Expects two dollars.
She is willing to go out of town.
Lived last at No. 4, Pemberton Square.
Kept the place six months.
May refer to it.
Can be found at 34, High Street.

You first go to Pemberton Square, it is quite possible that this girl may not be what you want; but if she is, and your eye tells you that you can trust the judgment of her referee, you have only to go to High Street, and make your own terms. If you are already prejudiced in her favor, you will go prepared to make some concessions, so that the chance will be better for you both; and this process may be repeated without loss of time, till you are supplied.
You will see that this is quite a feasible plan, and has two advantages. One is, that you have access to the books, and can choose for yourself; the other is, that there would be no waiting-room for servants, where they should talk with prejudice, or morally harm each other. You would also be saved the pain of rejecting servants to their facts, on the ground of "greenness," or bodily unfitness. Such an institution would offer this advantage over the present offices, that it would direct you to temporary laborers, and give you in a moment the addresses of some dozens. Such an institution would be a very great saver of time, and so a great blessing.

If, in the course of these lectures, any words that I have spoken have touched your hearts, or carried conviction to your minds, do not put aside, I beseech you, such impulse as they may be given. Remember that, however feebly the subject has been treated, however presumptuous may seem the attempt, the subject itself is the most important theme that is presented to this generation. In my first lecture I showed you, that while women, ever since the beginning of civilization, have been sharing the hardest, and doing the most unwholesome work, they have also done the worst paid in the world. I showed you that this poor pay, founded on false estimates of woman's value as a human being, and consequently as a laborer, was filling your streets with criminals, with stricken souls and bodies, for whose blood society is responsible to God. Having proved thus, that women need new avenues of labor, I tried in my second lecture to show you, that when she sought these, she had been met too often by the selfish opposition of man. I showed also that all such opposition proved, in the end, unavailing; that all the work she asks will inevitably be given. I showed you, from the censuses of Great Britain and America, how much labor is even now open to her; that it is not half so necessary to open new avenues of labor as to make work itself respectable for women; and I therefore intreated women to learn to work thoroughly and well, that men might respect their labor in the aggregate. "Woman's work" means nothing very honorable or conscientious now. Alter its significance till it indicates the best work in the world.

In my present lecture I have indicated some of the steps that might be taken to benefit the women in the heart of this city. To encourage you to take them I have briefly appointed Ellen Wood's remarkable success. Have I kindled any interest in your minds? Can you enter into such labors? Have you strength or time or enthusiasm to spare? In the ballads of Northern Europe, a loving sister trod out, with her bare feet, the nettles whose fibre, woven into clothing, might one day restore her brothers to human form.

Your feet are shod, your nettles are gathered; will you treat them out courageously, and so restore to your sisters the nature and the privileges of a blessed humanity?
Opportunity is a rare and sacred thing. God seldom offered it twice. In the English fields, the little Drosera, or sundew, lifts its tiny, crimson head. The delicate buds are clustered in a raceme, to the summit of which they climb one by one. The topmost bud waits only through the twelve hours of a single day to open. If the sun does not shine, it withers and drops, and gives way to the next aspirant.

So it is with the human heart and its purposes. One by one, they come to the point of blossoming. If the sunshine of faith and the serene heaven of resolution meet the ripe hour, all is well; but if you faint, repel, delay, they wither at the core, and your crown is stolen from you. -- your privilege set aside. Esau has sold his birthright, and the pottage has lost its savor.
The delicate ladies on Beacon Street, who order their ice creams flavored with vanilla or pear-juice, may not know that bituminous coal, rope-ends, and creosote, furnish a larger proportion of the piquant seasoning than the blossoming bean or the orchard-tree; but every man of science does.

Already the chemist furnishes the attar of Cashmere from heaps of offal that lie rotting by the way. It is as if God forced man to face (to face) with every repellent fact of nature, and said, "Sake they thirst at this turbid fountain, child of the dust; for the purer streams of the hillsides shall trickle in vain."

Somewhat so, I am compelled to turn your eyes to most repulsive side of human life. I do not do it willingly, but of a necessity; because not that I like it, but because it is essential to the argument. May the contract prove, that the perfumed joy of later years of its disguised self, for both of us, in the rotting accumulations of our social life!

But, in such case, the responsibility is not mine. I would have you look on vice, that you may learn to loathe it; I would have you realize, that what a noble friend of ours has called the "perishing classes" are made of men and women like yourselves.

Bidding you trust, to a certain extent, to the truth of those terrible statistics that crush Thomas Henry Buckle in their grasp, I would still have you remember, that, beside the active laws of moral and material life, there is over the living God immanent in the world; and that it is always for you to change the results of history, at any given era, according to the great first law, — none the less real because so often forgotten, — that this living God helps or hinders you as you will, and becomes, at any moment that you choose, an important element in each calculation.

The subject at present before us is "Woman's Claims to labor."
These claims rest upon these points:

First, The absolute necessity of bread.
Second, A natural ability, physical and psychical; and an attraction inherent in the ability.
Third, An absolute want of moral nature.

Having treated these in turn, I propose to show you what practical opposition man offers to her advance; what fault lies in herself; how much more numerous are the occupations open than is generally supposed; and what social obstructions have prevented her taking advantage of them.

In this connection, I shall speak of those women who have opened a way for their sex; and shall offer to you certain plans of action, by which, it seems to us, the convenience and happiness of the employer and the employed may be materially advanced, especially as regards our own city. Like a wise child, who from his fretful pillow take the pill first, and the conserve afterwards, I shall open the most painful branch of my subject in this lecture, and turn from it as soon as the needed impression has been made.

I ask you woman, then, free, untrammelled access to all fields of labor; and I ask it, first, on the ground that she needs to be fed; and that the question which is at this moment before the great body of working women is "death or dishonor;" for lust is a better paymaster than the mill-owner or the tailor, and economy never yet shook hands with crime.

Do you object, that America is free from this alternative? I will prove you the contrary within a rod of your own doorstep.

Do you assert, that, if all avenues were thrown open, it would not increase the equality and quantity of work; and that there would be more laborers in consequence, and lower wages for all?

Lower wages for some, I reply; but certainly higher wages for women; and they, too, would be raised to the rank of partners, and personal ill treatment would not follow those who had position and property before the law.

You offer them a high education in vain till you add to it the stimulus of a free career. In this lecture, I undertake to prove to you, that a large majority of women stand in such relations to their employers, that they are compelled to death or a life of shame. Why not choose death, then?

So I asked once of woman thus pressed to the wall. "Ah, madam?" she answered, "I chose it long ago for myself but what shall I do for my mother and child?"

The superior has a right to every advantage which he can honestly gain, as well as the inferior; but he has no right to in-
I will not admit that the argument of the political economist has, as yet, any rightful connection with the price of woman's work. "The price of labor will always rise or fall," he says, "as the number of laborers is small or large; and it is because there are too many women for a few avenues of labor that the wages are so low." If man believes this, let him help us to open new avenues, and so reduce the number in any one. But I claim that he has increased the natural difference in his own favor, supposing that there be any such, by laws and customs which cripples women; and that his own lust of gain stands in the way of her daily bread. Just so in hydraulics, men tell us, the water rises everywhere to the level of its source; but you may raise it a thousand feet higher by the aid of your forcing-pump, or drop it from a siphon a thousand feet below. And a forcing-pump and a siphon has man imposed upon the natural currents of labor. If, in my correspondence with employers last winter, one man told me with pride that he gave from eight to fifty cents for the making of pantaloons, including the heaviest doeskin, he forgot to tell me what he charged his customers for the same work. Ah! on those bills, so for long unpaid, the eight cents sometimes rises to thirty, and the fifty cents always to a dollar or a dollar and twenty-five cents.

The most efficient help this class of work-women could receive would be the thorough adoption of the cash system, and the establishment of a large workshop in the hands of women whose position in society would win for respect for labor. When I said, six months ago, that ten Beacon-street women, engaged in honorable work, would do more for this cause than all the female artists, all the speech-making and conventions, in the world, and I was certainly in earnest.

It is pretty and lady-like, men think, to paint and chisel; philanthropic young ladies must work for nothing, like the angels. Let them, when the rise to angelic spheres; but, here and now, every woman who works for nothing helps to keep her sister's wage down, -- helps to keep the question of death or dishonor perpetually before the women of the slop-shop.
Why? Because she help to depress the estimate of women's ability. What if persistently given for nothing is everywhere thought to be worth nothing. I throw open a door here for some stifled sufferers at the West End; let her open a clothing establishment, and employ her own sex; let her make money by it, and watch for the end. When an Employment Society or a needle-woman's Friend become bankrupt in purse, it is bankrupt in morals and argument as well. The wheels of the world move on the grooves of good management, of success. Set these once firmly underneath, and the outcry against our moral Fultons will be hushed.

*************

A terrible account has lately been published of the straw-bonnet warehouses in London, by one who has worked in them. One single story will show you how that touch of truth, which far more than the touch of genius, makes the 'whole world kin,' revealed a noble human nature in the midst of what seemed utter depravity.

One day, the worn-out women tried to compel a young, fresh worker to do less than she was able, or to secrete a portion of her braid, instead of making it up. They could not prevail.

"Are you a Netherdame, mis?" asked one woman. "I'm not a thief," she replied gently. A big, bad woman stole her extra plait; but no one dared insult her. Once she fainted, and some one offered her gin; but the big, bad woman started forward; "Would you make her a devil like the rest of us?" she cried; "I'd sooner see her stabbed!" and she got her a cup of tea from her own "screw."...When they were late, this woman walked home with her, cautioning her against gin, against young men, especially the gentry, and bidding her not to forget her prayers: "For," said she "you know how; I was never taught." As she parted from her one night, she said, "I don't expect it's any use; but it would do no harm if you prayed once for me." Who will say that this woman was irredeemable? And, in estimating that the chances of saving a depraved woman, you should always remember, that in nine cases out of twelve, she sold herself, not the vice, but to what seemed, at least, to her longing heart, like love. Put yourself in her place. Do not start; it will do you no harm. Think what it would be to slavish soul and body day after day, for a crust and a cup of cold water. Not so much would your failing body crave one nourishing meal, as the aching, human heart within you one tender look, one loving word. If, you in your misery, you had kept some beauty; if you had known no gentler touch than a drunken father's blow or a mother's curse, -- how strong would be the temptation when one above you pleaded for affection! See how like an angel of light this demon would descend! O my sisters! you have never read this story right. Such a woman is no monster, only a gentle-hearted creature, unsupported by God's law, unrestrained by self-control. Your scorn, the world's rejection, may make
"Some positions," says Legouve, "attract by their ease; but it is work that purifies and fills existence. God permits hard trials; but he has appointed labor, and we forget them all. A serious comforter, it gives always more than it promises, and dries the bitterest tears. A pleasure unequaled in itself, it is the salt of all other pleasures."

You have seen that a necessity to live demands of you new fields for woman to work in; and the question arises, Is she fit for these new duties?

I consider the question of intellectual ability settled. The volumes of science, mathematics, general literature, etc., which women have given to the world, without sharing to the full educational advantages of man, seem to promise that they shall outstrip him here, the moment they have a fair start. But I go farther, and state boldly, that women have, from the beginning, done the hardest and most unwholesome work of the world in all countries, whether civilized or uncivilized; and I am prepared to prove it. I do not mean that rocking the cradle and making bread is hard work as any, but that women have always been doing man's work, and that all but the outtry society makes against work for women is not to protect women, but a certain class called ladies. Now, I believe that work is good for ladies; so let us look at the truth. "Let us once be understood," says one of our English friends, "that the young business-woman is shielded by the social intercourse of those who are called ladies, and it would obviate many of those grave objections which deter parents from consenting that their children shall brave the world in shop and warehouses."

Most certainly it would; and to this point we must frequently return. Meanwhile, say Sydney Smith, so long as girls and boys run about in the dirt, and trundle hoop together, they are both precisely alike; and I shall proceed to show that large numbers have not only played but worked in the dirt together, and trundled hoop, not merely through our own lives, but ever since work and play began.

I shall speak first of Asiatic women; and I can afford to begin by quoting a Cochín-China proverb, to the effect that "a woman has nine lives, and bears a great deal of killing." I do not know anything else about the Cochín-China women; but this looks as if their lot were no exception to the general rule. The China peasant-woman goes to the field with her male infant on her back, and ploughs, sows, and reaps, exposed to all the changes of the weather. When her husband is proved criminal, she must die as his accomplice; having, at least, strength enough to suffer. In Calcutta, women are the masons who keep the roof tight; and you may see them daily carrying their hods of cement, spreading it on the tops of houses, and flattening
it with a wooden mallet like that with which our Irishmen
pave the streets.

You have heard of the Bombay ghauts. Ghaut is a native word,
which means "passage through;" and it applied by the resident
not only to the railway out between the hills, but to the hills
themselves. These are of volcanic origin, — a sort of trap.
Formed beneath the water, the mall cooled as it was thrown
up, and the sides do not slope much. "When I gained an eleva-
tion of two thousand feet," says my correspondent, "and looked
back I saw hills of all shapes and sizes thrown up, and ravines
thousands of feet below, all looking like the drag bed of the
ocean. The table-land on which I stood is two thousand five
hundred feet above the level of the sea; and, as this the eleva-
tion at Poonah, the railroad from Campoolu winds as it can
along the sides of the mountains. There are twenty-five tunnels
through the solid rock on this road, each a half a mile long
or more. There are piers of solid stone, with arches spanning
forty feet, which rise a hundred feet above the ravine. Part of
the grade was formed by lowering men with ropes, to drill the
holes for blasting, a thousand feet above the ravine. There
are twenty thousand workmen employed; and one-third, or about
seven thousand, of these are — what do you think? In a coun-
try where no European man can labor, where the native rests
until compelled by his conqueror to work, in the year 1859
behold seven thousand women laboring in the ghauts! Climbing,
climbing, through the — in hot day, women carrying baskets of
stone and earth upon their heads, to creep to the edge of the
ravines, and fill these tedious contributions thousands of
perpendicular feet; and the men who pay them, doubtless, talk
to their daughters about man lack of physical strength.

**********

So, the Northern Indian glides nimbly through the woods; while
the squaw carries on her unlucky back their common foot and
covering, or perhaps hauls the canoe across a portage. A Jes-
uit priest rebuked an Orinoco woman for infanticide. "I wish
my mother had been brave enough to part with me!" was her reply.
"Our husbands go to hunt; and we drag after them, one baby at
the breast, another on our back. When we return, we cannot
sleep, but must grind maize all night for their chica. Drunk-
en, they beat us, or stamp us under foot; and, after twenty
years of such labor, a young wife is brough home to abuse us
and such children as we have not killed. What ought I to do?"

At Santa Crux, Theodore Parker writes to Francis Jackson that
man and women work together to repair the public highway; hoe-
ing the earth into trays, and throwing it into a cart which
they drag and push together.

In Ohio, last year, about thirty girls went from farm to farm,
hoeing, ploughing, and the like for sixty-two and a half cents
a day. At Media, in Pennsylvania, two girls named Miller carry
on a farm of three hundred acres; raising hay and grain, hiring labor, but working mostly themselves. These women are not ignorant; they at one time made meteorological observations for an association auxiliary to the Smithsonian Institute. But labor attracts them, as it would many women if they were not oppressed by public opinion.

"In New York," writes a late correspondent of the "Lily," "I saw women performing the most menial offices, — carrying parcels for grocers, and trunks for steamboats. They often sweep the crossings in muddy weather; and I once saw one carrying brick and mortar for a mason."

Several women last winter, and one or two very young girls, gave evidence of bodily strength by skating from Lowell to Lawrence, with a head wind; and one or two made the ten miles in forty minutes.

You know what bodily strength and nervous energy carried Mary Patton around Cape Horn. Well, on the 25th of June, 1858, the British ship "Brotto" left Cuba; and, on the second day, the yellow-fever broke out in its worst form. Seven days later, so many had died, that there remained only the captain, his wife, and two of the crew. Then the captain was taken ill; and, besides nursing him, the poor wife, who had already nursed officers and men, took her station at the wheel, and steered by his instructions for Sandy Hook. There the steam-tug "Huntress" found them, the heroic woman at the wheel, the husband that moment struggling with death; and, when they reached New York, three out of eleven, one of them the suffering wife, survived to tell the tale, and show how a woman can work. So common are such instances becoming, that you have hardly heard the name of this Mrs. Nichols, for whom tender charity soon cared.

But all such labor is the result of compulsion, — and compulsion of barbarism, of slavery, of unfair competition, or dire disease. Let us close this branch of our subject with a picture homely but attractive. "According to they request," writes a Quaker friend from Wilmington, Del., "I send thee some facts concerning Sarah Ann Scofield. Some fifteen years since, her father became very much involved in debt. He owed some ten or twelve hundred dollars; having lost largely by working for cotton and woolen mills. His business was making spindles and filers. His daughter, just sixteen then, proposed to go into her father's shop and assist him; she being the oldest of seven children. He accepted her offer, and told me himself, that, in twelve months she could finish more work, and do it better, than any man he had ever trained for eighteen. She earned fifteen dollars a week at the rate he then paid other hands. Her father died. Her two oldest brothers learned the trade of her and went away. She has now two younger sisters in apprenticeship.
and a brother fourteen years of age, all working under her; turning, polishing, filing, and fitting all kinds of machinery. I went out to see her last week. She was then making water-rams to force streams into barns and houses. She is also beginning to make many kinds of carriage-axles. She is her own draughtsman, and occasionally does her own forging. To use her own words, "What any man can do, I can but try at." She has a steam-engine, every part of which she understands; and I know that her work gives entire satisfaction. When they have steady employment, they clear sixty dollars a week; and she says she would rather work at it for her bread, than at sewing for ten times the money. The truth is, it is a business she is fond of."

I have shown you that a very large number of women are compelled to self-support; that the old idea, that all men support all women, is an absurd fiction; and, if you require other evidence than this, you may find it in the English courts, under the working of the new Divorce Bill. Nearly all the women who have applied for divorces have proved that the subsistence of the family depended upon them. Out of six million of British women over twenty-one years of age, one-half are industrial in their mode of life, and more than two millions are self-supporting in their industry like men. Put this fact fully before your eyes.

Driven to self-support, you have seen, also, that low wages and comparatively few and overcrowded avenues of labor compel women to vicious courses for their daily bread. The streets of Paris, London, Edinburgh, New York, and Boston, tell us the same painful story; and in glaring, crimson letters, rises everywhere the question, "Death or dishonor?" I have shown you that there is encouragement for moral effort because these women escape from vice as fast as they find work to do. "Have they strength for the conflict?" you ask, "or desire to enter such fields?" Find your answer in what they have done from the earliest ages, with the foot of Confucius and Vishnu, of capital in interest, upon their necks. In the lovely lives of Bertha and Ann Turney, and the powerful attraction of Sarah Schofield, you have found pleasanter pictures whereon to rest your eyes. Let no man taunt woman with inability to labor, till the coal-mines and metal-works, the rotting cocoons and fuzzing-cards, give up their dead; till he shares with her, equally at least, the perils of manufactures and the press of the market. As partners, they must test and prove their comparative power.

We must next consider what need woman's moral nature has of work and what sort of opposition man practically offer her.
CAROLINE W. H. DALL

Verify Your Credentials


If low wages, by actually starving women and those dependent upon them, force many into vicious courses, so does the want of employment lower the whole moral tone, and destroy even the domestic efficiency of those whose minds seek variety and freedom. More than once have I been to insane asylums with young girls whom active and acceptable employment would have saved from mania; and scores of times have young women of fortune asked me, "What can you give me to do?"

And to this question there is, in the present state of the public mind, no possible answer. No woman of rank can find work, if she does not happen to be philanthropic, literary, or artistic in her taste, without braving the influence of home, or, what is next dearest, the social circle, and earning for herself a position so conspicuous as to be painful to the most energetic. The woman who is prepared for all this will not ask anybody what she is to do: she will take her work into her own hands, and do it.

That was a pleasant time in the history of the world, when every woman found, in spinning, weaving, and sewing, in the active labor or small or the skilful management of a large household, full employment for time and thought, under the cheering shelter of a husband's or a father's smile. That was a pleasant time also, when, in the middle English classes, women worked freely by a husband's side, with more regard to his interest than heed of the world's talk. But with the wife intellectual culture that America has been the first country in the world to offer to women, individual tastes and wishes must develop in single women; and all men who value the moral health of society must aid in this development.

There is no greater enemy to body and soul than idleness, unless it be the absurd public sentiment which compels to idleness. Thousands and tens of thousands have fallen victims to it. The woman who will not labor, rich or honored though she be, bends her head to the inevitable curse of Heaven.

This curse works in failing health, fading beauty, broken temper, and weary days. Let her never fancy, that, being neither wife nor mother, she is exempt from the law: she cannot balance that decree of God by the foolish customs of society or the weak
objections of her kindred. Never let her say she does not need
to labor. Disease, depression, moral idocy or inertia, follow
on an idle life. He who never rests has 'made woman in His image;
and health, beauty, force, and influence follow on the steps of
labor alone.

I shall not pursue this subject; for it is far easier for you
to think it out, than to gather the facts I wish to bring be-
fore you. Read "Shirley," and let the saddest hours of Caroline
Helstone's life bear witness for thousands who never find a
vocation. Read the "Professor," and let its sweet stimulus
kindle in you some appreciation of the joy which mutual labor
can bring to a happy husband and wife.

Sad indeed, then, is it when man himself represses a woman's
longing for work, whether from false tenderness, from a dread
of public opinion, a shrinking from her ultimate independence,
or a small personal jealously. That he does, in the aggregate
as an individual, so repress it, is unfortunately matter
of history: it is no invention of an outraged inferior. I could
offer you many private examples of this; but those that carry
proofs of their reality with them will, I fear, seem very fami-
lar. The first consists in the opposition shown to the attempt
d of Mr. Bennett to establish young women as watchmakers. Honorary
Secretary to the Horological Department of the great Exhibition,
said he could not help observing the superiority of the Swiss
watches, in cheapness and convenience of carriage. In England,
watches are so dear that only the privileged classes can carry
them. It would be for the interest of the manufacturers, of cour-
se, to be able to compete with the Swiss; but they were too
short-sighted to see it, finding that twenty thousand women and
girls were employed in Switzerland in the manufacture of watches
and watchmakers' tools. Mr. Bennett undertook to deliver a pub-
lic lecture on the subject. It was interrupted by hisses, and
broken up like a New York convention. Three well-educated women
applied to him to be taught; but no Englishman could be found
to take them. A Swiss, settled in London, did. They made more
progress in six months than ordinary boys in six years; but
they, as well as their teacher, were so cruelly persecuted,
that it was found necessary to relinquish the attempt. My im-
pression is, though I cannot find the account in print, that
a further effort was made on a more extended scale, something
like a school; and this was resisted by such combined effort on
the part of trade, that Mr. Bennett and his friends began to
make a stir through the press. "The Edinburgh Review" mentions
a watchmaker's wife who wished to work with her husband in his
special department. Finding that it could not be done with the
cement of the trade, she undertook, instead, the engraving of
the brass work; but, though working in her own house, she was
at last successfully under the plea that she had been regularly
apprenticed by her father, also in the business. She persevered,
and taught her two daughters; and so will many others.

Women in England must certainly make watches; and the time is
not far distant when the men of Coventry will yield to this de-
winding silk, weaving ribbon, and pasting patterns of floss
upon cards, excited the same opposition; but now thousands of
women pursue these employments, and the men look on as quietly
as the grazing cattle in the fields.

Fancy a strong man winding silk for a whole day, or sorting
colors in floss! How has he ever degraded himself to such
girl's work?

I need only remind you of the formal petition sent in at the
time of the opening of the School of Design at Marlborough House,
to entreat the Government not to instruct and aid women, lest
the poor, helpless men should starve! A similar prejudice, more
active than any in America prevents English women from qualify­
ing themselves as physicians. Dr. Spencer, of Bristol, really
educated his daughter as an accoucheuse; but the prejudice was
so strong that she was not allowed to practise, and became a
governess instead. The same prejudice kept the English Army
suffering for months, while it delayed the departure of female
nurses to the Crimea.

In Staffordshire, women are employed to paint crockery and china,
which they can do with more taste and grace than men. It seems
hardly credible, that the desire of the men to deepen their
wages should deprive females of the customary hand-rest; which
would, of course, diminish the fatigue, and make the pencil­
stroke more certain. I am happy to believe that not an employ­
en the United States would submit to this absurd demand; and the
result of any such attempt on the part of workmen would probably
be a general permission to leave. We are, in this country, much
more free from the control of guilds and unions of various sorts
than the people of England; yet the conduct of our printers
furnishes a fair parallel to these foreign facts. Within a few
years, there have been more than twenty strikes in the print­
ing-offices, consequent upon the employment of a few wwomen;
and the result has generally been an entire change of hands,
masters in America not enduring dictation.

In August in 1854, the journey men employed in the office of the
Philadelphia Daily Register left the office, in high dudgeon,
because the publisher had employed two women as typesetters
in a separate office. They acted in conformity to a resolve
of the Printer's Union, and were permitted to depart. This
is not all. Threats of personal violence followed all who
sought the waiting work, and an attempt was made to cut the rope
by which the forms were raised. The result would have been to
break up the type, prevent the issue of the paper, and run
the risk of endangering life. Complaints were lodged against
the printers; and, after a hearing, they were each held to bail
of six hundred dollars, to answer to the charge of conspiracy,
at the Court of Quarter Sessions.
At the close of the Revolution, there were in New England, and perhaps farther south, many women conducting large business establishments, and few females employed as clerks, partly because we were still English, and had not lost English habits. Men went to the war or the General Court, and their wives soon learned to carry on the business upon which not only the family bread, but the fate of the nation, depended; while our common schools had not yet begun to fit women for book-keepers and clerks.

The Island of Nantucket was, at the close of the war, a good example of the whole country. Great destitution existed on the establishment of peace. The men began the whale fishery with redoubled energy; some fitted out and others manned the ships; while the women laid aside distaff and loom to attend to trade. A very interesting letter from Mr. Eliza Barney to Mr. Higginson gives me many particulars. "Fifty years ago," she says, "all the dry-goods and groceries were kept by women, who went to Boston semi-annually to renew their stock. The heroine of "Miriam Coffin" was one of the most influential of our commercial women. She not only traded in dry-goods and provisions, but fitted vessels for the merchant service. Since that time, I can recall near seventy women who have successfully engaged in commerce, brought up and educated large families, and retired with a competence. It was the influence of capitalists from the Continent that drove the Nantucket women out of the trade; and they only resumed it a few years since, when the California emigration made it necessary. Five dry-goods and a few large groceries are now carried on by women, as also one druggist's shop." Mrs. Taskell, in her "Life of Charlotte Bronte," mentions a woman living as a druggist, I think, at Haworth; and I have always been surprised that this business was not left to women. Our Nantucket druggist is doing well. In Pennsylvania, the Quaker view of the duties and rights of women contributed to throw many into trade at the same period. One lady in Philadelphia transferred a large wholesale business to two nephews, and died wealthy. I saw a letter the other day, which gave an interesting account of two girls who got permission there to sell a little stock in their father's shop. One began with sixty-two cents, which she invested in a dozen tapes. The other had three dollars. In a few years, they bought their father out. The little tape-seller married, and carried her husband eight thousand dollars; while the single sister kept on till she accumulated twenty thousand dollars, and too, a poor boy into partnership.

I have spoke of English female printers. The first paper ever issued in Rhode Island was printed by a brother of Dr. Franklin, at Newport. He died early, and his widow continued the work. She was aided by her two daughters, with swift and correct compositors. She was made printer to the Colony, and, in 1845, printed an edition of the laws, in 346 folio pages. That she found time to do something else, you may judge from this advertisement:—
The printer hereof prints linens, calicoes, silk, etc., in figures, in lively and durable colors, without offensive smell which commonly attends linen printed here.

Margaret Draper printed the "Boston News Letter," and was so good a Tory that the English Government pensioned her when the war drove her away. Clementine Bird edited and printed the "Virginia Gazette," and Thomas Jefferson wrote for her paper. Penelope Russell also printed the "Censor," in Boston, in 1771.

When we record these things, and think how women are pressing into printing offices in our time, it is pleasant to find a generous action to sustain them. At a recent Printers' Convention held in Springfield, Ill., the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas, the employment of females in printing offices as compositors has, wherever adopted, been found a decided benefit as regards moral influence and steady work, and also as offering better wages to a deserving class; therefore, be it —

"Resolved, That this Association recommends to its members the employment of females whenever practicable.

Mrs. Barney tells us that failures were very uncommon in Nantucket while women managed the business; and some of the largest and safest fortunes in Boston were founded by women, one of whom, I remember, rode in her own chariot, and kept fifty thousand dollars in gold in the chimney corner, lest the banks should not be as cautious in their dealings as herself. While writing these pages, I have visited such a woman, still living in Prince Street, at the age of ninety-five. Her name is Hillman. She lived for sixty-four years in the same house, and made her property by a large grocery business, and speculations on a strip of real estate. Her father, Mr. William Higgo, was a nautical instrument maker; and she has a very remarkable head, and as conservative a horror of modern changes — steam bakeries, for instance — as any of you could wish. Some of you will remember the two sisters Johnson, who, for some more than a half a century, kept a crockery shop on Hanover Street, and separated about two years ago, — one sister to retire on her earnings; the other to rest quite in her grave, at the age of fourscore. The spirit of modern improvement has since seized hold of the old shop.

It was one of the most distinguished of our female merchants — Martha Bussckminster Curtis — who planted, in Framingham, the first potatoes ever set in New England; and you will start to hear that our dear and honored friend Ann Bent entered on her business career so long ago as 1784, at, goods firm; but, at the age of sixteen. She first entered a crockery ward and dry-goods firm; but, at the age of twenty-one, established herself in Washington, north of Summer Street, where we remember her. She soon became the centre of a happy home, where sisters,
cousins, nieces, and young friends, received her affectionate care. The intimacy which linked her name to that of Mary Ware is fresh in all our minds. What admirable health she contrived to keep we may judge from the fact, that she dined at one brother’s table on Thanksgiving Day for over fifty years. She was the valued friend of Channing and Jammet; and her character magnified her office, ennobled her condition, gave dignity to labor, and won the love and respect of all the worthy. Less than two years ago, at the age of ninety, she left us, but I wished to mention both her and Miss Kincaid in this connection, because they were the first women in our society to confer a merchantable value upon taste.

Instead of importing largely themselves, they bought of New York importers and privilege of selection, and always took the prettiest and nicest pieces out of every case. As they paid for this privilege themselves, so they charged their customers for it, by asking a little more on each yard of goods than the common dealer.

I know nothing for which it is pleasanter to pay than for taste. When time is precious (and to all serious people it soon becomes so), it is a comfort to go to one counter, sure that in ten minutes you can purchase what is the time required for a whole morning to winnow from the countless shelves of the town.

Scientific pursuits cannot be said to be fairly opened to women here. The two ladies employed on the Coast Survey were employed by special favor, and probably on the account of the near relationship to the gentlemen who had charge of the department of latitudes and longitudes. Their work is done at home. Some years ago, Congress made an appropriation for an American nautical almanac; and Lieut. Davis was appointed to take charge of it. Three ladies were at one time employed upon the lunar tables. Lieut. Davis told one of them that he preferred women’s work, because it was quite as accurate, and much more neat, than the men’s. In 1854, Maria Mitchell was employed in computing for this almanac, with the same salary that would be given to a man. I may say, in this connection, that a great many extra female clerks have been employed in Washington for many years. The work has generally been obtained by women who have lost a husband or a father in the service of his country; and, I am proud to say, such women have usually been paid the same wages as men. During Mr. Fillmore’s administration, two women wrote for the Treasury, on salaries of twelve hundred and fifteen dollars a year; but the succeeding administration reformed this abuse, and very few are not at work.

I have often spoken, not only in this lecture, but in almost every one I have ever give, of the great need of conscientious, painstaking woman’s work. During the last year, Baron Toerner
has been borne by torchlight to his last home, and the medi­

val artist has been mourned as a personal friend by many a

crowned head. The torches of the priests who bore him to his
grave very likely startled to the window our two young country¬

women, who are pursuing sculpture in the Eternal City. Little
did they guess, th¬t, in the city of Florence, there was liv­
ing at that moment a woman as able, as renowned, though, for

certain reasons, not so well know to them, as the great artist just departed. I will close this lecture with a brief

sketch of Felicie de Fauveau, for whose woman's work no apology will ever need to be made.

Entering Florence by the Porta Romana, you find, in the Via della

Fornace, a dark-green door, which opens into a paved court,

once the entrance to a convent. Beyond stretches a cool,

quiet garden; and all manner of birdcages and dovecotes remind

you of Rosa Bonheur's fondness for pets. Through that quiet

garden, hedged with laurel and cypress, you might have walked,

but a little time ago, with a shrewd, sagacious, life-loving

French woman, an aristocrat and a Legitimist, whose eyes has

looked upon the guillotine, and whose self was proud of having

suffered for her faith and country. She would lead you to

her small parlor, furnished with ancient hangings, carved chairs,

and gold-grounded Pre-Raphaelite pictures of great value. Here

she would introduce you to her daughter Felicie de Fauveau.

A forehead low and broad; soft, brown eyes; an aquiline nose;

a well-cut, well closed mouth; a flexible fine figure; a velv­
et cap of the same, drawn over blonde hair, cut square across

the forehead, as in the picture of Faust, — this what you see

when you look at the artist; this is what Ary Scheffer painted

and valued so, that no gold would buy the portrait while he

lived. Fire, air, and water are in that organisation: the move­

ments of the arms are angular; but the hands are soft, white,

fine and royal.

Born in Tuscany, she was early carried to Paris; whence she

removed, when very young, to Limoux, Bayonne, and Besancon. A

great taste for music and painting she inherited from her mo­
th. Her studies were profound, and among them she pursued

archaeology and heraldry. At Besancon she painted in oils,

but was not satisfied; and from the workmen who carved for the

churches she got her first hint towards modelling. When her

father died, she was ready to devote herself to the support of

her family. When people told her it was unbecoming, she drew

herself up: "Are you ignorant," she asked, "that an artist is a

gentlewoman?"

Benvenuto Cellini was her prototype; and to her may be attri­

buted that revival of a taste for medieval art, which, pro­
ceeding from Paris, has had, of late years, so great an influence on England.
Her first work was a group called "The Abbot." Encouraged by unlimited praise, she made a basso-relievo, containing six figures, and representing Christina of Sweden in the fatal galley with Monaldeschi. This was in the last "Exposition des Beaux Arts," and received the gold medal from Charles X in person.

Up to 1830, the young girl remained in Paris. Her mother was so accomplished, Felicie herself so witty and profound a talker, that a distinguished circle gathered round them; among them, Scheffer, Delaroche, Giraud. All manner of fine artistic experiments in modelling and drawing were improvised about their study-table. There she executed from Count Poursales a bronze lamp of singular beauty. A bivouac of archangels, armed as knights, were represented as resting round a watchfire where St. Michael stood sentinel; round the lamp, in golden letters, "Veillant, veillant," — "Brave, and cautious;" beneath, a stork's foot holds a pebble surrounded by beautiful aquatic plants. Many models were lost on the breaking-up of her Paris studio. She was incessantly occupied with commissions for private galleries; she was to have modelled two doors for the Louvre, and to have superintended the decoration of a baptistery, — when the Revolution broke up her calm and studious life. With the celebrated daughter of the Duras Family, she retired to La Vendee, and, virtuous and honor, made herself as active, politically, as the reckless women of the Fronde. To this day, the peasantry know her as the Demoiselle. For those who remember her, there will never be another. Finally came pursuit and capture. After a long search, the two women dragged from the mouth of an oven. Felicie assisted her companion to escape; was watched more closely in consequence, and remained seven months in prison at Angers. In prison she designed a group representing the duel of the Lord of Jarnac before Henry II. and a monument of Luis de Bonnechere. At the close of the seven months, she returned to her studio at Paris. But very soon the appearance of the Duchesse de Berri in La Vendee restored hope to all Royalist hearts, and Felicie rushed to her side.

"My opinions are dearer to me than my art," she said, and proved it by heroic sacrifices. On the failure of this second attempt, she was exiled by the government. In the very teeth of the authorities, she returned to Paris, broke up her studio, and joined her mother in Florence, where they have ever since resided, clad, not without significance, in colors of the fallen leaf. No one but an artist can guess what loss is involved in the sudden and forcible breaking-up of an old studio. At the very last moment when Felicie and her mother were all but starving in Florence, a man in Paris made an almost fabulous fortune by selling walking-sticks made from designs which she had sketched during the happy evenings of her girlhood. The Fauveaus would not accept a dollar from the party they had served; and Madame had as much pride as her daughter in establishing the new studio. Felicie wrote, "We have manna, but only on condition that we save none for the morrow."
In her studio you find no pagan traces, only Christian art—St. Dorothea lifting her lovely hands for the basket of fruit an angel brings; a Santa Reparata, perfecting terra-cotta; exquisite mirror frames of wood, bronze, and silver. She has executed for Count Zichy of Hungarian costume, a collar belt, sword, and spurs, of the finest work. The Empress of Russia has ordered from her a silver bell, it is decorated by twenty-figures, the servants of a medieval household, who assemble at the call of three stewards, whose figures form the handle. Round the bell is blazoned, in Gothic letters,—

"Do bon vouloir servir le maître."
"With good will serve the master."

Beside the crowded labors of twenty-five years, Felicie has studied the merely mechanical portions of her art, and tried to discover some old artistic secrets. To cast a statue whole, so as to require no after-touch of the chisel, has been her lifelong endeavor. She finally succeeded in her St. Michael, though not till it had been recast seven times. It is probable her experiments led the way for those by which Crawford succeeded in casting his Beethoven. I cannot tell how many of you have heard of Felicie de Fauveau. The fact that her works are chiefly in private galleries and her own studio, screens her from observation. The higher dignitaries of the church and the princes of art are almost her only companions. She works constantly. About twice a year since, the death of her devoted mother drew the veil still closer round her daily life; but I retrace her story with honorable pride.

Felicie de Fauveau is not merely an artist. She is the first artist in the world, in her peculiar walk. As a worker in jewels, bronze, gold, and silver, as a designer of monuments and mediaeval furniture, she stands without reproach.

"Witness that she who did these things was born To do them; claims her license in her work."

So let all women claim it.
JULIA WARD HOWE
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(Endorsed, "Written from recollection")

Gentlemen, after the weighty and detailed argument to which we have just listened, I hope that the charge recently made against us, of falsifying the laws of Massachusetts in order to produce a mistaken impression of their deficiencies will be considered as having been disproved. Judge Swallow's statements have made it evident that, although these laws have been ameliorated in some respects, there is still much to be done before they will deserve to be called just and equal.

Something has certainly been done for us. We own our clothes now, but three years ago, we did not own them. We have a right, still more recently secured to us, to be buried in our husband's burial lot. Now the women of the community know very little about existing laws, and the men who are not lawyers, know no more. The women generally did not know that these rights were denied them. I wish to save one word concerning the spirit of these laws. Like all other laws in civilized communities, they represent two things. They represent, first, the intention and desire of justice, and second, the barbarism which limits the conformity of the community to what is really just.

The law which gives to the father an especial right in the children had probably its origin in the intention to throw upon him a certain responsibility concerning them. In a low state of civilization the father might abandon the children and the mother. The law was devised to prevent this.

But, gentlemen, in this twofold representation of the law, the thing we are to hold fast is the intention of justice, and not the barbarism which hindered the application of the principles of justice. The changes which are necessitated by the advance of civilization should relinquish the remnant of barbarism, holding fast the first intention. Those laws, which protected women from the older barbarism, now defraud them of the newer civilization. They cannot be too speedily modified to suit the demands of the time.

SPEECH AT LEGISLATIVE HEARING

Mr. Chairman: I would come here not only once, but twenty times to speak upon this theme, so nearly concerning the rights and liberties of the people. I have heard here some things which
surprise me. Is then the Boston School Committee such a nuisance that the less we have of it, the better? I remember a wise king who, said, many centuries ago, that there is safety in a multitude of counsellors. Some of us have found it so. Again, I hear so much about this table around which twenty-four men cannot sit and hold easy converse. In the women's clubs with which I am familiar, such a number can easily sit around a table, and so seated, we do not speechify, but converse quite easily. But to come to the heart of the question. The change proposed in the bill appears to me a step in the wrong direction, a going back from the principle of representation. As to the concentration of responsibility on which stress is laid, I remember a time, years ago, when the financial interests of the city of New York were all confided to the care of some two or three men. People said: "What a good plan is this! Now the whole money responsibility of the city is concentrated in the hands of these men." And this turned out to be the Tweed Ring, which was afterwards exposed and held up to the contempt of the country. And, as one of the women who have devoted much time to the attainment of the fraction of the suffrage conceded us, I protest against an act which would deprive us even of that. We should have no voice in the election of the Mayor who would have the appointment of the School Board, and if he should appoint women to serve upon it, they would not represent us, as we should have had no opportunity to vote for or against them. Much has been said here of the trouble and inconvenience consequent upon the method of election now in use, the trouble of investigating nominations, and of finding out which are good and which are not. Why, gentlemen, these are the troubles and inconveniences to which, as Americans, we stand pledged. The people of this great country have undertaken to govern themselves. This implies much trouble, much labor and inconvenience. Are we on that account to go back from our pledge? No—on the contrary, we are bound to go forward, to increase our labor, care and diligence. Gentlemen, my heart and soul are against this bill, and I earnestly hope and pray that it will not pass.
JULIA WARD HOWE
To the
National Convention of 1890
Washington

Preface: "A large audience listened to the address of Mrs. Julia Ward Howe on the Chivalry of Reform during which she said:

The political enfranchisement of woman has long been sought upon the ground of abstract right and justice. This ground is surely the soundest and safest basis for any claim to rest upon. But mankind, after yielding a general obedience to the moral law, will reserve for themselves a certain freedom in its application to particular things. Even in so imperative a matter as the salvation of their own souls they will not be content with weights and measures. The touch of sentiment must come in, uplifting what law knocks down, freeing what it trammels, satisfying man's love for freedom by ministering to his sense of beauty. When this subtle power joins itself to the demonstrations of reason, the victory is sure and lasting.

It is in the grand order of these ideas that I stand here to advocate the enfranchisement of my sex. Morally, socially, intellectually, equal with men, it is right that we should be politically equal with men in a society which claims to recognize and uphold one equal humanity. I do not say it is our right. I say it is right—God's right and the world's.

In the name of high sentiment then, in the name of all that good men profess, I ask that the gracious act may be consummated which will admit us to the place henceforth befits us, that of equal participants with you in the sovereignty of the people. Do this in the spirit of that mercy whose quality is not strained. Remember that the neglect of justice brings with it the direst retribution. Make your debt to us a debt of honor, and pay it in that spirit; if you do not pay it, dread the proportions which it appears will assume. Remember that he who has the power to do justice and refrains from doing it, will presently find it doing itself, to his no small discomfort.

Women, trained for the moral warfare of the time, armed with the fine instincts which are their birthright, are not doomed to sit forever as mere spectators in these encounters of society. They are to deserve the crown as well as to bestow it; to meet the powers of darkness with the powers of light; to bring their potent aid to the eternal conquest of right. And let me say here to those women who not only hang back from this encounter but who throw obstacles in the way of true reform and progress, that the shallow ground upon which they stand is
within the belt of the moral earthquake, and that what they build upon it will be overthrown...... . ....
JULIA WARD HOWE

The Salon In America


Preface: Lecture by Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, author, poet, public speaker (born in New York City, May 37, 1819; — — — ), written for a course of popular lectures arranged by the New England Woman's Club, Boston, Mass., and delivered before the Contemporary Club of Philadelphia, Penn., in March, 1893.

Ladies and Gentlemen: — The word "society" has reached the development of two opposite meanings. The generic term applies to the body politic or mass; the specific term is technically used to designate a very limited portion of that body. The use, nowadays, of the slang expression, "society" is evidence that we need a word which we do not as yet possess. It is with this department of the human fellowship that I now propose to occupy myself, and especially with one of its achievements, considered by some a lost art — the salon.

This prelude of mine is somewhat after the manner of Polonius, but as Shakespeare must have had occasion to observe, the mind of age has ever a retrospective turn. Those of us who are used to philosophizing must always go back to a particular judgment to some governing principle which we have found, or think we have found in long experience. The question whether salons are possible in America leads my thoughts to other questions which appear to me to lie behind this one, and which primarily concern the well-being of civilized man.

The uses of society, in the sense of an assemblage for social intercourse, may be briefly stated as follows: First of all, such assemblages are needed in order to make people better friends. Secondly, they are needed to enlarge the individual mind by the interchange of thought and expression with other minds. Thirdly, they are needed for the utilization of certain sorts and degrees of talent which would not be available either for professional, business, or educational work, but which appropriately combined and used, can forward the severe labors included under these heads by the instrumentality of sympathy, enjoyment, and good.

Any social custom or institution which can accomplish one of more of these ends, will be found of important use in the work of civilization; but here, as well as elsewhere, the ends which the human heart desires are defeated by the poverty of human judgment and the general ignorance concerning the relation of
Scene to ends. Society, thus far, is a sort of lottery, in which there few prizes and many blanks, and each of these blanks represents some good to which men and women are entitled, and which they should have, and could, if they only knew how to come at it. Thus, social intercourse is sometimes so ordered that it develops antagonism instead of harmony, and makes one set of people the enemies of another set, dividing not only circles, but friendships. Secondly, it will happen, and not seldom, that the frequent meeting together of a number of people, necessarily restricted, instead of enlarging the social horizon of the individual, will tend to narrow it more and more, so that sets and cliques will revolve around small centers of interest and refuse to extend their scope. In this way, and number two, the enlargement of the individual mind is lost sight of, and, end number three, the interchange of thought and experience does not have room to develop itself. People say that what they think others want to hear; they profess experience which they have never had. Here, consequently, a sad blank is drawn, where we might well look for the great set prize; and, end number four, the utilization of secondary or even tertiary talents do is defeated by the application of a certain fashion varnish which effaces all features of individuality, and produces a wondrously dull surface, where we might have hoped for a brilliant variety of form and color.

These defects of administration being easily recognized, the great business of social organizations ought to be guarded against them in such wise that the short space and limited opportunity of the individual life should have offered to it the possibility of a fair and generous investment, instead of the uncertain lottery of which I speak just now.

One of the great needs of society in all times is that its guardians shall take care that rules or institutions devised for some good and shall not become so perverted, in its use made of them, as to bring about the result most opposed to that which they were intended to secure. This, I take it, is the true meaning of the saying that "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance," no provision to secure this being sure to avail without the constant direction of personal care to the object.

The institution of the salon might, in some periods of social history, greatly forward the substantial and good ends of human companionship. I can easily fancy that, in other times and under other circumstances, its influence might be detrimental to general humanity and good fellowship. We can, in imagination, follow the two processes which I have here in mind. The strong action of a commanding character, or of a commanding interest, may, in the first instance, draw together those who belong together. Fine spirits, communicative and receptive, will obey the fine electric force which seeks to combine them; the poets, and their fit hearers; philosophers, statesmen, economists, and the men and women who will be able and eager to learn from the
in formal overflow of their wisdom and knowledge. Here we may have a glimpse of a true republic of intelligence. What should overthrow it? Why should it not last forever, and be handed down from one generation to another.

The salon is an insecure institution; first, because the exclusion of new material, of new men and new ideas, may so girdle such a society that its very perfection shall involve its death. Then, on account of the false ideas and artificial methods which self-limiting society tends to introduce, in time the genuine basis of association disappears from view; the great name is wanted for the reputation of the salon, not the great intelligence for its illumination. The moment that you put the name in place of the individual you introduce an element of insincerity and failure.

There is a short homage quite common in society, which amounts to such flattery as this: "Madam, I assure you that I consider you an eminently brilliant and successful sham. Will you tell me your secret, or shall I, a worker in the same line, tell you mine?" Again, the contradictory objects of our desired salon are its weakness. We wish it to exclude the general public, but we dreadfully desire that it shall be talked about and envied by the general public.

These two opposite aims—a severe restriction of membership, and a limited extension of reputation—are very likely to destroy the social equilibrium of any circle, coterie, or association. Such contradictions have deep roots. Even the general conduct of neighborhood evinces them. People are often concerned lest those who live near them should infringe upon the rights and reserves of their household. In large cities people sometimes boast, with glee, that they have no acquaintance with the families dwelling on either side of them. And yet, in some of these very cities, social intercourse is limited by regions, and one street of fine houses will ignore another, which is, to all circumstances some may naturally ask: "Who is my neighbor?" In the sense of the good Samaritan, most no one.

Dante has given us pictures of the ideal good and the ideal evil association. The company of his demons is distracted by incessant warfare. Weapons are hurled back and forth between them, curses and imprecations, while the solitary souls of great sinners abide in the torture of their own flame. As the great poet has introduced to us a number of his acquaintances of this infernal abode we may suppose him to have given us his idea of much of the society of this own line. Such appeared to him that part of the world which, with the Flesh and the Devil, completes the trinity of evil. But, in his "Paradise," what glimpses does he give us of the lofty spiritual communion which then, as now, redeemed humanity from its low discredit, its spite and malice! Resist as we may, the Christian order is prevailing.
and will more and more prevail. At the two opposite poles of popular affection and learned persuasion, it insomuch did overcome the world, ages ago. In the intimate details of life, in the spirit of ordinary society, will it penetrate more and more. We may put its features out of sight and out of mind, but they are present in the world about us, and what we may build in ignorance or defiance of them will not stand. Modern society itself is one of the results of this world conquest which was crowned with thorns nearly two thousand years ago. In spite of the selfishness of all classes of men and women, this conquest puts the great goods of life within the reach of all.

I speak of Christianity here, because, as I see it, it stands in direct opposition to the natural desire of privileged classes and circles to keep the best things for their own advantage and enjoyment. "What, then?" will you say, "shall society become an agrarian mob?" By no means. Its great domain is everywhere crossed by boundaries. All of us have our proper limits, and should keep them, when we have once learned them.

But all of us have a share, too, in the good and glory of human destiny. The free course of intelligence and sympathy in our own commonwealth established here a social unity which is hard to find elsewhere. Do not let any of us go against this. Animal life itself begins with a cell, and slowly unfolds until it generates the great electric currents which then impel the world of sentiment of beings. The social and political life of America has passed out of the cell state, into the sweep of a wide and brilliant efficiency. Let us not try to imprison this truly cosmopolitan life in cells, going back on the instinctive selfhood of the barbaric state.

Nature starts from cells, but develops by centers. If we want to find the true secret of social discrimination let us seek in the study of centers, —central attraction, each subordinated to the governing harmony of the universe, but each working to keep together the social atoms that belong together. There was a time in which the stars in our beautiful heavens were supposed to be kept in their places by solid mechanical contrivances, the heaven itself being an immense body that revolved with the rest. The progress of science has taught us that the luminous orbs which surround us are not held by mechanical bonds, but that natural laws of attraction bind the atom of the glove, and the glove to its orbit. Even so it is with the social atoms which compose humanity. Each of them has his place, his right, his beauty; and each and all are governed by laws of belonging which are as delicate as the tracery of the frost, and as mighty as the frost itself.

The club is taking the place of the salon today, and not without reason. I mean by this the study, culture, and social clubs, not those modern fortresses in which a man rather takes
refuge from society than reality seems to find it. I have just said that mankind are governed by centers and natural attraction around which their lives come to revolve. In the course of human progress of the highest centers exercise an ever-widening attraction, and the masses of mankind are brought more and more under their influence. Now, the affection of fraternal sympathy and good-will is as natural to man, though not so immediate in him, as are any of the selfish instincts. Objects of moral and intellectual worth call forth this sympathy in a high and ever-increasing degree, while objects in which self is paramount call forth just the opposite, and foster in one and all the selfish principle, which is always one of emulation, discord, and mutual distrust.

While a salon may be administered in a generous and disinterested manner, I should fear that it would often prove an arena in which the most selfish leadings of human nature would assert themselves. In the club, a sort of bono public spirit necessarily develops itself. Each of us would like to have his place there, --yes, and his appointed little time of shining, --but a worthy object, such as will hold together men and women on an intellectual basis, gradually wins from itself the place of command in the affections of those who follow it in company. Each of these will find that his unaided efforts are insufficient for the furthering and illustration of a great subject which all have greatly at heart.

I have been present at a forge on which the pure gold of thought has been hammered by thinkers into the rounded sphere of an almost perfect harmony. One and another gave his hit or his touch, and when the delightful hour was at an end, each of us carried the golden sphere away with him. The club which I have in mind at this moment has an unfashionable name, and was scarcely, if at all, recognized in the general society of Boston. It was called the Radical Club, and the really radical feature in it was the fact that the thoughts presented at its meetings had a root, and were, in that sense, radical. These thoughts, entertained by individuals of very various persuasions, often brought forth strong oppositions of opinion. Some of us used to wax warm in the defense of our own conviction; but our wrath was not the wrath of the peacock, enraged to see another peacock unfold its brilliant tail, but the concern of sincere thinkers be that a subject worth discussing should not be presented in a partial and one-sided manner, to which end, each marked his point and said his say; and when our meeting was over, we had all had the great instruction of looking into the minds of those to whom truth as was dear as to ourselves, even if her aspect to them was not exactly what it was to us.

Here I have heard Wendell Phillips and Oliver Wendell Holmes; John Weiss and James Freeman Clarke; Anthanase Coquerel, and the noble French Protestant preacher; William Henry Channing, worthy nephew of his great uncle; Colonel Higginson, Dr. Bartol, and
many others. Extravagant things were sometimes said, no doubt, and the equilibrium of ordinary persuasion was not infrequently disturbed for a time; but the satisfaction of those present when a sound basis of thought was vindicated and established is indeed pleasant to remember.

I feel tempted to introduce here one or two magic-lantern views of certain sittings of this renowned club, of which I cherish especial remembrance. Let me say, speaking in general terms, that, albeit the club was more critical than devout, its criticism was rarely other than serious and earnest. I remember that M. Coquereau's discourse there was upon "The Protestantism of Art," and that in it he combated the generally received idea that the Church of Rome has always stood first in the patronage of inspiration of art. The great Dutch painters, Holbein, Rembrandt, and their fellows, were not Roman Catholics. Michelangelo was Protestant in spirit; so was Dante. I cannot recall with much particularity the details of things heard so many years ago, but I remember the presence of this meeting of Charles Sumner, George Hillard, and Dr. Hidge. Mr. Sumner declined to take any part in the discussion which followed M. Coquereau's discourse. Colonel Higginson, who was often present at these meetings, maintained his view that Protestantism was simply the decline of the Christian religion. Mr. Hillard quoted St. James definition of religion, pure and undefined,—to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world. Dr. Hidge, who was about to withdraw, paused for a moment to say: "The word 'religion' is not rightly translated there; it should mean"—I forget what. The doctor's tones and manner did very much impress a friend, who afterwards said to me: "Did he not go away 'like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him'!"

Or it might be that John Weiss, the sham lady writer, whom pervasively described as "four parts spirit and one part flesh," gave us his paper on "Prometheus," or one on "Music," or propounded his theory of how the world came into existence. Colonel Higginson would descend from the Greek goddesses, as representing the feminine ideals of the Greek mythology, which he held to be superior to the Christian ideals of womanhood—dear Elizabeth Peabody and I meeting him in earnest opposition. David Wasson, powerful in verse and in prose, would speak against woman suffrage. When driven to the wall, he confessed that he did not believe in popular suffrage at all; and when forced to defend his position, he would instance the wicked and ill-governed city of New York as reason enough for his views. I remember his going away after such a discussion very abruptly, not at all in Dr. Hidge's grand style, but rather as if he shook the dust of our opinions from his feet; for no one of the radicals would countenance this doctrine, and though we freely confessed the sins of New York, we believed not a whit the less in the elective franchise, with amendments and extensions.
Dr. C. F. Holmes, one day, if I remember rightly, gave a very succinct and clear statement of the early forms of Calvinistic doctrines as held in this country, and Wendell Phillips lent his eloquent speech to this and to other discussions.

When I think of it, I believe that I had a salon once upon a time. I did not call it so, nor even think of it as such; yet within it were gathered people who represented many and various aspects of life. They were real people, earnest humanitarian interest in reform, education, and progress. It was my part to mix in with this graver element as much of social grace and geniality as I was able to gather about me. I was never afraid to bring together persons who rarely met elsewhere than at my house, confronting Theodore Parker with some archpriest of the old orthodoxy, or William Lloyd Garrison with a decade, perhaps, of Beacon Street dames. A friend said, on one of these occasions: "Our hostess delights in contrasts." I confess that I did; but I think that my greatest pleasure was in the lessons of human compatibility which I learned in this wise. I started, indeed, with the conviction that thought and character are the foremost values in society, and was not afraid nor ashamed to offer these to by guests, with or without the stamp of fashion and position. The results amply justified my belief.

Some periods in our own history are more favorable to such intercourse than others. The agony and enthusiasm of the Civil War, and the long period of ferment and disturbances which preceded and followed that great crisis — these social agitations penetrated the very fossils of the body politic. People were glad to meet together, glad to find strength and comfort among those who lived and walked by solid convictions. We cannot go back to that time; we would not, if we could; and but it has a grand time to live and to work in.

I am sorry when I see people build palaces in America. We do not need them. Why should we bury fortune and life in the dead state of rooms which are not lived in? Why should we double and triple for ourselves the dangers of insufficient drainage or defective sanitation? Let us have such houses as we need — comfortable, well aired, well lighted, adorned with such art as we can appreciate, enlivened by such company as we can enjoy. Similarly, to the real purposes of a salon by restricting the number of our guests and enlarging their variety.

If we are to have a salon, do not let us think too much about its appearance to the outside world — how it will be reported, and extolled, and envied. Mr. Emerson withdrew from the Boston Radical Club because newspaper reports of its meetings were allowed. We live too much in public notice.

There is not room in our short human life for both shame and realities. We can neither pursue nor possess both. I think of this now entirely with application to the theme under consideration.

Let us not exercise sham hospitality to sham friends.
Let the heart of our household be sincere; let our home affections expand to a wider human brotherhood and sisterhood. Let us be willing to take trouble to gather our friends together, and to offer them such entertainment as we can, remembering that the best entertainment is mutual. But do not let us offend ourselves or our friends with the glare of lights, the noise of numbers, in order that all may suffer a tedious and joyless being together, and part as those who have contributed to each other's ennui, all sincere and reasonable intercourse having been wanting in the general encounter.

We should not feel bound, either, to the literal imitation of any facts or features of European life which may not fit well upon our own. In many countries the currents of human life have become so deepened and strengthened by habit and custom as to render change on the contrary, life is flesh and fluent. Its boundaries should be elastic, capable even of indefinite expansion.

In the older countries of which I speak, political power and social recognition are supposed to emanate from some autocratic source, and, knowing none other, feel a personal interest in maintaining its ascendency, the status quo. In our own broad land, power and light have no such inevitable abiding place, but may emanate from an endless variety of points and personalities.

The other mode of living may have much to recommend it for those to whom it is native and inherited, but it is not for us. And when we apologize for our needs and deficiencies, it should not be on the ground of our youth and inexperience. If the settlement of our country is recent, we have behind us all the experience of the human race, and are bound to represent its fuller and riper manhood.

Our seriousness is sometimes complained of, usually by people whose jests and pleasantry fail to amuse us. Let us not apologize for this, nor envy any nation its power of trifling and of persiflage. We have mighty problems to solve; great questions to answer. The fate of the world's future is concerned in what we shall do or leave undone. We are a people of workers, and we love work — shame on him who is ashamed of it! When we are found, on our own or other shores, idling our life away, careless of vital issues, ignorant of true principles, then may we apologize, then let us make haste to amend.
Let There Be Light
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I wish that I felt able to give you some new message in favor of woman suffrage, but after so many years of pleading for it, I might despair of challenging your attention to this familiar theme by any statement which should have the attraction or novelty. The world is old, and the laws which govern it are as old as it is. Yet the world is ever renewing its life, putting on new fashions and new features. But upon these eternal principles, experience is always casting new light, while the great vital principle of creation is always filling the forms already received with new life.

The truths upon which is founded the demand for woman suffrage are as old as humanity. But the wonderful chain of circumstances which has made the question a practical one has been developed, link after link, by the upward progress slow but sure, and now, I hope, so well guarded that it can never more be wholly impeded.

I can imagine a state of darkness as prevailing prior to the divine command which said:

"Let there be light!"

And from this darkness I can call up two spirits who should argue for and against its continuance. One of these spirits say: "I feel that I have the ability to perceive something with these eyes, if it were not for this blank darkness, which casts its veil over things near and far." And the other spirit would say: "Out upon thee. Art thou not satisfied with having the breath of life, and the perceptions of time and space?" Their argument might extend over aeons of time, and at length, while the weary first spirit says for the trillionth time, "I thinks we are capable of enjoying something better than darkness!" the veil is suddenly rent away, and the dawn appears.

This picture images the history not only of our sex, but of our race. The early conditions of society, when compared with the results of civilization, are as darkness to light. Now man was made for light, and the multitudes longed and prayed for a boon which, they feared, might never be granted them. Prophetic calls, abiding on the heights of human thought, proclaimed the day which would sooner or later dawn upon the world. They were mocked and derided by many, but in some earnest souls the seed of the prophetic word sprang up and ripened into the
heavenly life. In the blessed fifteenth century a new world was discovered, destined to become a refuge from the tyranny and superstitions of the old world. And in the still more blessed nineteenth century, a new social world came into being. The great truth, formulated centuries before, but never before understood, came to men's notice, the truth that as the law of duty is universal, so is that of right, and the two must go together. Where there is duty, there must be right, and man and woman alike are entitled to fulfil their highest duty, and to claim, in fulfilling it, the noblest right to which humanity is heir. And so, we who have long stood for the political equality of the two sexes may now say to its opponents:

"Friends, behold the Dawn! The brighter day is already here. Prepare to set your thoughts and deeds in order fit for the splendor of its high noon. For the divine mandate of illumination has gone forth anew. In the vast domain of human conscience, God has again spoken the word:

"Let there be light!"
We all know the current phrase, borrowed from some French speaker or writer, that a man must have the courage of his opinions. This means, I suppose, that he must be willing to stand by what he believes to be true, and if necessary, suffer for it. This courage I may assume most of us have, but there is something more that we should have, viz: the patience of our faith. We must not work at great undertakings, expecting to see success bloom out like flowers after a summer rain. Such successes we may not see at all, but we are bound to believe in it, because truth must succeed. We are bound to believe, too, in honest work, because truth cannot be served by falsehood.

Believing in these things, we are justified in taking courage; and let me here suggest that the belief so much insisted upon in the New Testament is a belief in these very things—the power of truth, the power of honesty, rather than a literal acceptance of statements in metaphysics, or history. This is the saving faith, which it is shameful not to have. Having it, we can work on resolutely, even though the heathen world around us should furiously rage, and the people, alas! imagine a vain thing.

I wish that we may begin these sittings having "a spirit of power within," resting in a hope strong enough to uplift the world, and with a patient and sweet determination to work out the problem of our own salvation, and to let our work crown us, not our pretension of ambition. The illusions which make a small human creature great in his own eyes, which lead him to labor principally to assert the greatness, are not for us. Neither do we covet the cowardice of spirit which should make us mean and pitiful in our own eyes. The courage of the apostles, the meekness of the saints, are not like them, and as it costs no more to aim at the best things than at the poorest, let these be our mark, these our standard in what we shall endeavor to do and to say. The world around us is full of wickedness which we cannot overthrow, and of misery which we cannot relieve.

What we have done seems so little when compared with what there is to be done, that we may be tempted to pause and ask whether it is anything at all? Here it is that we need the patience and
humility that I spoke of just now. Are these great things for which we work to spring up like a root out of dry ground? Will the deep principles of divine truth oversweep the earth like an army of grasshoppers, which darkens the air for a day, and then disappears? Let us go back, return to our New Testament similes of the planted seed and the hidden leaven. The faith and work of one true human life is like mustard seed in comparison with the wild elements which surround it. But from that seed, in time a stately tree shall grow to give rest and shelter to myriads of creatures that need it. It is through no fault of ours, but through God's dispensation that the sublime part of our life comes so slowly into recognition and prominence. Let us have patience then, patience with the greatness of great things which swallow up our lives like a drop in the ocean. Still is it most pleasant to work for them, most blessed to believe in them. And small as it may seem, our work as surely tells and abides, as the sun's work tells on the planets.

---

We who are met here are met to pray and work not for our own time only, but for all time. The unborn future lays its claim upon us, as the past gives us its rich inheritance. "Be faithful over a little," is our word of command. We know that it carries along with it the great victories that are to be the victories which shall never be overthrown.
The religion which makes me moral agent equally with my father and brother, gives me my right and title to the citizenship which I am here to assert. I would share equally with them its privileges and its duties. No man can have more at stake in the community than I have. Imposition of taxes, laws concerning public health, order and morality affect me precisely as they affect the male members of my family, and I am bound equally with them to look to the maintenance of a worthy and proper status in all these departments.

The wisdom of our ancestors decided that the ballot is the safest instrument for the maintenance of the well-being of the state. We do not claim for it infallibility in the past or in the future, nothing of human infallibility in the past church or state. But most of us are born with a latent sense of good, and a desire for its attainment. Education adds to this rudimentary endowment the most precious inheritance of civilization, the thought and experience of past ages. Out of these are evolved the moral law, the maxims of political economy. Regarding these fundamental principles which govern society we women were long kept in tutelage. Thanks to the growth of human intelligence, led by a few valorous spirits, we have now freedom to enter into this glorious heritage of the ages. With equal moral and mental capacity, we now have education equal to that enjoyed by men. Where is the deficit? Where the deficiency which bars our way to the full exercise of our social and political efficiency? We think that it must be with those who fail to interpret aright the promise of this, our twentieth century, those by whom the logic of freedom and its just conclusions are imperfectly apprehended. The women of England have long enjoyed the privilege of the suffrage for which we ask. The women of New Zealand have it. Several of our western states have granted it, distancing our slow Boston by a score or more of years. And shall we, in all this light, remain a little island of darkness?

History shows us many parallels to this state of things. The People before the flood though that the world was clean enough as it was. No need for any Deluge to wash away its wickedness. But God thought otherwise, and the flood came. From the earliest ages of human history, through the days of Moses, through those of Christ, human progress has been resisted by those who should most zealous for its advancement.
It is quite true that women suffrage is a feature of a new time. The foremost spirits among men are now making new and unaccustomed studies, both of the actual state of society and of that which it is capable of reaching. To attain this higher legal, this worthier status a greater moral effort is necessary. We must employ efficiently the whole ethical force of society. Half, perhaps two thirds, of this force has been kept latent; by the imperfect training and education of women, and by the legal and social tutelage in which they have been held. Time and with it human progress have brought to pass wonderful changes. The one for which we ask will be one of the happiest and most beneficent.

"Aid it, paper, aid it, pen,
Aid it, minds of noble men."

Such, gentlemen, we believe you to be, and to you, as such, we commit the fate of our petition.
Plato's great work, the "Republic," is dedicated to the study of justice. In order to illustrate the nature and conditions of justice, he has drawn an elaborate picture of a state which should be strictly and governed by rules.

To me it has been assigned as a special task to speak of the position allotted to women in this ideal society. The attempt to do this, however, has necessitated some study of the work as a whole, for it would be a little profit to take us a single point in so weighty a treatise. Moreover, the supposed position of women in the "Republic" stands in the supposed close connection with the whole idea of what a state should be.

Education, according to Plato (in Book Second), consists first in instilling into the mind of youth notions of the divine which correspond with our highest views of qualities and of character. To this end, the fictions of the poets shall be carefully weighed, and those of them which represented the gods as capable of actions which we should call unworthy in men, shall not be brought to the knowledge of the young. In this connection, mothers and nurses are appealed to. Socrates says: (Quotation omitted).

The second point demands the rejection and withholding of all such views of a life after death as shall cause it to be regarded with fear or abhorrence. The reason given for this is that these views incline men to cowardice, and intensify their clinging to life by inspiring a terror of what may come after it. The ideal citizen is not to consider death as anything terrible, nor to sorrow for his friends as though in dying they had suffered some great misfortune. The man of noble ideas, being sufficient to himself, will not unduly mourn the loss of any friend. Lamentations of this sort, Socrates says, are to be left to women, "and not even to women who are good for anything." Women, indeed, are as it were commissioned to do the mourning of the world, i.e. to attend all of its forms rules concerning the same. They are also supposed or expected to cherish in their heart a deep, silent sorrow for the loss of friends for which the hurry of practical life, leaves men, but little time. Plato will have these best of his women brave like his men. Death shall not appear to them either an irreparable loss or an eternal separation. Excessive laughter is considered by Socrates unbecoming either to gods or to men. It is dangerous, because intemperate mirth naturally leads to intemperate melancholy. "Laughter holding both his sides" was congenial to an Englishman like Milton, but would not been so to the stateliest of the Greeks.
Akin to courage is temperance, which makes head against the paralyzing power of luxury. The spirit of true poetry will uphold this, refusing to dwell upon the excesses of the banquet as attractive to real heroes. The proper themes of poetry having been insisted upon, its forms and methods are next treated as of matters important to education.

"Enough of the subjects of poetry. Let us now speak of its style," says Socrates, who proceeds to characterize the difference between narrative and dramatic poetry, and to give his verdict in favor of the former, as having simpler dignity, free from what he considers the falseness of imitation. Versatile talents and imitative characters are looked upon by him with distrust.

"When any one of these clever multiform gentlemen, who can imitate anything, comes to our state, and proposes to exhibit himself and his poetry, we will fall down and worship him as a sweet and holy being; but we must also inform him there is no place for such as he is in our state — the law will not allow them. And so, when we have anointed him with myrrh, and set a garland of wool upon his head, we shall send him away to another city. For we mean to employ for our soul's health the rougher and severer poet and story-teller, who will imitate the style of the virtuous only."

From the sense and spirit of poetry, he now passes on to the melody and rhythm which may be considered its form. Here too he admits only a stern and simple music. The harmonies which are expressive of sorrow must be banished from use. Of these he says: "Even to women of virtue and character they are of no use, and much less to men." Of all existing harmonies, he will retain but two, one of them expressive of the resolve of courage, the other, suitable for prayer to God, or for the entertainment of peaceable and instructive propositions.

The flute shall be banished, and the lyre and harp only shall be allowed in the city, while the rustic pipe may suffice for the rural districts.

Plastic and pictorial art also must be purified and regenerated. Vice, intemperance and indecency must be eliminated from sculpture, and meanness from architecture. The guardians of the state shall not grow up amid images of moral deformity, as in some noxious pasture. Artists shall be such as are gifted to discern the true nature of grace and of beauty, so that the youth shall dwell amid fair sights and sounds which, even childhood, shall draw the soul into harmony with the beauty of reason.

I am afraid that Browning and others of our favorites might have seemed to the philosopher as deserving inclusion in the
order of the multiform gentlemen, and in consequence, exclusion from the perfect state. His severe judgments against the flute will not be depreciated by those musical critics who follow the French saying that there is only one thing worse than one flute, viz.: two flutes. When, however, he decries what he calls "multiplicity of notes on a panharmonic scale," I feel quite sure that he would not have been a devotee of the 3od Wagner.

In Plato's ordering of society, the elders are to rule the young people, and of the elders, the best. These rulers are to be the guardians of the state. They are to be chosen from their devotion to the public good. They are to be followed and watched through life, and to be subjected to various probationary ordeals. Next in order to these rulers, come the soldiers, the people. He illustrates the degrees of merit in men by the relative value of metals. Those who have the true talent of command he styles men of gold. Those who are fit to be helpers of these are men of silver. Husbandmen and craftsmen are called men of brass and of iron. But, says Plato, in an imagined address to these people: (Quotation omitted). In another part of the treatise, he again insists upon the importance of allowing the son of high parentage to descend in the social scale, if he shows deficiency or unworthiness, and of facilitating the upward way of the lowly born, where these evince high qualities and talents.

The first object of education is the right understanding of justice, which is to be acquired by the study and attainment of courage, temperance, and judgment. In this training, athletic exercises play an important part. The art which regulates and conserves the body politic. Having blocked out his curriculum for the men, Socrates says "It is now women's turn." The most eminent office accorded to men is that they should be the guardians and watchdogs of the herd. This having been conceded, he says: "Let us proceed then to give the women a similar training, and see how far that accords with our design?"

In the unfolding of this proposition, Socrates, like a skillful advocate, anticipates the objections sure to be brought forward by the adversaries of this plan. He begins by asking whether female dogs are employed in hunting and in guarding flocks, or whether the functions of bearing and suckling their young are supposed to exhaust them. The answer is that they are found useful for the same offices for which dogs of the opposite sex are employed, within the limits of their strength.

For the same service, he goes on to ask, they must have the same feeding and training? This is conceded. Women must then be taught music, gymnastic, and the art of war. Plato foresees
the ridiculous which would naturally follow their appearance in
the apiestra, but reminds hearers of other innovations which
at first awakened the same ridicule, but in regard to which,
to use his own words: "The ludicrous effect to the outward eye
vanishes before the approval of reason."

He now anticipates the first serious objection likely to be
urged by his adversaries. The principle has already been laid
down that people are to work according to their own natures.
The nature of men and women differing much the one from the
other, it appears inconsistent to say that they shall be held
capable of performing the same offices. The argument which
follows brings in view the fact that the intellectual capaci-
ties of women are as various as those of men, and that phy-
sical unlikeness of men with hair, but both alike can exer-
cise the cobbler's trade. A woman may have the soul of a phy-
sician. Being thus endowed, her bodily unlikeness to a male
physician will be no hindrance to her exercising the same
profession. A man, on the other hand, may not be capable of
being a physician at all. He may be fit only to be a carpenter.
The woman physician and the man physician will then be more
nearly on the same plane than will be the man physician
and the man carpenter.

And there my thoughts must review an arena very near to the p
resent time. I remember when the propositions like these,
unknown or forgotten in the neglect of centuries, were taken
up and unfolded before a wondering public, to which they ap-
peared as extraordinary innovations. I hear Garrison and
Phillips and Lucretia Mott, asking those very questions, and
leading their hearers irresistibly to the same conclusions.
When I reflect that to the American public, and perhaps
especially to the public of college bred men, these propos-
itons appeared to embody a novel and dangerous heresy, I must
wonder. Those who should have been students of Plato, Bachel-
ors and Masters of Arts, if the cognizant of these statements
as made by him, have often failed to perceive their signifi-
cance. Those only whose heart's love and inspiration have led
them to seek this perfect measure of right, have recognized the
fact that justice is all is safety for all.

Another point very familiar in recent discussions is the fol-
lowing. Socrates calls attention to the dexterity exhibited by
all men in callings supposed to be especially appropriate to
women. He mentions among these the art of weaving, and the
making of sweetmeats and pancakes, in which, he says, woman-
kind does really appear to be great. Men nevertheless are some-
times seen to attain excellence in these things.

What would Socrates have said of Worth and Fanchaud, and the
Parisian men dressmakers, who costume the elegantes of Europe
and America?
"And so," says Socrates, "in the administration of a state neither a woman as a woman nor a man as a man has any special function, but the gifts of nature are equally infused in both sexes; all the pursuits of men are the pursuits of women also, only (in his view) "in all of them a woman is a lesser man."

In the catechism which follows, we see something of what women had accomplished in Greece, in spite of the crushing burden of disabilities laid upon them by custom and prejudice.

Socrates claims for them gifts of healing, of music, of gymnastic and military ability, of philosophy, and what he calls "the temper of a guardian," i.e. the judicial mind, based on principles, endowed with insight, characterized by firmness tempered with benevolence.

The claim is not disallowed by the opposing party. The law which is to secure to women the cultivation and the exercise of these several capacities is confessed to be "agreeable to nature, and the contrary practice" (not yet wholly abrogated) "appears a violation of nature." The possibility of this change having been made apparent, its advantage is next insisted upon. These women, spoken of as the wives of the guardians of the state, are to share the duties of their husbands. The best men are to marry the best women, and the latter, even forsaking their feminine habiliments in the needs of war, are to be looked upon as "having virtue for their robe, while he who laugheth at them knows not what he is laughing at, and needs to be taught the truth that"

"The useful is the noble and the hurtful the base."

The interest of this treatise is somewhat lessened by its elaborate and cumbrous dialectic. Thus much Plato does build up by solid logic. Justice is the only safe and permanent foundation for human relations. Justice cannot be maintained unless those most capable of understanding its conditions are entrusted with its administration. This capacity is a moral and an intellectual one with which sex has nothing to do. In the interest of this state, therefore wise women should be associated with wise men in the administration of public affairs. As a condition of this, they should receive the sort of education which best enable men of capacity to serve the commonwealth.

We must value the uncompromising sincerity with which Plato determines that custom and prejudice, and even the sense of the ridiculous, shall give way before the demands of justice. His faith also in the happy result of right-doing is edifying. Dreadful pictures are sometimes drawn today of what the world would be if it were governed by wisdom irrespective of sex. Plato's serene soul soars above these nightmares, and sees, as the result of this equality of administration, a world purified and regenerated.
Plato's ideal state would only be attained by the co-operation in the belief that no society can be truly prosperous or happy which denies any one of the claims of ideal justice.

He calls woman a lesser man, but even from that standpoint demands that she shall be made stronger instead of weaker. He ascribes much of her want of ability, real or supposed, to her imperfect education and servile position, and to the tyranny of ignorance.

This doctrine of the political equality of men and women is presently harnessed to another, which is quite as abhorrent to modern as it could have been to ancient thought. Socrates, having brought his friends to agree to the first, announces the coming of a much greater wave of difficulty.

Doctor Channing, in his lecture on the Present Age (May 11, 1841) says: "Christianity has given new sacredness to home, new tenderness to love, new force to the ties of husband and wife, parent and child." Shall we think that our Plato, whose reasonings sometimes anticipate the very phraseology of the New Testament, could have held, on the momentous subject of marriage and family life, a creed so opposed to its teachings? How shall we have patience, for a single moment, with one who seeks apparently to annihilate the family relation, and to reduce parentage to a purely political feature of society?

This destruction of family life would also destroy the significance of sex. The relation of men and women to each other, rendered entirely subservient to the objects of the state, would be despoiled of all individual affinity and preference. So, while material results are to be ensured, all that consecrates these in the religion of personal life would be obliterated. No lover, no beloved, no husband, no wife, no mother, no father, no child. The state would be father, mother, brother, sister, child.

Plato's doctrine with regard to parentage must be considered—in the light of his character. He is a fearless and uncompromising soldier of conscience, who feels to the utmost the wrong-doings of society. His sense of these is to be measured by the sacrifice he is willing to make to put an end to them. Sweet even to a philosopher, even to a Greek must have been the memory of his mother's arms, of his mother's knee. Plato is tender with mothers, and remarks that the heavy burden of maternity ought to be made as easy as possible to them. He sees, however, the self-seeking which grows out of the family relation. Under its influence, men and women will not only endeavor to monopolize advantages for themselves, but for their children also, and the covetousness which has been a curse to one generation, hands itself down to another and another, and another. In order to get rid of this crying evil, Plato is willing to sacrifice the intense joys and comforts, no more mother-
hood, the babe at birth becoming the property of the state. Those who might have been father and mother shall regard as their own all who, in virtue of their age and other circumstances, might possibly have been their children. This abstract affection for childhood in general, regarding any child and caring for it as you were assured of its descent from yourself, is certainly a most noble and desirable conception, not to be fulfilled, however, by the destruction of the personal affections and instinct. A simpler logic brings us in view of the result, a process of reasoning made up of real interest and ideal aspiration. Interest shows us that good citizens are at once the only safeguard of the state, and its greatest wealth. In order to keep society solvent, every man and woman who composes it should have value enough to pay for his or her keeping. This value they cannot have without education. So the state now regards all children as its own, provides for their education and enforces it. This is the palpable ground of interest. The ideal motive in education is the belief, amounting to certainty, that the higher examples, the nobler sentiments, will strongly command themselves to the human heart, when the intellect has become sufficiently trained to conceive of them. Thus, one hero will make many men heroic, and a single martyr will, in spiritual parentage, beget a church, nay a whole order of changes.

We must allow the philosopher room for the breadth of speculative thought. Let him follow his hypothesis to the verge of the impossible. He knows the limitations of practical life as or better than we do. There is much, even in this treatise, which is in direct opposition to this outing of his fancy. In the saying which I have already quoted about the silver son of the golden father, and vice versa, we see the idea of definite descent held fast to. It is the slavish aspect of sex against which Plato would make war, as inconsistent with true progress. Women and children are not to be considered as belonging to men, but men, women and children all belong to the state, and are all to share its duties, the women as co-workers with the men, the children as learners.

Plato's doctrine of the family and of property as well must be considered as abstract statements of the absolute duty of the citizen to the state. To this duty, he would have us sacrifice every personal affection and interest.

We can look back from this to Abraham's time, and behold the sacrificial knife held at the throat of his son and narrowly averted. We can look forward to the elder Brutus, who passes sentence of death of his own son. And we can also meditate upon the sense in which Christ says that his doctrine shall set the heart of the mother against her daughter, of the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law. I find in Plato and in Christ the same idea, that we must follow the impelling power of conscience to its utmost end, regardless of consequences.
No matter who or what stands in the way, we must go forward. Fortunately or providentially, when we have made our stand, some compensating power, unthought of before, shows itself in the order of things, and the temporary discord resolves itself in progressive harmony.

From the cruelty of the masculine world Plato does not deliver us. He would not only prevent feebleness and deformity in the race, but he would destroy all those infants who at their birth promise to develop disease or malformation. Here, he makes an important omission. The robust and healthy infant may be born with the elements of a moral deformity more dangerous to society than any bodily failure or infirmity. Who shall assure us that this splendid boy-baby shall not grow up to be an atrocious enemy of his kind, that this girl-child shall not lose the flames which destroy a city, and desolate a continent? Moral deformity is more fatal to society than physical monstrosity and it is impossible to foresee its manifestations. On the other hand, physical weakness and deformity are sometimes accompanied by great excellence of mind and of heart. Therefore, while the state cannot rightly neglect the person of any, it must bring up all of its children in the same hope and the same respect.

And here we see something that the world has gained since Plato's time, viz.: the sense of the sacredness of the individual as well as of the state. The dignity of humanity resides equally in both. The state is the aggregate of individual souls, the guardian of individual rights. While each should be willing to sacrifice himself for the good of all, the all as the whole cannot make light of the person of any, since each and all stand to it in the same vital relation.

Into the great views of education unfolded in Books Seventh and Eighth of the "Republic," the limits of my subject hardly allow me to enter. Yet will I call to mind one or two points which have a certain connection with it. Plato has elsewhere affirmed the early years of life to be the most important for training. In Book Seventh, while insisting that the studies which he calls "preparation for dialectic," shall be presented to the mind in childhood, he at the same time forbids teaching them by compulsion, holding that a freeman must have freedom in his studies. He says: "Let early education be a sort of amusement; that will better enable you to find out the natural bent."

The introduction of the pleasurable in early education is a feature of this age. Kindergartners should seize upon this passage as pointing to the achievements of Froebel. I mention it because I am seeking the points in which Plato's prophecies are already fulfilling themselves in the world's experience.

Dialectic, says our philosopher, should not be studied too
Having built up the man by study, gymnastic and probation, to the age of fifty years, he who still survives and has distinguished himself in action and acquirement shall come to his consummation. This consummation is described as a beholding of the universal light, the absolute good, according to which the life of the state and that of the individual should be ordered.

At one point in the dialogue Glaucon says: "You are a statutory, Socrates, and have made your governor perfect in beauty."

Socrates replies: "Yes, and our governesses also, for you must not suppose that what I have been saying applies to men only, and not to women as far as their natures can go."

The good of the state, according to Socrates, must be a controlling motive. The guardians of the state are not to have a happiness which will make them anything but guardians. The husbandmen are not to be bidden that they till the ground no more than they like. Nor are the artificers to repose on couches and feast by the fireside, working as such as they like, and no more. For in this state, a high condition of general advantage is to be the aim kept constantly in view, and not the rapturous gratification of any individual or class; and the growing up of the state into this noble order is to be made to take precedence, in the minds of men, of the personal and selfish motives. In this order, all persons are to receive the proportion of happiness only which nature assigns them.

Does the experience of history show us that Plato was right or wrong in espousing the cause of ideal justice, and in making her requisitions the only foundation for a safe and happy state?

How has it been in our own country, in our own time? What enormous powers, what subtle combinations have sought to exclude justice from human affairs? Look at the immense combination of forces which supported slavery in this country. Look at the knot which, forty years ago, bound Italy hand and foot; look at France under the two Napoleons. With great rage and convulsions, these strongholds of the old orders have passed away. Look at England today, scared with the nightmare of her own tyrannies. One man, old but valorous, stands for the ideal right, stands and will not yield an inch.

One feature which must strike us in Plato's "Republic" is that its provisions are such to make the whole term of human
Life on continual education. The only graduation from this high school is into the company of the gods. In this mode of living, the higher training and discipline go ever forward. Sobriety and measure are everywhere present, and the reserve power which these ensure enable every man to go from strength to strength, and to build always a better upon yesterday's well. The high satisfaction of always using one's best powers in the best way gradually excludes the desire of all irrational gratifications. There is no place for luxury in a world so filled with content and well-being. Those who live to merit the approval of enlightened conscience cannot care to astonish the vulgar. Having real merits, they cannot stoop to assume fictitious ones. The pomp and splendors, therefore, with which tyrants, governmental and social, love to surround themselves, are here absolutely without significance, and would seem to our republicans fit only for madmen.

Something of this prophecy is fulfilled today. Life in a republic is a never-ending education, for those who are educable. We have seen, are every day seeing, its beneficent effects, which lift races degraded by ages of ignorance and servitude, by giving to them offices which task, not only their muscular, but also their moral and intellectual strength.

The exclusion of corrupting influences, by which Plato assures the permanence and safety of his state, would be possible only under a spiritual despotism which would sap the energies of society by anticipating and restraining the will power of individuals. The preventive power of education constantly increases, but the great ideals of character commend themselves but slowly to the mass of mankind, and the vulgar, dishonest rich man still appears a hero to a sordid multitude whose elimination from our society seems distant, and to some, hopeless. In Plato's "Republic," these robbers who gather enormous for times by fraud and sublety would be regarded with a contempt which would inevitably lower them in their own self-esteem. Cast out from the fellowship of all good citizens, their place would be with barbarians whom their money could bribe or their splendors overawe.

The ideal state exists today in certain individuals, and perhaps in certain associations. And it is quite true that in its esteem those rich men who are of low character weight but little. These men as forced to have recourse to the old barbarism, still enthroned and cultivated in Europe. Their money will buy for them, in foreign lands, an artificial rank which no doubt more than compensates to them the obscurity of the public respect which they have never dreamed of deserving. We sometimes mourn the expenditure made of their money in other countries. Perhaps it is better for us that they take their plunder and their extravagance elsewhere.

Another fulfilment of prophecy may be seen within the borders of our country. In Plato's order, the women and children are everywhere the companions of the men. In the camp and on the
battlefield, the little ones are to learn courage from the ex­
ample of brave warriors, and strategy from the contemplation of
military manoeuvres.

When I hear that the mothers of Wyoming and of Washington Ter­
ritory take their young children with them to the polls, I see a partial realization of Plato's vision. The ballot is our weapon, the election is our peaceable contest, is which it is just and proper that the mother shall be armed like the father, and that the child shall learn from both what his own office is to be in the defense of his country, how he should exercise.

Socrates, pushed for a statement regarding the possibility of the existence of this ideal city, falls back upon the assertion that an ideal does not necessarily embody itself in tangible form. It remains, a truth of supreme significance, but no one can safely predicate when, if ever, the actions and perceptions of men will be conformable to it. If we can make any approximation to it, we are fortunate. Read in this sense, there is almost the meaning of "never" in the following prognostic: (Quotation omitted).

It is like the witches' prophecy: "When Birnam Wood shall come to Dunsinane"? Such prophecies do fulfill themselves, foretelling of evil to the evil, of good also to the good. At the bottom of Plato's prophecy, is the faith thus expressed. (Quotation omitted).

I will confess that, nibbling round the edgives of this great treatise, I feel like the small mouse dealing with a mighty cheese, I find in its pages some thoughts which have become the property of the civilized world. I find sentiments which will only seem possible to the saints of disinterested humanity and patriotism. I find problems which distract society today as much as or more than ever. I find also points which are settled, scars to be brought again into general doubt and question.

I find in this treatise high sayings which, I fear, would be more familiar to our fathers, than to our children. I find prophecies which have been realized, and which still, like a flaming banner, wave us to new victories, to new achievements. I find promises only partially fulfilled, and foremost and most sacred among them, I hold this promise, that the women of the state, equally with its men, shall be trained to high offices of public guardianship.

The progress of the ages brings to light one after another of these ideal objects which, at first seen abstractly and intangibly by some strangely inspired thinker, became adopted into the Programme of the living and working world.

The equal opportunity for women is already demanded and in great measure accorded. In this, equality of education nec-
essarily precedes quality of function. Duty, in its noblest interpretation, is the right of men and women alike. The pattern of the city laid up in heaven is becoming the plan of our social and civic architecture, and those who give the rule of morals and in intellect are followed for the assurance given that they will act according to the laws of that city and no other.

The form in which Plato entertains these beautiful visions is rather that of a problem. The world of men ought to be harmonious and happy, by reason of the unity of social interest, considered in the abstract. Its dissensions, treasons, contentions, self-seekings, some of a want of instruction concerning this unity, this fundamental harmony which underlies the diversities of men. This dexterity, this manifoldness of gifts, impulses, wants and passions, is most precious to the race. Out of it comes the ego, the individual. Apart from it, we have only the crowd, the mass. An intelligent traveller, lately returned for Korea, tells me that in the language of that country there is no word answering to the personal pronoun. Self-effacement goes with self-abasement. The great problem is, how to retain both the unity and the variety, and how to reconcile and harmonize these opposites. Plato gives some great guesses at the solution, but these guesses are all dependent upon some unknown quantity which he is obliged to leave undeclared. For the ages of life and energy supply the wonderful machinery by which the question is worked out. Ten ages, and in them, the great dissensions of the spiritual order. A coherence of which Plato scarcely dreamed makes itself felt to-day between the various sorts and conditions of men.

"All mankind are friends and brothers," says Schiller.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," says the founders of the commonwealth. "That all men are born free and equal, and are entitled to certain inalienable rights." These utterances have become the word of command to the nations, and the problem, too mighty for any one man to declare, solves itself in the experience and inspiration of the human race.
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The Heavenly Vision

The Reverend Anna Howard Shaw, Vice-president at large of the National American Suffrage Association at the National Suffrage convention March 23, 1887 -- the 19th national convention held in the M. E. Church of Washington -- gave the sermon, a matchless discourse on the Heavenly Vision. From the "History of Woman Suffrage," Vol. IV., pp. 138-33.

"Whereupon, O, King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." Acts, XXVI:19.

In the beauty of his Oriental home the Psalmist caught the vision of the events in the midst of which you and I are living to-day. And though he wrought the vision into the wonderful prophecy of the 68th Psalm, yet so new and strange were the thoughts to men, that for thousands of years they failed to catch its spirit and understand its power.

The vision appeared to David was a world lost in sin. He heard its cry for deliverance, he saw its uplifted hands. Everywhere the eyes of good men were turned toward the skies for help. For ages had they striven against the forces of evil; they had sought by every device to turn back the flood-tide of base passion and avarice, but to no purpose. It seemed as if all men were engulfed in one common ruin. Patient sphinx-like, sat woman, limited by sin, limited by social custom, limited by false theories, limited by bigotry and by creeds, listening to the tramp of the weary millions as they passed on through the centuries, patiently toiling and waiting, humbly bearing the pain and weariness which fell to their lot.

Century after century came forth from the divine life only to pass into the great eternity -- and still she toiled and still she waited. At last, in the mute agony of despair, she lifted her eyes above the earth to heaven and away from the jarring strife which surrounded her, and that which dawned upon her gaze was so full of wonder that her soul burst its prison-house of bondage as she beheld the vision of true womanhood. She knew then it was not the purpose of the Divine that she should crouch beneath the bonds of custom and ignorance. She learned that she was created not from the side of man, but rather by the side of man. The world had suffered because she had not kept her divinely-appointed place. Then she remembered the words of prophecy, that salvation was to come to the race not through the man, but through the descendant of the woman. Recognising her mission at last, she cried out: "Speak now, Lord, for thy servant heareth thee." And the answer came: "The Lord giveth the Word, and the women that publish the tidings are a great host."
To-day the vision is a reality. From every land the voice of woman is heard proclaiming the word which is given her, and the wondering world, which for a moment stopped its busy wheel of life that it might smile and jeer her, has learned at last that wherever the institutions of the human mind are called into special exercise, wherever the art of persuasive eloquence is demanded, wherever heroic conduct is based upon duty rather than impulse, wherever her efforts in the opening the sacred doors for the benefit of truth can avail — in one and all these respects woman greatly excels man. Now the wisest and best people everywhere feel that if woman enters upon her tasks wielding her own effective armor, if her inspirations are pure and holy, the Spirit Omnipotent, whose influence has held sway in all movements and reforms, whose voice has called into its service the great workmen of every age, shall, in these last days, fall especially upon woman. If she venture to obey, what is man he should attempt to abrogate her sacred and divine mission? In the presence of what woman has already accomplished, who shall say that a true woman — noble in her humility, strong in her gentleness, rising above all selfishness, gathering up her varied gifts and accomplishments to consecrate them to God and humanity — who shall say that such a one is not in a position to do that for which the world will not longer rank her other than among the first in the work of human redemption? Then, influenced by lofty motives, stimulated by the wail of humanity and the glory of God, woman may go forth and enter into any field of usefulness which opens up before her...

In the Scripture from which the text is taken we recognize a universal law which has been the experience of every one of us. Paul is telling his story of a vision he saw, which became the inspiration of his life, the turning point where his whole existence was changed, when, in obedience to that vision, he put himself in relation with the power to which he belonged, and recognizing that One Divine Master, he also recognized that the purpose of his life could be fulfilled only when, in obedience to that Master, he caught and assimilated to himself the nature of Him, whose servant he was...

Every reformer the world has ever seen has had a similar experience. Every truth which has been taught to humanity has passed through a like channel. No one of God's children has ever gone forth to the world who has not first revealed to him his mission, in a vision.

To this Jew, bound by the prejudices of past generations, weighed down by the bigotry of human creeds, educated therein the schools of an effete philosophy, struggling through the darkness and gloom which surrounded him, when as a persecutor he sought to annihilate the disciples of a new faith, there came this vision into life; these dawned the electric light of a great truth, which filled his life and heart, the divine germ that is implanted in the soul of each one of God's children.
Then came crowding through his mind new queries: "Can it be that my fathers were wrong, and that their philosophy and religion do not contain all there is of truth? Can it be that outside of all we have known, there lies a great unexplored universe to which the mind of man can yet attain?" And filled with the divine purpose, he opened his heart to receive the new truth that came to him from the vision which God revealed to his soul.

All down through the centuries God has been revealing in visions the great truths which have lifted the race, step by step, until today womanhood, in this sunset hour of the nineteenth century, is gathered here from the East and the West, the North and the South, women of every land, of every race, of all religious beliefs. But diverse and varied as are our races, our theories, our religions, yet we come together here with one harmonious purpose — that of lifting humanity into a higher, purer, truer life.

To one has come the vision of political freedom. She saw how the avarice and ambition of one class with power made them forget the rights of another. She saw how the unjust laws embittered both — those who made them and those upon whom the injustice rested. She recognized the great principles of universal equality, seeing that all alike must be free; that humanity everywhere must be lifted out of subjection into the free and full air of divine liberty.

To another was revealed the vision of social freedom. She saw that sin which crushed the lives of one class, rested lightly on the lives of the other. She saw its blighting effect on both, and she lifted up her voice and demanded that there be recognized no sex in sin.

Another has come hither, who, gazing about her, saw men brutalized by the rum field, the very life of a nation threatened, and the power of the liquor traffic, with its hand on the helm of the Ship of State, guiding it with sails full spread straight upon the rocks of destruction. Then, looking away from earth, she beheld a vision of what the race and our nation might become, with all its possibility of wealth and power, if freed from this burden, and forth upon her mission of deliverance she sped her way.

Another beheld a vision of what it is to be learned, to explore the great fields of knowledge which the Infinite has spread before the world, and this vision has driven her out from the seclusion of her own quiet life that she might give this great truth to womanhood everywhere.

And so we come, each bearing her torch of living truth, casting over the world the light of the vision that has dawned upon her soul.

But there is still another vision which reaches above earth,
beyond time — a vision which has dawned upon many, that they are here not to do their own work, but the will of Him who sent them. And the woman who sees the still higher truth, recognizes the great power to which she belongs and what her life may become when, in submission to that Master, she takes upon herself the nature of Him whom she serves.

We will notice in the second place the purpose of all these visions which have come to us. Paul was not permitted to dwell on the vision of truth which came to him. God had a purpose in its manifestation, and that purpose was revealed when He said to the wonder-stricken servant, "Arise, for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, not that thou behold the truth for thyself, but to make thee a minister and a witness both of that which thou hast already seen and of other truths which I shall reveal unto thee. Go unto the Gentiles. Give them the truth which thou shalt receive that their eyes may be opened, and that they may be turned from darkness to light; and they, too, may receive a like inheritance with thyself.

This, then, is God's lesson to you and to me. He opens before our eyes the vision of a great truth and for a moment He permits our wondering gaze to rest upon it; then He bids us to go forth. Jacob of old saw the vision of God's messengers ascending and descending, but none of them standing still.

Herein, then, lies the secret of the success of the reformer. First the vision, then the purpose of the vision. "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." This is the manly and noble confession of one of the world's greatest reformers, and in it we catch a glimpse of the secrets of the success of his divinely-appointed mission. The between Saul of Tarsus and Paul the Prisoner of the World was measured by his obedience. This, too, is a universal law, true of the life of every reformer, who, having had revealed to him a vision of the great truth, has in obedience to that vision carried it to humanity. Though at first he holds the truth to himself, and longs to be lifted up by its power, he soon learns that there is a giving forth of that which one possesses which enriches the giver, and that the more he gives of his vision to men the richer it becomes, the brighter it grows, until it illuminates all his pathway.

Yet Paul's life was not an idle dream; it was a constant struggle against the very people whom he tried to save; his greatest foes were those to them he was sent. He had learned the lesson all reformers must sooner or later learn, that the world never welcomes its deliverers save with the dungeon, the fagot or the cross. No man or woman has ever sought to lead his fellows to a higher and better mode of life without learning the power of the world's ingratitude; and though at times popularity may follow in the wake of a reformer, yet the reformer knows popularity is not love. The world will support you when you
have compelled it to do so by manifestations of power, but it will shrink from you as soon as power and greatness are no longer on your side. This is the penalty paid by good people who sacrifice themselves for others. They must live without sympathy; their feelings will be misunderstood; their efforts will be uncomprehended. Like Paul, they will be betrayed by friends; like Christ in the agony of Gethsemane, they must bear their struggle alone.

Our reverence for the reformers of the past is posterity's judgment of them. But to them, what is that now? They have passed into the shadows where neither our voice of praise or of blame disturbs their repose.

This is the hardest lesson the reformer has to learn. When, with soul aglow with the light of a great truth, she, in obedience to the vision, turns to take it to the needy one, instead of finding a world ready to rise and receive her, she finds it wrapped in the swaddling clothes of error, eagerly seeking to win others to its conditions of slavery. She longs to make humanity free; she listens to their conflicting creeds, and yearns to save them from the misery they endure. She knows that there is no form of slavery more bitter or arrogant than error, that truth alone can make man free, and she longs to bring the heart of the world and the heart of truth together, that the truth may exercise its transforming power over the life of the world. The greatest test of the reformer's courage comes when, with a warm, earnest longing for humanity, she breaks for it the bread of truth and the world turns from this life-giving power and asks instead of bread a stone.

It is just here that so many of God's workmen fail, and themselves need to turn back to the vision as it appeared to them, and to gather fresh courage and new inspiration for the future. This, my sisters, we all must do if we would succeed. The reformer's consistency, she may be stern or even impatient, but if the world feels that she is in earnest she cannot fail. Let the truth which she desires to teach first take possession of herself. Every woman who to-day goes out into the world with a truth, had far better stay at home.

Who would have dreamed, when at that great anti-slavery meeting in London, some years ago, the arrogance and pride of men excluded the women whom God had moved to lift up their voices in behalf of the baby that was sold by the pound — who would have dreamed that that very exclusion would be the keynote of woman's freedom? That out of the prejudice of that hour God should be able to fashion upon the crushed hearts of those excluded the grand vision which we see manifested here to-day? That out of a longing for the liberty of a portion of the race, God should be able to show to women the still larger vision of the freedom of all human kind?
grand as is this vision which meets us here, it is but the dawning of a new day; and as the first beams of morning light give promise of the radiance which shall envelope the earth when the sun shall have arisen in all its splendor, so there comes to us a prophecy of that glorious day when the vision which we are now beholding, which is beaming in the soul of one, shall enter the hearts and transfigure the lives of all.
I was very glad when I learned that Mrs. Bottoms was going to give exhortation. I said amen, -- I don't know whether a theatre has any amen corner, -- but I remember in the old days it was almost impossible to go in church anywhere without hearing the exhortation that followed the sermon.

There was one thing that impressed itself upon my mind in Mrs. Bottoms's remarks, and that is the love and friendliness manifested by the women who gather themselves together.

I think it was the first time in the history of the world, when the great International Council of Women was held in this house three years ago, that women came together from all parts of the United States, Germany, England, Scotland, Finland and the isles of the sea, women of all phases of Christian belief, and some of pagan belief, and yet even more Christian perhaps than some of us who are Christians, -- women interested in all kinds of work. I believe women never realized the good there was in other women as they did when missionary women came here and met with grand suffrage women, and found out that the missionary women and women suffrage women were working the interest of the same humanity and doing the service of the same Master. There were Temperance and women of the King's Daughters, and I couldn't begin to tell you all the great organizations represented here; and every one of these women went away from that Council with a broader idea of the extent of woman's work, and with the conviction that no line of work could be pursued without coming into contact with other lines of work; and I think there has been a larger love among women, a deeper sympathy, than there ever was before in the history of the race.

And now to-day we gather on the platform Congregationalists, Unitarians, Universalists, Methodists, Presbyterians. Some one asks, "Why do you women take to all these liberal denominations?" I say, "Is it our fault that the Methodist Church and the Congregationalist Church have not opened their doors and said, "Christ died for all," the door of Christ's Church is as wide open to God's daughters as to his sons, -- are we women to blame?" If the trouble is that women are more attached to the liberal churches than to the orthodox, there is one way to change it. Let the orthodox church open its doors and let us come in.

I want to make this explanation because this criticism has been
passed upon us. We will be Presbyterian, we will be Baptist, — deep water or shallow water, — and all other kinds if you will let us; but you don't let us.
Rev. Anna H. Shaw: The subject, God's women, as suggested to me by reading an article in a Chicago newspaper, in which a gentleman defined God's Women. It has always seemed to me very remarkable how clear the definitions of men are in regard to women, their duties, their privileges, their responsibilities, their relations to each other, to men, to government, and now to God; and while they have been elucidating them for years, we have been patiently listening.

The women of the nineteenth century has taken to definitions, and she has come to the conclusion that it may be quite possible for a woman as well as a man to comprehend the relations of women to each other, to their homes, to the Church, to the State, and listen for the voice of God themselves, to know what the relation of women to the Divine is; and, believing this, no divine, whether he bears the name of Ender, Deacon, Priest, Bishop, or Pope, shall define for the woman of the twentieth century her right to be and to become all God makes it possible for her to be.

Every reform must pass through three stages of struggle. Ours has passed through the first, and we have gotten clear beyond it. We are just at the end of the second stage, and in the dawn of the next century will come the third stage upon us.

The first stage, through which every reform must pass, is that of the assertion that it is impossible, it is impracticable, it is ridiculous, it is unthinkable; and they who begin in the beginnings of reform, and bring the question before the people, must stand and bear all the scorn, all the loneliness, all the "aloneness" of great reformers in great questions, and, like the Lord Jesus Christ, they must learn to tread the wine-press alone. Womanhood has had its leaders, who have taken the stand and borne the scorn of it; and now you and I to-day are able to walk in a smooth path, to be welcomed by thousands, to be cheered for the sentiments for which they were scorned, and to be paid for doing that which they paid for the privilege of doing.

We have passed that stage. The second stage of every reform is the religious phase of it, the stage in which it must meet all the obstacles reared by religionists, by theologians, and by a class of people who are always afraid that religion born of God, emanating from God, the soul and life of the world, will be overthrown by a few of God's simple children; and these people fearing that God -- I speak reverently -- shall not be able to hold His own against a few, think they must stand up in defence of
God and the great principle and soul-life of His Being, and of our being. We have been passing through this stage for some time. We have proved by the Bible that when God created man in the beginning in his own image, He created man, male and female, and called their name Adam, and to this male and female man, whom he called Adam, He gave all these things, and bade this man Adam male and female, to subdue all things, even the world, to themselves.

The race has believed all this time that Adam was Mr. Adam, and not Mrs. Adam at all. Eve was not Mrs. Adam because she was the wife of Mr. Adam. She was no more Mrs. Adam because she was the husband of Mrs. Adam; not a bit. They were each Adam, and neither of them alone was Adam. They were Adam together. You can never have a male Adam or a female Adam. You must have male and female Adam, and you have manhood and womanhood-humanity.

The great divine who originated this subject for me was lecturing before an Institute of Sacred Theology in the city of Chicago. Before him was a class of students male and female, and he was defining to the male students what they, the male, might permit the females to do. He says, "There are some things which women may be permitted to do." Now, we like that, don't we? Something that we may be permitted to do. "They may be permitted to dispense certain charities; they may be permitted to do certain lines of church work. There are other things which women may not be permitted to do. Among the things which they may not be permitted to do it to hold high official relation to the Church, to become its ministers and to dispense its sacraments. These things women may not be permitted to do."

In referring to the relation of woman to the Church, he spoke of the argument, raised by many women, that it was the design of God that woman should be eligible to any position she could occupy. The women go to the Bible to prove their position; and the one woman upon whom we have all laid our claim and our boast, is that grand old woman who was able to cry out, in looking over Israel in its hours of peace, "There was trouble, there was dissertation, there was unrest in Israel until Deborah, a mother in Israel arose;" and we point to the fact that the judges of Israel were always understood by those people to be divinely selected for their position; and, being thus divinely selected, we can not assume that any human being could have taken this position who was not recognized by the people at least to have been chosen by God, and, even with the authority of the Bishop back of it, we cannot assume that God did not know what He was doing when He chose Deborah to be judge in Israel.

If the Bishop thinks God made a mistake, he will have to wait forever to correct it, for it is done, and we cannot go back of the record. This woman found a country greatly disturbed, a country where the judges had been taking bribes, a country where the people were utterly demoralized, where they dared not walk
on their highways because of thieves and robbers, but were com-
pelled to go secretly through cross-lots in order to get from
city to city. During the forty years of her reign as judge of
Israel the whole condition of things was revolutionized. We
are told that she judged all the people in righteousness, and the
people had peace for forty years. Just think of forty years of
peace! We have never known such a period since that day. Now,
then, this woman was not, we are told by the Bishop, God's woman.
If, then, she was not God's woman, whose woman was she? And if
God is not able to recognize His own, what will become of us
at the last? We believe that this judge in Israel was divinely
ordained for the work, because otherwise she could not have
done her work so well.

This same divine tells us that Miriam was not God's woman ei-
ther; that this woman was a sort of something interpolated
for the time of war and distress. All great souls are inter-
polated for great occasions when they are needed. And when
God wants a certain thing done that he knows needs a woman to
do it, he generally raises a woman and not a man for the pos-
tion. The world needed a woman.

Here was the boy Moses, under the reign of a man by whom he would
have been put to death in his babyhood, but that the loving
heart of his mother said, "He shall not die;" and she hid him
away.

We are told that women have no reasoning powers. They are not
able to arrive at logical conclusions. When I was studying
theology a young man in my class in the same college who was
arrayed, as they always are in the first year, with a coat
buttoned up high around the neck, and all that, said he thought
it was his duty to warn me in the beginning. He said, "You
are making a great mistake; God never intended woman to preach
the gospel. God has so constructed the brain of a woman that
she cannot give a correct and continuous exegesis of Scripture." 
Doesn't that sound like a first-year student? "It may be,"
I said, "that God has constructed our brain so that we cannot
give a correct and continuous exegesis of Scripture, but he has
at least, constructed our brain so that somewhere He found a
-place in it in which He has bestowed a large amount of gum-
pition. Now if we have not the power of exegetical ability, we
have gumption enough, if we undertake to preach and preach our
church empty, to get out of the pulpit and get into the pew."
What a grand thing it would be for the church at large if the
other sex had some of that kind of gumption.

There might not be so many Bishops, either.

Now this woman, Miriam, we are told, is not God's woman. But see
this little gumption, how she gets around the young princess,
and the mother-heart of the young princess goes out towards
the baby! She was a woman, though she was a princess. See how
shrewdly this little girl planned it so that the child's mother should become his nurse, and how, under the guidance and care of his mother, Moses was reared to become the leader of the people of Israel! You see that in all that transaction God did not need a man, and He did need a number of women; and He found women enough of the kind He wanted to do just the work that He wanted done. What more natural than that when Moses, years after, led the people out from Egypt, there went by the side of the great leader his sister Miriam, and that they, with their other brother became the united leaders of the children of Israel out from their bondage?

If God chose a woman to act in these cases, when the world needed a clear brain, a tender, affectionate, loving, motherly heart, a firm and determined will, and chose the woman to do it, and if when the people needed a leader to guide them out of bondage to freedom He chose a woman to be among the leading instruments of that great undertaking, who shall dare to say, be he laymen or priest, that such a woman is not God's woman?

The Bishop says there are certain classes of women who are God's women. We want to know who they are, because then we can range ourselves on the right side. God's women, according to the Bishop, are "the Ruths, the Rachels, and the Marys."

Ruth was certainly a remarkable young woman, because she was absolutely devoted to her mother-in-law, and that takes a great woman. I shall never rise to say that a woman devoted to her mother-in-law is not God's woman. But then, Ruth had some peculiar ways of getting along in this world. I hardly think he would like us to follow her line of courtship; yet the only two things for which she is admired are devotion to her mother-in-law and a peculiar method of obtaining a husband. I hardly think the Bishop would like to have some of us who are unmarried follow Ruth's method of securing a husband. These are perhaps two very good things in themselves, but we should hardly think they were of such importance to the race that such a woman should be especially held up as a type of God's women.

Then there was Rachel. We know two or three things about Rachel. One is that she had such a high sense of the subserviency of woman to man that, while the lazy shepherds lay about, gazing at each other, and at the skies, and perhaps at her, she left them gazing while she went to the well and drew the water—to water the flocks. That might be the Bishop's idea of God's woman, but it is hardly my idea of the proper division of labor between the sexes. I should prefer to let the Bishop draw the water while I gazed. There is another thing we know about Rachel, — that she was a very handsome woman; but I have heard it said that women are always jealous of each other's beauty, and always angry if anybody says anything about the beauty of another's.
This gathering of women is certainly an exception to the rule, for we have been the proudest set of women you ever saw, because in the providence of God there has been gathered here with us in this Council such a magnificent band of beautiful young women of whom we are all proud, and we glory in their beauty. Those of us who have passed our youth look at these young girls, not with envy, but with a little bit of pain in our hearts, and say, "If God had only made us that way, we would have been glad." We do rejoice in each other, and we are glad of a good-looking young woman. Rachel was so good looking that Jacob wanted to marry her, and he worked seven years of his life for her. She must have been a very desirable woman for Jacob to give seven years' hard labor for her. Nowadays if a man courts for a few evenings he thinks it is plenty of time to spend on it. Jacob waited seven years and then got cheated out of the woman he wanted to marry, and had to marry her oldest sister, Rachel, however was a courageous woman, and he was a faithful man, so he waited seven years more. The only other thing I know about Rachel is that the Bible says she wept for her children because they were not. The inference is that you men may go on behaving, as you say you do, improperly in politics; that you may make the politics of this nation dark, damaging and unclean; that at last you may have an unrighteous war; and then take our children and kill them on the battle-field, and all we have to do about it is to stay at home and weep for our children because they are not. We are to have nothing to say as to whether you shall kill them or not. All we are to have to do about it is to cry about it.

Would it not be infinitely better for the race if, instead of weeping for their children slain in battle or by the unrighteousness of cruel and wicked laws, women would rise in the dignity of their motherhood and demand that wars shall cease, and children shall be protected by law?

Then the Bishop tells us Mary was one of God's women. There are a number of Marys and the Bishop does not designate which of them it was. If he means the Mary out of whom the seven devils were cast, I should agree with him, for when seven devils have been cast out of a woman she must be something of a saint. If it was the Mary who washed the feet of Christ and wiped them with the hairs of her head, in token of penitence, I again agree with him, for that kind of penitence shows us she had been lifted up very close to the divine life.

Then there was another Mary, and she is the Mary whom I have taken as my example in my profession. This was the Mary who stood by the tomb of the Lord, and there at the mouth of the open tomb she received the first divine commission from the Divine One Himself to go out into the world and preach the gospel of a risen Lord.
If it was the Mary who was his mother, the Bishop has brought forward the wrong Mary to prove this case. What does the Bible tell us? In the fullness of the time God needed for the world a Redeemer. How should He give the Redeemer to the world? He gave the Redeemer to the world by choosing out of the world a woman to become the mother of the Savior of the race. God and a woman gave to the world its Redeemer.

Here are the Marys, two of whom were sisters. One was a woman who was a theological student learning at the feet of the master. The other was the first divinely-commissioned preacher of the resurrection. One was the mother of the Lord, doing the greatest public work for the race that has ever been done in the world. I am glad the Bishop holds that women theological students are God’s women; that women ministers are God’s women; and that the woman who was the mother of the Savior of the world was also God’s woman. I believe they were; I believe that the Miriams and the Deborahs and Vashtis were God’s woman too.

When I was a girl I read the Bible through in order to select from it the two people who were to be my hero and heroine through life. My hero was Caleb, my heroine Vashti. Vashti disobeyed her husband, and was driven from her place because of it.

I selected Vashti from among them all because she did disobey her husband a woman away back in the centuries, who recognized the dictates of her own self-respect; a woman who refused to become the puppet of a king and of his drunken courtiers; a woman ready to give up a throne, a husband, and a kingdom rather than do an ignominious thing; such a woman is God’s woman, husband or no husband. I wish the world were full of Vashtis today, standing by the right of their individual respect.

The concluding remarks of the Bishop were in relation to motherhood. He referred to that passage of Scripture which we have heard so much about in this discussion; “She shall be saved in childbirth.” Most of us regard this passage of Scripture as meaning that she shall be saved by the coming of the Child, shall be saved by the birth of Jesus Christ. She shall be saved because Jesus Christ came into the world to save not man alone, but women also. Women shall be saved because of the coming of Him who is the Emancipator of the race, women concluded. Believing this, we think the discussion which has been raised upon this line is a mere makeshift; it has nothing to stand upon.

There are two things to be considered in relation to motherhood. We have heard that motherhood is the greatest crown of glory which a woman can wear. Motherhood may even not be a crown of glory at all. It may be a crown of shame. It requires that there shall be something back of motherhood to define what motherhood shall be, and in this something back of motherhood lies that which may make it a crown of glory. The highest crown of glory
which a woman can wear is not motherhood, it is womanhood,—true noble, strong, healthy, spiritual, womanhood; the daughter of the King, the child of God, equal with the Bishop or any man in the world. If the woman is first of all woman, all things shall be to her a crown of glory, whether it be motherhood or spinsterhood. The mother-heart of woman that reaches out to the race and finds a wrong and rights it, finds a broken heart and heals it, finds a bruised life ready to be broken and sustains it,—a woman instinctly with mother-love, which is the expression of the Divine love; a woman who, finding any wrong, any weakness, any pain, any sorrow, anywhere in the world, reaches out her hand to right the wrong, to heal the pain to comfort the suffering,—such a woman is God's woman. It matters not where she may be,—where she was born, under what skies she has lived, she is God's woman, and at the bet she shall find her God.
The study of the rise and fall of great republics shows a remarkable correspondence in them all. They all had like beginnings, having been established by a body of people whose views were in advance of the age and the people among whom they dwelt; who were driven forth from their native country or became voluntary exiles, wandering into new lands, establishing a new system of government, the central idea of which was civil and religious liberty. About this central idea, by industry, perseverance, indomitable courage and patriotism, republics have grown more rapidly and attained to their period of glory in much shorter time than any other form of government. They have also decayed and come to their ruin more rapidly than other equally great nations until statesmen are beginning to ask, Is it possible for a republic to become a permanent form of government? Republics have also grown along like lines, and have come to their ruin from similar causes. The lines of growth correspond with those elements in human nature where men are superior to women. Point out a line of strength which is peculiarly masculine, and you will find a corresponding line of marked progress in all great republics — business enterprise, and inventive genius, the aggressive spirit and warlike nature, are the lines of strength in all the great republics of the world.

On the other hand, Republics have decayed along the lines of our human nature in which men are inferior to women. Those of morality and purity, temperance and obedience to law, of loyalty to the teachings of religion and a love of peace. No republic, ancient or modern, ever died from the lack of material prosperity. Rome, Greece, Carthage, the Dutch Republic, followed in the wake of great wealth, corruption close followed on vice, then barbarism, the vital fate of all. When we find a uniform result in any system of government, it is the part of wisdom to seek for the cause, and if the result is disastrous to the best interests of the nation, it is then the duty of patriots to remove the cause, regardless of prejudice or presedent.

It is an axiom in political economy "that in a republic, the class which votes affects the government in the long run along the lines of its nature." Following this law, it will readily be seen why republics into whose structure men have built their own nature, have manifested in all their lines of growth the strength of the masculine character; and on the other hand,
since women have been excluded from all participation in government affairs, the peculiar characteristics of their nature have never been developed in the nation's life, therefore republics have always become weak and have ultimately come to their death through the decay of the moral and spiritual side of their life.

The question before us then is this: Is there anything in the nature of woman, differing from the nature of man in such a manner, that if women were permitted to vote it would enable them to affect the government differently from the way in which men affect it? In a speech made in Kansas some time since, a United States senator said, "The nature of woman is as different from the nature of man, as the East is from the West." From which fact, he drew the conclusion that women ought to be dis-enfranchised. He further states that, "If women were permitted to vote, the result would not be changed, as they would affect the government just as men affect it." In his speech the senator made a strong plea for the superiority of his sex on the ground of their reasoning and logical powers; and said: "Women cannot reason, but arrive at their conclusions intuitively." On reading the senator's speech one is led to inquire what woman's head he borrowed to enable him to arrive at his conclusions from the premises with which he started. If in a republic every class that votes affects the government in the long run along the line of its nature, and the nature of woman differs from the nature of man as the East differs from the West, how can any reasoning or logical mind conclude that the votes of women would affect the government exactly as those of men? Reason, or intuition, or by whatever mental process women reach their conclusions, they would claim the result of voting of women to be as different from that of men as the East is from the West.

We need no argument to prove that the liquor class is able to affect the government, and that it influences it because of its power in the caucus, at the ballot box and in halls of legislation. Recent laws in many states show us how men interested in many forms of gambling and vice are able to affect the government through the power of the ballot. In one of my old parishes in Massachusetts, a body of men interested in cranberry culture were equally successful in defeating another body of men engaged in the fishing industry, because the cranberry men elected their candidate to the legislature, who through his ability to exchange votes, secured the passage of a bill in the interests of his constituents. Had women owned the property, in whose behalf legislation was secured, they would have done nothing but watch the shiny herring swim up and down the stream which was dammed by legislative enactment, until the last trump was sounded; because, not having votes, they could have sent no representative to the legislature to look after their special interests. If in a republic liquor men, gambling men and cranberry men having votes are able to affect the government, and to affect it along the lines of their nature; and
If women differ from men, as the East does from the West, then the effect of their participation in government would differ less from that of men in like manner.

Wherein does the nature women differ from that of men in such a way that if they voted they would be able to affect the government. It is universally admitted that women are more moral than men. The great moral factor of the world is its womanhood. Men recognize this fact even more than women, as, in all their arguments against the extension of suffrage to women, they claim it would degrade them to the level of men. In the congressional debate over admission of Wyoming territory into the Union as a state, every gentleman who opposed it based his argument upon the woman suffrage plank in its constitution, urging that women are "too good and pure to vote." For the first time in history goodness and virtue were made the basis of disfranchisement.

In response to this sentiment Mr. Carey, the United States delegate from Wyoming, declared this very characteristic of womanhood had compelled both great political parties in that territory to nominate their best men in the caucuses, since the women defeated the immoral men at the polls. Said a woman in Wyoming: "We are not particular to hold offices ourselves, but we are very particular who do hold them." Women are more temperate than men; yet when the state has a temperance question to settle, the ballot is placed in the hands of every distiller, every brewer, every saloonkeeper, every bartender and every male drunkard, and is kept out of the hands of women, the great temperance factor of the world, which, to our intuitive natures, is a mark of very poor statesmanship. Women are also more religious than men; nearly three-fourths of the church members are women, and nine-tenths of the spiritual and philanthropic work of the world is done by them. Yet when it comes to building up the life of a republic this spiritual factor is counted out. And this men call statesmanship. It is charged that women, if possessed of political power, would seek to unite church and state. This statement is wholly without foundation; knowing as we do that such a union would be disastrous to both church and state, women would oppose it even more than men. Yet we answer the gentlemen who claimed that, "there is no place in the politics of this country, He has no place for the politics of any country in which there is no room for the decalogue or the golden rule. What we need more than the settlement of any of the problems which are at present agitating the political mind is an infusion of the golden rule into politics, and of the decalogue into the laws of the land. This cannot be accomplished either by putting the name of Deity into the Constitution, or by the union of church and state, but by bringing to bear upon the government the influence of the class of people where the spiritual strength of the church.

Again, women are more peace-loving than men. This has led some to say that women ought not to vote because they cannot bear arms. This claim is usually made by men who in the hour of
their country's need, send substitutes to the army, or fled to Canada; or else, by the young men who have been born since the close of the war. The class who never made the statement that the ballot and the bayonet go together, are the heroes maimed in battle or broken in health, and prematurely old because of exposure and suffering in their country's behalf. They knew the value of women in war time, and that women do go to war. Had it not been for the forty thousand women who went to the hospitals, visited the camps and battle-fields to care for our wounded heroes, there are thousands with us today who would never have seen home or friends again, but who would be sleeping in unknown graves. These heroes remember not only the services of the women in the field, but the great sanitary commission, sending its millions of dollars' worth of those things which were made for health and comfort, to hospital and field during those terrible years of suffering. But, best of all, they remember the Grand Army of the Republic that stood home, who, when the citizen soldiers laid down the implements of peace, took up the weapons of war, took those implements of peace and went to the workshop, the factory, the counting room, the store and the farm, filling the places of men and earning the livelihood for the family, when prices were such as had never been known in the history of our time; and when the news came, flashing over the wire that they who had gone forth would never more return, the broken-hearted wives, forgetting the agony of their own loss gathered their children about their knees, and asked God that they might be both father and mother to their fatherless little ones; and alone and single-handed all over the land women have reared to manhood and womanhood the children left by their dead heroes as their only legacy. Then some man who never struck a blow in behalf of his country exclaims; "Women must not vote, because they cannot fight." In the face of the loyalty of America's Womanhood the darkest stain on the escutcheon of our country is its utter forgetfulness of their services. From the beginning of its history to the present hour, by no act of Congress or of any state legislature has there ever been any public recognition of the services of its women. By no monument of granite, or marble, or bronze has it ever commemorated the memory of their patriotism. They are as utterly forgotten as if they had never lived, suffered or died for their country.

When a committee appealed to Congress, asking that when the negroes were enfranchised the loyal women might share their freedom, Congress answered; "It is the negro's hour. women must wait." The negro's hour struck, again women asked for liberty, and were again assured that Congress had weightier matters to consume its time and attention -- it had the South to reconstruct, and the North to bring back to a sound business basis. The severest form of punishment it could devise for the crime of treason was disfranchisement, reducing traitors to the level of loyal women, who had given all they had for their cou-
try, and this the only recognition that Congress had ever granted them. I have traveled in many countries, and in every one, save in these United States, I have seen stately monuments erected in grateful memory of the patriotic services of women. We had a faint hope of at least a part in one, when we learned that a national monument to the Pilgrims was to be unveiled at Plymouth, Massachusetts. On the great day, scores of women gathered to witness the ceremonies. We were told that this government had taught the nations of the world the great principle that, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." We sighed as we remembered the taxes we had paid, and yet were refused representation. We were also told that in this country under God the people rule, and yet the constitution of every state in the Union, at that time, declared it was the males, and not the people who rule. The orator again assured us that the powers of this government were just, since governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; but they recently hung a woman, in one of these just states, who had never given her consent of women, her peers, ever been asked regarding it. Then we were told that as the voice of the people is the voice of God, and this was repeated both in Latin and in English, that there might be no doubt in regard to it, that the laws of our land were the crystallized voice of Deity. The speaker, forgetting that in the compass of the people's voice there is a soprano as well as a bass, and that if the voice of the people is the voice of God, we will never know what His voice of the people is until the bass and soprano unite in harmonious sound, the resultant of which will be the voice of God. After many other statements of similar character, which are true in spirit, but had never been practiced by any nation, the monument was unveiled, and our hearts sank with intense disappointment when we read the inscription, "Erected by a grateful country in honor of the Pilgrim Fathers." We had again witnessed the evidence of a country's easy forgetfulness of its debt to women. We felt just as we do when we gaze on that picture so familiar to all of you; a ship in the background, between it and the shore is a man carrying what seems to be a woman in his arms, on the beach kneel a company of people, and farther up the beach stand another group with uplifted hands, thanking God for their deliverance. They look like men and women. You wonder what company of people it is, and read the inscription beneath the picture to learn, that it is not a company of men and women at all, but a representation of the "The Landing of the Forefathers." You instinctively exclaim how kind the forefathers were to carry each other ashore, and how much some of them resemble others, they were all fathers, every mother of them.

There never was another country which had so many fathers—Pilgrim father, Plymouth fathers, forefathers, revolutionary fathers, and church fathers, and fathers of every description—but, like Topsey, we have never had a mother. In this lies the
weakness of all republics. They have been fathered to death. The great need of our country today is a little mothering to undo the evils of too much fathering. Like Israel of old, when the people were reduced to their utmost extremity, in order to save the nation, there was needed a ruler who was at once a statesman, and commander-in-chief of the armies and a righteous judge, who would render justice and be impervious to bribes. God called a woman to rule, and Deborah tells us in her wonderful ode that the great need of the nation is in this extremity was motherhood applied to government, when she exclaims, "Behold the condition of Israel when I Deborah, a mother in Israel, arose." "Then was there peace in Israel" and prosperity and success, as "Deborah ruled the people in righteousness for forty years."

Women are more law-abiding than men. It is universally accepted that the class of people who best obey the laws are best fitted to make them. It is also stated that everything in a republic depends upon the obedience of the citizens to law. I visited the penitentiary of a state whose senator made this statement, and asked the warden how many prisoners he had. He replied, "Eight hundred and eighty-nine, of whom eight hundred are men and nine are women," so that in the State of Kansas the women are a hundred times more law-abiding than the men. In the United States the same year there were sixty-eight thousand and five prisoners, of whom fifty-three were women, showing that as a whole United States there were ten times as many men criminals as women.

It has been claimed that the small number of women prisoners is due to the fact that women have no part in politics, for, in the thought of some people politics are synonymous terms. If, however, this statement were true of women, then were most be engaged in politics would be in prison. We have but one state to which we can turn for statistics. At the close of the census in 1890 Mrs. Clara Bewick Colby, of Washington, consulted the statistics of crime, and learned to our great satisfaction that the only state in the union in which there was not a woman criminal in jail or penitentiary was Wyoming, the state where women had voted for twenty-one years.

It has also been charged that on account of her emotional nature woman's mental condition would be unsettled if she engaged in anything so exciting as public affairs. But Mrs. Colby also learned from the same source that the only state in which there was not an insane woman in public or private asylum was the State of Wyoming, where women have been voting for twenty-five years. She also learned that Wyoming was the only state in which but few men were insane — only three — and concludes that the exercise of suffrage makes women so peaceable to live with that very few men go insane. The same authority points to the fact that Wyoming is the only state in which during the
last two decades the percent of marriage has increased over the percent of divorce.

If, then, in a republic the class which votes affects the government in the long run along the line of its nature, and women are more moral, more temperate, more religious, more peace-loving and more law-abiding than men, then if they were permitted to vote they would affect the government along these lines. It needs but a glance at the world's history to show that these are the lines of weakness in republics, and that they have all died because of their immorality, licentiousness, intemperance, their disregard of their own laws, the violation of the statutes of God, and by their warlike nature, and they can only become strong by the incoming of that class of people who are strong where they are weak. Then shall the voice of the people become the voice of God, and for the first time in history the voice of God shall be crystallized into the laws of a republic.
DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

Eulogy on Susan B. Anthony

Preface: The final tribute was offered by Miss Shaw, of whom an account said: "She had sat through the service with white face and tremulous lips, showing more plainly than others how greatly she was bereaved. It was with difficulty that she controlled herself at the beginning of her address, but she gained self-possession as she proceeded. It was deeply eloquent, given with feeling so intense that one fancied the words were watered with tears. When she spoke of Miss Anthony's last utterances her voice broke; and when she had finished she retired to her seat as if wholly exhausted, bowing head and pressing a trembling hand to it."

The Speech

Your flags at half-mast tell of a nation's loss, but there are no symbols and no words which can tell the love and sorrow that fill our hearts. And yet, out of the depths of our grief arise feelings of truest gratitude for the beauty, the tenderness, the nobility of example, of our peerless leader's life. There is no death for such as she. There are no last words of love. The ages to come will revere her name. Unnumbered generations of the children of men shall rise up and call her blessed. Her words, her work and her character will go on to brighten the pathway and bless the lives of all people. That which seems death to our unseeing eyes is to her translation. Her work will not be finished, nor will her last word be spoken, while there remains a wrong to be righted or a fettered life to be freed in all the earth. You do well to strew her bier with palms of victory and to crown her with unfading laurel, for never did more victorious hero enter into rest.

Her character was well poised. She did not emphasize one characteristic to the exclusion of others. She taught us that the real beauty of a true life is found in the harmonious blending of diverse elements, and her own life was the epitome of her teaching. She merged a keen sense of justice with the deepest love. Her masterful intellect never for one moment checked the tenderness of her emotions. Her splendid self-assertion found its highest realization in perfect self-surrender. She demonstrated the divine principle that the truest self-development must go hand in hand with the greatest and most amiable service for others.

Here was the most harmoniously developed character I have ever
known; a living soul whose individuality was blended into oneness with all humanity. She lived and all humanity lived in her. Fighting the battle for individual freedom, she was so lost to the consciousness of her own personality that she was unconscious of her existence apart from all mankind.

Her unshakable passion for her cause was that it was yours and mine, the cause of the whole world. She knew that where freedom is, there is the center of power. In it she saw potentially all that humanity might attain when possessed by its spirit. Hence her cause — perfect equality of rights, of opportunity, of privilege for all, civil and political — was to her the bed-rock upon which all true progress must rest. There she was nothing, her cause was everything. She knew no existence apart from it. In it she lived and moved and had her being. It was the first and last thought of each day. It was the last word upon her faltering lips. To it her flitting soul responded when the silenced voice could no longer obey the will, and she could only answer our broken hearted questions with the clasp of her trembling hand.

She was in the truest sense a reformer, unhindered in her service by the narrowness and negative destructiveness which often so sadly hamper the work of true reform. Possessed by an unshakable conviction of the primary importance of her own cause, she nevertheless recognized that every effort by either one or many earnest souls toward what they believed to be a better or saner life, should be met in a spirit of encouragement and helpfulness. She recognized that it was immeasurably more desirable to be honestly and earnestly seeking that which in its attainment might not prove best, than to be hypocritically subservient to the truth through a spirit of selfish fear of losing the book of power. She instinctively grasped the truth underlying all the great movements which have helped the progress of the ages, and did not wait for an individual or a cause to win popularity before freely extending it struggling life as hands of helpful comradeship. She was never found in the cheering crowd that follows an already victorious standard. She left that to the time-servers who divide the spoil after they have crucified their Savior. She was truly great — great in her humility and utter lack of pretension.

On her eightieth birthday this noble soul could truthfully say, in response to the words of loving appreciation from those who showered garlands all about her, "I am not accustomed to demonstrations of gratitude or of praise. I have been a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for this movement. Whatever I have done has been done because I wanted to see better conditions, better opportunities for women.

Speaking of Miss Anthony, Lady Henry Somerset said: "She has the true sign of greatness in that she is absolutely without pretension. No woman of fame has ever so thoroughly made this
impression she made upon all who knew her, and, leaving her presence, one would say, "How humble she is!" Viewing her life achievements, one would exclaim, "How transcendentally great she is!" No wonder she has won a name and a fame of world-wide, and that she has turned the entire current conviction. One indeed wrote truly who said of her: "She has lived a thousand years of achievement can measure the length of life."

She whose name we honor, whose friendship we reverence, whose love we prize as a deathless treasure, would say, "This is not an hour for grief or despair. If my life has achieved anything, if I have lived to any purpose, carry on the work I have to lay down." In our last conversation when her prophetic soul saw what we even dared not think, she said: "I leave my work to you and to others who have been so faithful. Promise that you will never let it go down or lessen our demands. There is so much to be done. Think of it! I have struggled for sixty years for a bit of justice and give up without securing it."

Oh, the unutterable cruelty of it! The time will come when at these words every American heart will feel the unspeakable shame and wrong of such a martyrdom!

She did not gain the little bit of freedom for herself, but there is scarcely a civilized land, not even our own, in which she has not been instrumental in securing for some women that which she herself did not attain. She did not reach the goal, but along the weary years what marvellous achievements, what countless victories! The whole progress has been a triumphal march, marked indeed by sorrow and hardship but never by despair. The heart sometimes yearned for sympathy and the way was long, and oh, so lonely, but every step showed some evidence of progress, some wrong righted, some right established. We have followed her leadership until we stand upon the mount of vision where she leaves us today. The promised land lies just before us. It is for us to go forward and take possession. Without faltering, without a desertion from our ranks without delaying even to mourn the loss of our departed leader, the faithful host is marching on. Already the call to advance is head along the line, and one devoted young follower writes (Quotation omitted).

She has not only blessed us in the legacy of her work and example but she has left us the dearest legacy of her love. The world knew Miss Anthony as the courageous, earnest, unflinching champion of a great principle and the friend of all reform. Those of us who knew her best knew that she was all this and more; that she was one of the most home-making and home-loving women. To her own heart, always turned with tenderest longing, and for the one who made home possible she felt the most devoted love and gratitude. She inscribed upon the first volume of her Life History, "To my youngest sister, Mary, without whose faithful and constant home-making there could have
To this home-making sister the affection of every loyal heart will turn, and we, her co-workers, will love and honor her, not alone for this devotion to her sister, but for her loyal comradeship and faithful service in our great cause. She is our legacy of love, and it will be the joy of every younger woman to bestow upon her the homage of affection.

On the heights alone such souls greet God. In silent communion they learn life's sublimest lessons. They are the world's unreal heroes. Her's was a heroic life. By it she has taught us that the philosophy of the ancients is wrong; that it is not true that man are made heros by indifference to life and death, but by learning to love something more than life. Her heroism was the heroism of an all-absorbing love, a love which neither indifference nor persecution nor misrepresentation nor betrayal nor hatred nor flattery could quench; a heroism which would suffer her to see and know nothing but the power of injustice and hatred to destroy, the power of justice, and love to develop, all that is best and noblest in human character. To the causes which such souls espouse, "Failure is impossible." Truly did President Thomas say in her address at our last National Convention, "Of such as you were the lines of the poet Yeats written:

*They shall be remembered forever,
They shall be alive forever,
They shall be speaking forever,
The people shall hear them forever."*

-000-
This year I took for my motto these splendid words: "Truth loses many battles but always wins its war." We did not win the battles that those who fight for the truth are always the people who win. There never was, there never will be greater defeat in human life than the victory which comes to the man or woman who is fighting against the truth, and there never can be a greater futility in any human soul than the fact that it is fighting for the truth, whether it wins or not. This has been a year of victory in that more women have been enfranchised than in any preceding year. We have the largest membership that we have ever had. We come together in hope and in the firm determination that we will fight it out on this line if it takes all summer and all the summer of our life, and then the battle will not be finished unless the victory is absolutely won for all women. While we have cause to rejoice we have also cause for sorrow. As an organization it has been the saddest year we have known or ever can know, for there has gone out from among us the visible presence of her who was our leader for over fifty years, and I have just come with others directly from the home in Rochester where we attended the funeral services of dear sister Mary, who was the first of the two to enter the movement and was always the faithful co-worker and home-maker. Both have folded their hands in rest since our last convention. Each gave her whole life to the cause of woman and each in passing away left all she had to the cause. The sorrow is ours, the peace and the triumph reward of loving service are theirs. I hope we shall spend no time in mourning and turning to the past but with our faces toward the future, strengthened by the inspiration we have received from our great leader, go on fighting her battle until the complete victory is won.
After a brief sketch of the condition of the world after a year and a half of the war in Europe, the address continued:

As an association we are confronted through the eternal law of progress by changes in our methods such as we have not met since the union of the two national societies in 1890. Our enlarged and expanding status as an association, the new and varied duties which devolve upon us the innumerable demands increasing with the accumulation of means and workers call for a new kind of service in leadership. Political necessity has supplanted the reform epoch; the reapers of the harvest have replaced the ploughman and seed sower, each equally needed in the process of cultivation and the development of an ideal as in the harvest of the land. When this movement began, its pioneers were reformers, people who saw a vision and dreamed dreams of the time when all mankind should be free and all human beings have an equal opportunity under the law. Other reformers became possessed by it, and, following it in the spirit of Him who cried, "I was not disobedient to the Heavenly vision," they went forth proclaiming it to the world, knowing that misunderstanding, misrepresentation and persecution would combine to make the task difficult. It was not that they sought persecution but that they loved justice and freedom more than escape from it — these pioneers of the greatest political reform which history recounts. Year after year the task has been carried forward until the time has come when new occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth, and the idealist and the reformer are supplanted in our movement by the politician. Our cause has passed beyond the stage of academic discussion and has entered the realm of practical politics. The time has come when our organized machinery must be political in its character and work along political lines directed by political leaders........

The United States is looked upon as being the most powerful neutral nation, which with its high human ideal is the best equipped to present its good offices in mediation between the warring nations of the East, but is this true? What better preparation could it make than by removing from within its own borders the very cause which led to the present barbarous conditions across the sea? . . . How can the United States, in any spirit of a truly great nation, offer its services as mediator when it is following the same line of action towards its own
people? How can it plead for justice in the East when it denies this to its own women? How can it claim that written agreements between nations are binding when it violates the fundamentals between nations of its own National Constitution which declared that "the right of the citizen to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State," and for forty-five years Congress has turned a deaf ear to the appeal of our own citizens for protection under this law? Is it true that the United States Constitution too is but a "scrap of paper" to be repudiated at will? If, as a mediator of justice, we hold out our hands to lift other nations from the abyss into which injustice has plunged them, they must be clean hands. Our words must ring true.

Many appeals will be made by our association to abandon its one purpose of securing votes for women and turn its attention and organized machinery to the real or imaginary dangers which beset us as a nation, but let us never for a moment forget the spacious promise and assurances that were given for the pioneers, who, when the Civil War took place, gave up their associated work and turned their efforts to its demand in the belief that when the war was over, the country would recognize their patriotic services and the dependence of the nation upon women in war as in peace and reward them with the ballot, the crowning symbol of citizenship. But instead of recognizing their services and rewarding the loyal women, the cry went forth: "This is the negro's hour. Let the women wait" — and they are still waiting. As they wait they are not blind to the fact that this nation did what no other nation has ever done, when it voluntarily made its former slaves the sovereign rulers of its loyal and patriotic women.

The greatest service suffragists can render their country and through it the whole world at this time, is to teach it that there is no sex in love of individual liberty and to stand without faltering by their demand for justice and equality or political rights for men and women.

Dr. Shaw impressed upon the workers, especially the younger ones, not to be discouraged at what seemed slow progress and said:

It has been the privilege of your president to participate actively in twenty-four out of twenty-seven State campaigns; in the New Hampshire constitutional convention campaign, the Wheeling municipal campaign and directly though not officially in all the others except that of Illinois. The vote cast upon the amendments but inadequately expressed the expanding sentiment in behalf of woman suffrage and it needs only consecrated, persistent, systematic service to reach the goal and complete
the task begun by the pioneers of 1848 and led by Susan B. Anthony until her death in 1906. While we accept as our motto her last public utterance, "Failure is impossible," we must also remember her prophetic words, uttered just before she laid down her life work: "There is nothing which can ultimately prevent the triumph of our cause but the time of its coming depends largely upon the loyalty and devotion of those who believe in it."

While recognizing that our primary object is to secure the ballot for women citizens and that as an organization we are not wedded to one method of obtaining it but are willing to adopt any just plan which promises success, nevertheless until a better way is found we will seek to secure an amendment to the National Constitution prohibiting disfranchisement on account of sex, and at the same time will appeal to the States that by their action a sufficiently strong support may be given to the Federal Amendment to secure its adoption, unless it becomes necessary by action of the States themselves. . . .

We must face the fact that large bodies of our new recruits know practically little of the history of the suffrage movement, of the long years of faithful devotion and the wise and statesmanlike service which have brought it to its present position. These recruits are attracted by new and spectacular methods, are impatient of delay and eagerly follow any scheme which promises to "get it quick". . . . If we analyze the arguments set forth by these most ardent advocates of the Federal Constitutional Amendment as the only means of securing immediate results and learn upon what they base their hopes of success, we shall see, as has been shown again and again, that every one of them has its source in the unfranchised states; that instead of state by State action being "wasteful, expensive and slow," it is the foundation of hope. This is the strongest argument in behalf of the wisdom of the founders of our movement, that they recognized the necessity that State and Federal action must go together.

This is the American flag. It is a piece of bunting and why is it that, when it is surrounded by the flags of all other nations, your eyes and mine turn first toward it and there is a warmth at our hearts such as we do not feel when we gaze on any other flag? It is not because of the beauty of its colors, for the flags of England and France which hang beside it have same colors. It is not because it of artistic beauty, for other flags are as artistic. It is because you and I see in that piece of bunting what we see in no other. It is not visible to the human eye but it is to the human soul.

We see in every stripe of red the blood which has been shed through the centuries by men and women who have sacrificed their lives for the idea of democracy; we see in every stripe of white the purity of the democratic ideal toward which all the world is tending, and in every star in its field of blue we see the hope of mankind that some day the democracy which that bit of bunting symbolized shall permeate the lives of men and nations, and we love it because it enshrines our ideals of human freedom and justice.

---

2. On receiving the Distinguished Service Medal from the Secretary of War, Baker, she said:

"I realize that in conferring upon me the Distinguished Service Medal, the President and the Secretary of War not are expressing their appreciation of what I, as an individual, have done but of the collective services of the women of the country. As it is impossible to decorate all women who have served equally with the Chairman of the Woman's Committee, I have been chosen, and while I appreciate the honor and am proud to wear this decoration that I receive any other recognition save by political freedom, which is the first desire of a loyal American. I nevertheless look upon this as the beginning of the recognition of the country of the service and loyalty of women, and above that the part women are called upon to take in times of war is recognized as equally necessary in times of peace. This departure on the part of the National Government through the President and Secretary of War gives the greater promise of the time near at hand when every citizen of the United States will be esteemed a government asset because of his or her loyalty and service rather than because of sex."
While Mr. Wilson declared we want nothing out of the war, I said in my own heart: "It may be that he wanted nothing material out of the war, but, oh, we want the biggest thing that has ever come to the world -- we want peace and Peace forever." If we cannot get that peace out of this war what hope is there that it will ever come to humanity? Was there ever such a chance offered to the world before? Was there ever a time when the peoples of all nations looked towards America as they are looking to-day because of our unselfishness in our dealings with them during the war? We have not always been unselfish but we have been in this war.

The war is over as far as the fighting is concerned but it is only begun as far as the life of the people is concerned. What would there be of inspiration to them to come back to their ruined homes and build up again their cities if within a few years the same thing could be repeated and homes destroyed and cities devastated, the people outraged and made slaves as they have been?

Men and women, they are looking to us as the hope of the world and whenever I gaze on our flag, whenever I look on those stars on their field of blue and those stripes of red and white, I say to myself: "I do not wonder that when that flag went over the trenches and surmounted the barriers, the people of the world took heart of hope. It was then that they began to feel they could unite with us in some sort of security for the future. And that flag means so much to me now. I never look on its stars but I see in every star the hope that must stir the peoples of the old world when they think of us and the power we have of helping to lead them up to a place where they may hope for their children and for their children's children and the things that have not come to them.

We women, the mothers of the race, have given everything, have suffered everything, have sacrificed everything and we say to you now: "The time is come when we will no longer sit quietly by and bear and rear sons to die at the will of a few men. We will not endure it. We demand either that you shall do something to prevent war or that we shall be permitted to try to do something ourselves." Could there be any cowardice, could there be any injustice, could there be any wrong, greater than for us to refuse to hear the voice of a woman expressing the will of women at the peace table of the world and then not providing a way by which the women of the future shall not be robbed of their sons as the women of the past have been?

To you men we look for support. We look for everything of your support back of your Senators and from this day until the day
Welcome to Ky. Delegates

We welcome you with hearts tender with the remembrance of the past, when two of the great historic figures which have made this convention possible gave their labors to Kentucky. In the early fifties, Lucy Stone, in the vigor and freshness of her lovely youth and enthusiasm for high ideals, spoke in the cities and towns on both sides of the Ohio River; and in 1881 she held in Louisville a convention of the American Woman Suffrage Association. She established the "Woman's Journal," which is now edited, with all the noble moral principles and polished literary ability which have characterized it throughout, by her daughter, Alice Stone Blackwell, who is with us today. In 1879 that other heroic woman, Susan B. Anthony, made a tour through central Kentucky and left an enduring monument of her visit in the Equal Rights Association of Richmond, Madison County, which has had the longest continuous existence of any woman suffrage society in the state.

We welcome you with hearts strong with hope for the future. The glorious victories that we have had inspire us and in all the harbinger of hope we see none greater than the Men's Leagues for Woman Suffrage. These prove to us that the men of our country are preparing to extend equal political rights to women, who, since the time when this vast continent was a wilderness, have stood side by side with them in the heroic labors which have made it blossom like the rose with the fairest civilization the world has ever known. In the great International Alliance Congress at Stockholm men of many nations formed themselves into a Suffrage League, and the Men's League of California did grand service in the glorious victory to their State. This noble land extends from California across the continent to Virginia where the latest league of men has just been formed. We see in this general cooperation of the men of our nation a better exposition of the legend on Kentucky's shield, "United we stand, divided we fall," when man and woman shall clasp hands and become a truer realization of the vision of the poet and the patriot.

Hearing Before Congress 1913

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, this is the forty-third year that the women suffragists have been represented by delegations appointed by the national body to speak in behalf of resolutions which have been introduced to eliminate from the Constitution of the United States in effect the word 'male,' to
eliminate all disqualifications for suffrage on account of sex. The desire of our association is not so much to put on record the opinions of this committee in regard to woman suffrage as to plead with it to give a favorable report, so that the question can come before Congress, to be discussed on its merits and then submitted to the various States for Ratification. The Federal Constitution guarantees to every State a republican form of government — that is, a government in which the laws are enacted by representatives elected by the people — we claim that it has violated its own principle in refusing the protection of women in their right to select their representatives, so we are asking for no more than that the consideration shall be carried out by the U.S. Government. As the president of the National Suffrage Association, I stand here in the place of a woman who gave sixty years of her life in advocacy of it, that grand principle for which so many of our ancestors died; Miss Susan B. Anthony. There is not a woman here today who was at the first hearing, nor a woman alive today who was among those that struggled in the beginning for this fundamental right of every citizen. I now introduce Mrs. Susan Walker Fitzgerald of Mass. It has been said that women cannot fight. Mrs. Fitzgerald's father was an Admiral in the Navy and if she can not fight her father could.

3. pp371 Dr. Shaw's Piquant Address — 1913

By some objectors women are supposed to be unfit to vote because they are hysterical and emotional and of course men would not like to have emotion enter into political campaigns. They want to cut out all emotion and so they would like to cut us out. I had heard so much about our emotionalism that I went to the last Democratic National Convention, held at Baltimore, to observe the calm repose of the male politicians. I saw some men take a picture of one gentleman whom they wanted elected and it was so big they had to walk sideways as they carried it forward; they were followed by hundreds of other men screaming and yelling, shouting and singing the "Houn' Dawg"; then, when there was a lull, another set of men would start forward under another man's picture, not to be outdone by the "Houn' Dawg" melody whooping and howling still louder. I saw men jump up on their seats and throw their hats in the air and shout; what's the matter with Champ Clark? Then, when the hats came down, other men would kick them back into the air, shouting, at the top of their voices: "He's all right!" Then I heard others howling "Underwood! Underwood! first, last and all the time!" No hysteria about it — just patriotic loyalty, splendid manly devotion to principle. And so they went on and on until 5 o'clock in the morning — the whole night long. I saw men jump up on their seats and jump down again and run around in a ring. I saw two men run towards another to hug and hold him both at once, and they split his coat in the middle of his back and sent him spinning around like a wheel. All this with the perfect poise of the legal mind in male politics.
I have been to many woman’s conventions in my day but I never saw a woman leap up on a chair and take off her bonnet and toss it up in the air and shout: "That’s the materf somebody. I never saw a woman knock another woman’s bonnet off her head as she screamed; "She’s all right!" I never heard a body of woman whooping and yelling for five minutes when somebody’s name was mentioned in the convention. But we are willing to admit that we are emotional. I have actually seen women stand up and wave their handkerchiefs. I have even seen them take hold hands and sing. "Blest be the tie that binds." Nobody denies that women are excitable. Still, when I hear how emotional and excitable we are, I cannot help seeing in my mind’s eye the fine repose and dignity of this Baltimore and other political conventions I have attended!

-0000-
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As president of the national Suffrage Association I come with this delegation, authorized by the association, to present to you the object for which we are organized — to secure equal suffrage for the women citizens of the United States. We have made these pilgrimages to Washington for many, many years and committees have received us with grace and listened to our arguments, but the difficulty is that they have not permitted our claims to come before Congress, so that body itself might act upon them. Our wish is that we may have a national constitutional amendment, enfranchising the women citizens and preventing the States from depriving them of presentation in the Government. Since the Judiciary Committee has not reported our measure for many years and has not given the House an opportunity to discuss it was have asked that a special committee shall be appointed to consider it. The Senate some years ago did appoint a special committee and our question has been referred to it. We have appeared before it this year and it has again reported favorably. We hope that the administration of which you are the head may use its influence to bring the matter before the Senate and House.

We ask your assistance in one of two ways or in any other way which an appeal to your judgment: First of all that you shall send a special message to Congress to submit to the legislatures of the States an amendment to the National Constitution enfranchising women citizens of the United States; if, however, this does not appeal to you, we ask that you will use the administration’s influence on the Rules Committee to recommend the appointment in the Lower House of a committee corresponding with the suffrage committee in the upper House, one which will have leisure to consider our subject and report on it.

We appeal to you in behalf of the women citizens of the country. Many of them have cast their ballots for the President already and have an influence in the Government; many are very eager to take an equal part and they appreciate the just manner in which since your administration began you have weighed public
questions. Recognizing your splendid stand on the liberties and
erights of the people we appeal to you because we believe you
will bring to ours that same spirit of justice which you have
manifested toward other great issues.

There is not a single reason given upon which to base a hope
for a congressional action that does not rest upon the power
and influence to be derived from the equal suffrage States,
which power was assured by the slow but effective method of
winning state by state. If all our past and present successes
in Congress are due to the influence of enfranchised States, is
it not safe to assume that the future power must come from the
same source until it is sufficiently strong to insure a reason­
able prospect of national legislation? To transform this hope
into fulfillment we must follow several lines of campaign, each
of which is essential to success; 1. By continuing the appeal
which for thirty-seven years without cessation the National
Association has made upon Congress to submit to the Legislatures
of State an amendment enfranchising women and by using
every just means within the power to secure action upon it.
2. By Congressional District organization, such as has been
set in motion by our National Congressional Committee and which
has proved so successful during the past year. 3. By the organ­
ization of enfranchised women, who, through direct political
activity in their own State, and within their own political
parties may become efficient factors in national conventions
and in Congress. 4. By increasing the numbers of equal suffrage
through referring a State amendment to the voters.
FRANCES E. WILLARD
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   GOSPEL POLITICS 1892
How hard men work for votes! They do not assemble the faithful by general bell-ringing and let that end it. Nay, verily! They obey the Gospel injunction: "Go out into the highways, and hedges, and compel them to come in." Carriages are running all day between the voters and the polls, no matter how hard it is to bring the two together. Thus must we go out to seek and save the lost; as eager for our Master's triumph in the individual soul, as politicians are for the elections of their candidates.

This work can not be done by proxy nor at arms length. We ought to have always, in every local union, an active committee of visitation to the homes of those who drink. I beg you to do this, though you do nothing else. Go into homes and saloons, inviting lost men to come to Christ. We must go; we can not send. As an earnest-hearted minister recently said in my hearing: "Salvation by tongues is a failure." The grip of our own hands can alone convey the unbeliever's ham to the firm and tender grasp of the Hand once pierced for us and him.

The Bishop of Durham founded the White Cross League. Its pledge predicts the time when fatherhood shall take its place beside motherhood, its divine correlate, as equal sharer in the cares that have so ennobled women as to make some of them akin to angels. Its blessed pledge declares: "I will Ñ-- Ñ-- Ñ-- to fulfill the sacred command, 'Keep thyself pure'."

Those noble men, Anthony Comstock, of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice and Rev. Dr. Comstock of the White Cross League will address our convention. Their work relates to the overthrow of those Satanic means by which the theory and practise of the abominable crimes against social purity are carried on in our great cities, and from thence spread their leprous taint to every town and village.

Our Department for Suppression of the Social Evil is as yet inoperative. It is greatly to be regretted that we do not yet succeed in winning the services, as superintendent of this most difficult work, of a lady who combines the rare qualities of a delicate perception of propriety with practical ability and leisure. The special aim of this new superintendency will be to trace the relation between the drink habit and the nameless practice, outrages and crimes which disgrace so-called modern civilization; especially the brutalizing influence of malt liquors upon the sexual nature. Besides this we should emul-
ate the example set us by Mrs. Stevens, of Maine, and her clear-headed associates, in providing a temporary home for women whom our police matrons rescue from the clutch of penalties, whose usual accompaniments often render them still more familiar with sin. But the effect upon our minds of such unspeakable disclosures as those of the Pall Mall Gazette, and the horrible assurances given us by such authority as Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, that we should unpardon in the same direction, were the hidden life of our own great cities known, has so stirred the heart of womanhood throughout this land, that we are, I trust, ready for an advance. Had we to-day the right woman in this place of unequalled need and opportunity, we could be instrumental in the passage of such laws as would punish the outrage of defenseless girls and women by making the repetition of such outrage an impossibility. Woman only induce lawmakers to furnish the most available of all possible methods of protection to the physically weak. Men alone will never gain the courage thus to legislate against other men. Crimes against women seem to be upon the increase everywhere. Three years ago the Chicago Inter Ocean gathered from the press in three (in three) weeks forty cases of the direct outrage, sixteen of the victims being girls. In a majority of cases, where the gentler sex is thus hunted to its ruin, or lured to the same pit in a more gradual way, strong drink is the devil's kindling-wood of passion, as everyone knows. Hence the relation of this most sacred work to that of the W.T.G.U. is so close that the press through some of its noblest representatives has, in the last year, appealed to us to ignore the tempted and fallen of our own sex no longer. It is not by the vain attempt to introduce the exploded harem method of secluding women that they are to be saved. It is rather by holding men to the same standard of morality which, happily for us, they long ago prescribed for the physically weaker, that society shall rise to higher levels, and by punishing with extreme penalties such men as inflict upon women atrocities compared with which death would be infinitely welcome. When we remember the unavenged murder of Jennie Cramer, of New Haven, and the acquittal of the ravishers of Emma Bond, a cultivated school teacher in Illinois; when we reflect that the Pall Mall Gazette declares "The law is framed to enable dissolute men to outrage girls of thirteen with impunity," that in Massachusetts and Vermont it is a greater crime to steal a cow than to abduct and ruin a girl, and that in Illinois seduction is not recognized as a crime, it is a marvel not to be explained, that we go on the even tenor of our way, too delicate, too refined, too prudish to make any allusion to these awful facts, much less to take up arms against these awful crimes.

We have been the victims of conventional cowardice too long. Let us signalize the second century of temperance reform by a fearless avowal of our purpose to take up the work of promoting social purity by the insalubrity of right principles and the serious demand for more equitable laws. The Society of the White
Cross will warmly cooperate with our endeavors in this righteous cause. Oh, may some clear brain, true heart and winsome spirit in our great fraternity cry out under the baptism of the Heavenly Spirit, "Here am I, Lord, send me!"

Gentlemen — The temperance women of America have never before asked for one moment of your time. Thousands of them have worked and prayed for your success in the heroic day gone by, but up to this hour they have laid no tax on the attention of the people's representatives in presidential convention assembled. Though the position is a new one, I can not count myself other than at home in your presence, Gentlemen, as you represent that great party which, on the prairies of Wisconsin, my honored father helped to build, and whose early motto roused my girlish enthusiasm, "Free soil, free speech, free labor and free men." But I rejoice today in the sisterhood of the women's party — the Woman's Christian Temperance Union — where I may march side by side with that brilliant Southern leader, Sallie F. Chapin, of South Carolina, who, in our new anti-slavery war, the fight for a free brain, is my beloved coadjutor.

I am here in no individual character, but as a delegated representative of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Forty-eight states and territories, including the District of Columbia, to present to you the memorial of the American home against the American saloon. You will notice that we make no note of foreign drinking customs, but speak directly from our own government. Our society is the lineal descendant of that whirlwind of the Lord known as the "Woman's Temperance Crusade," of 1874, and stands not only for total abstinence and prohibition, but for no sectarianism in religion, no sectionalism in politics, no sex in citizenship. We recognize state rights as to the adoption of these principles, but move forward in one grand, solid phalanx — a society as well known in Florida as it is in Oregon, by the results of the last ten years' work; a society that has an open hand by the Catholic and Protestant, for the foreign as well as the native born.

We know that in America the great olanging mill of government, kept in motion at enormous cost, turns out some one product, and that is protection for life and limb and property. But it seems to us women that the citadel of purity, the palladium of liberty, the home, our brothers have forgotten adequately to protect. Therefore I am here to-day to speak on behalf of millions of women, good and true, but grieved and sorrowful; to ask that the guarantees and safeguards of law shall be stripped...
from the saloons of my country; that their tarnished gold shall
no more pollute our treasury, and that the land we love may
at once and forever go out of partnership with liquor traffic.

Gentlemen, some political party will respond to this plea from
the hearts of women asking for protection from a stimulant which
nerves with dangerous strength the manly arm that God meant
to be woman's shelter and protection, so that man's cruelty
toward those he loves the best. Some party will declare that
when our best beloved go forth into life's battle they shall
not have to take chances so unequal in the fight for a clear
brain, nor run the gauntlet of saloons legalized and set along
our streets. Some party will lay to heart this object-lesson
of the "Nation's Annual Drink Bill," shown in the chart I have
had placed before your eyes today, with its nine hundred mill-
ions for intoxicating liquors, to five millions and a half for
the spread of Christ's gospel.

The Greenback convention has already received with favor this
memorial. Senator Donan, our gallant Iowa champion, has se-
cured its reading in your own great convention and its refer-
ence to your committee. Tomorrow you will act upon it. On July
8 it will be presented to the Democratic convention in this
city, and July 23 to that of the Prohibition Home Protection
party, in Pittsburgh, Pa.

A great chief of your party, who was with us as the hero of your
last convention, said that not in the turmoil of politics, but
as the sacred fireside hearth does God prepare the vessels of a
great, free people. Let me say, gentlemen, that the party that
declares for national prohibition in 1884 shall be the one for
which the temperance women of this land will pray and work,
circulate literature, convene assemblies, and do all in our
power to secure its success. Nor is the influence of these wo-
men to be forgotten or lightly esteemed, as the past has suf-
iciently proved. While I have tried to speak, my spirit has
been sustained and soothed by the presence of that devoted
army which I am here to represent. As womanly, as considerate,
as gentle as the women of the Woman's Temperance Union, from
Alabama to Wyoming, would wish me to be in this presence, I have
tried to be — that I might justly represent them — good-natur-
ed as sunshine, steadfast as gravitation, persistent as a
Christian's faith. I have no harsh word to speak of any. The
liquor traffic is the awful heritage of a less wise, less kind
and less enlightened past. For its existence in this gentler
age we are all more or less responsible.

Let us combine to put it away, "with malice toward none, with
charity for all." Daughters of heroes and sisters of patriots
are those for whose dear sake I have dared to speak to-day.
De Tocqueville said: "Life is neither a pleasure nor a pain; it
is a serious business, to be entered on with courage, and in a
spirit of self-sacrifice." Gentlemen, in that spirit I have tried to speak, not because I wished to be heard, but to present, as best I could, the homes of America in their sacred warfare against the American saloon. May God lead and guide us all into lives and deeds of tenderest charity and divinest toil for the sorrowful and weak.

Some of us have sung the Miriam song of this great party in other days, and whether or not we shall, ere long, chant it requiem depends upon whether or not the party shall be as true to living issues of the present as it was to living issues in the past. For

"New occasions teach new duties,  
Time makes ancient good uncOUTH;  
They must upward still, and onward,  
Who would keep abreast of truth."

We ask you to declare in favor of submitting to the people a national constitutional amendment for the prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, I thank you for this courteous hearing.
FRANCES E. WILLARD

Our Temperance Round-Up

We are wiser than we were; our intellects ought to be all aflame with clear and penetrating thought. We are more loving-hearted than we were; our sympathies ought to move with more compassionate enthusiasm to the rescue where the onslaught is most fierce and the crisis most inevitable. We have a steadiness of purpose that comes of faith in God, and our wills ought to fly with resistless sweep to the execution of both thought and sympathy in glowing deeds.

Resolutions never move backward. Pillar of cloud, pillar of fire, where dost thou lead? This question has burned in my heart as I read the news of our defeat in Illinois and Michigan; our victory in the states that having eyes, have also seen -- the Buckeyes and the Hawkeyes! Sisters, we must send the plea "Home, Sweet Home," into national conventions of the Republican and Democratic parties, when, six months hence, they meet to select candidates for the Presidency of these United States. Thank God, the nation has one senator who declares his purpose to insist on a prohibitory constitutional amendment plank in the platform of his party. You know his name, Henry W. Blair, of the Old Granite State. Let us give emphasis to his demand by rolling such petitions in its support as never before bombarded a political assembly! Let us redeem the pledge made to the senator when he addressed our Washington convention, by intrenching him behind such towers and bastions of petition as will give decisive courage to the good, and bring confusion to the counsels of the base. All honor to the gallant Republicans of Iowa! Every woman's heart blesses them of their party outside that state which has not pierced them of suchlike a javelin, nor a leader in its counsels who has not jeered them as the Don Quixote of the party camp. In Ohio the Republican candidate for Governor planted himself squarely on a license platform; the leading organs exhausted contempt and sarcasm upon our cause before the election, and bitterest curses since, while it seems not unlikely that their carelessness or complicity, or both, have combined with Democratic treachery to render doubtful or futile the most sacred "counts" known to the annals of this country, of votes "for God and Home and Native Land." But if the party that in 1872 at the dictation of the Germans passed the "Herman Raster Resolution," intended as a stab at prohibitory legislation; if the party that now champions license and deludes the unwary with prefix "high," turns a deaf ear to our prayers; and if the party of Judge Headley remains true to its alliance with the rum-power, as undoubtedly it will, and our petitions are once more trampled underfoot of
men, I ask what then would be the duty of the hour? O friends, 3od hath not left Himself without a witness. There is still a party in the land to be helped onward toward success by women. There is one now despised for the single reason that it lacks majority and commands no high position as the rewards of skillful leadership or wily caucusing, but which declares as its cardinal doctrine, that a government is impotent indeed which cannot protect the lowest home within its orders from the agressions of the vilest saloon that would destroy that home. It declares all other issues trifling when compared with this, and insists that the "home guards" shall be armed with the ballot as a Home Protection weapon. Here, then, let us invest our loyalty, our faith and works, our songs, and prayers. Today that party is Endymion, the unknown youth, but the friendship of Diana, the clear-eyed Queen of heaven, shall make for it friends, everywhere, until it becomes regnant, and the two reign side by side. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union was never weak, but it is a giant now. The Pacific Coast, the New Northwest, the South are all with us today. But yesterday, Mary A. Livermore, of Massachusetts, sent to Sallie F. Chapin, of South Carolina, our forces being in convention assembly in both states, this telegraphic message: "If your heart is as our heart, give us thy hand." Back came this message from our gifted Southern Leader; "For God and Home and Native Land, we'll give you both our heart and hand." The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Headed by a Woodbridge, and Aldrich, Lathrap, West and Stevens, with the flush and prestige of success, can not go forth in vain. Auxiliaries are in every important town of all the nation, sometimes ambushed, it is true, little thought of by the public, but ready to execute with promptness all military orders wisely planned and gently given. Our work grows most rapidly where the need is most imminent. Witness Ohio, with five hundred unions this year, outleaping by half, its previous record, and forcing the issue of prohibition with a persistence like that of gravitation, and a faith high as the hope of a saint, and deep as the depth of a drunkard's despair. Look at Iowa, where Judith Ellen Foster started five years ago with a petition of which few took note, but which, like the genie of Arabian story, "expanded its pinions in nebulous bars" until the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has moulded a mighty state's decree, and shaped the whisper of the throne for which a sovereign people declares its sovereign will. Look at Georgia and Florida, where the petitions of our women last winter resulted in the advance step of local; and Arkansas where their efforts secured the banishment of saloons from seventy-five counties by the united signatures of men and women. Look at Vermont, New Hampshire and Michigan, where we have already won the battle for compulsory scientific instruction in the principles of temperance, and tell us, has not God chosen the Crusade Army to be His warriors, indeed? Let no man say, "But you have not the ballot yet, and must not expect recognition from a party." Be it well understood, we do not come as empty-handed suppliants, but as victorious allies. Our
soldiers are not raw recruits, but veterans, wearing well-won laurels. We have no more to gain than God has given us to bestow. Let not the lessons of history be disregarded. Of old and world had its Semiramis and Dido, its Zenobia and Boadicea, may, better still, its Miriam and Deborah. Later in Russia had her Catherine, and England her Elizabeth. But in my thought I always liken the Woman's Christian Temperance Union to the Joan of Arc, whom God raised up from France, and who, in spite of their muscle and their military prowess, beat the English and crowned her King! But evermore she heard and heeded heavenly voices, and God grant that we may hear and heed them every time! To the martyrdom of public rebuke and criticism they will surely lead us, a sacrifice not easy or gentle for hearts to bear; doubtless, also, with some of us to the actual martyrdom by which a national history becomes heroic, but following where those voices lead, we shall steadily pass onward from the depths of this world's pain to the heights of eternity's peace, and, best of all, we shall help to lift Humanity, so weak and bewildered, nearer to the law, the life, the freedom of God in Christ our Lord.
The new movement for the study of the Bible, as the finest of English classics, introducing it into colleges and seminaries of the highest grade, is full of possibilities for Christian progress and development. The marvel is that the Christian scholars should ever have permitted the heathen classics to outrank the psalms of David, the visions of Isaiah, and the wonderful philosophy of the four gospels. But something else needs to be done on the same line, and must be universal before we can fairly call ourselves other than a practically pagan republic. This is the teaching of those principles of ethics that are found in the Scriptures and questioned by no sane mind, whether "Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant." No general movement toward making our public school system an ethical system has yet been inaugurated, except by the W.C.T.U. and this kingdom of heaven has come to the children of the land, as its wont is, "Not by observation" but so quietly that our people hardly know the good thing that has happened to them.

The effort of good women everywhere should be to secure the introduction of a text-book of right-living; one that should teach the reasons for the social code of good manners, every particular of which is based on the Golden Rule and those refinements of behavior which involve the utmost kindness to the animal creation, including the organization of Bands of Mercy in all our public schools. All is sure to come, and that right speedily, as a consequence of the awakened interest of women everywhere in the subject of education, and their increasing power along these lines. The time will come when it will be told as a relic of our primitive barbarism that children were taught the list of prepositions and the names of the rivers of Thibet, but were not taught the wonderful laws on which their own happiness is based, and the humanities by which they could live in peace and good will with those about them. The time will come when, whatever we do teach, we shall teach ethics as the foundation of every form of culture, and the "faith that makes faithful" in every relation of life will become a thing of knowledge to the child of the then truly Christian republic. For we can never teach these things and leave out Christ as the central figure, and His philosophy as the central fact of our system of education. At the same time our teaching must be as far removed from anything sectarian or involving the statement of a creed, as the North Star is from the Southern Cross. There will be no trouble in those days about the opening school with such extracts from the Bible as have been agreed upon by men.
and women of all faiths, and the repetition of the Lord's Prayer with its universal benignities will be a matter of course. It is for the W.T.C.U.'s work to fondly go on quietly to this end, without haste, without rest.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN

By a strange and grievous paradox, the church of Christ, although first to recognize and nurture woman's spiritual powers, is one of the most difficult centers to reach with the sense of justice toward her, under the improved conditions of her present development and opportunity. The sense of authority is here so strong that, while we cannot fail to deplore, we need not wonder at the present condition. Here, as elsewhere, enlightened womanhood will come with the magic open sesame which shall ere-long prevail even against these gates so sedulously barred! Woman, like man, should be freely permitted to do whatever she can do well.

Who that is reasonable doubts that if we had in every church a voice in all its circles of power, it would be better for the church, and hence more effective in its great mission of brotherly and sisterly love. By what righteous principle of law or logic are we excluded from the church councils when we so largely make up the church's membership? Who that did not know it beforehand would believe that good men actually desire to keep us out? Antecedently I would have made my affidavit that nothing could have pleased them so much as to have us come in and share with them the power and honor, as we do the burdens and responsibilities of the church home. Indeed I cannot help thinking that it might be said of us, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have said!" We have not ourselves rightly understood the liberty wherewith Christ hath made woman free by introducing a religion that removes the world from a war footing to a peace basis, thus rendering science possible, with invention as its consequence, from all of which comes a civilization having as its choicest blossom the material efforts and contrivances of the modern home. We have not seen that the old-time duties have been taken from our hands that we might enter upon higher ones, and that to make the whole world home-like is the province of one half the race. But as these truths take possession of our inmost hearts we shall go gently to our brothers, asking them to open every opportunity, and to share with us every prerogative within the Church of Christ. In the United States, the generous spirit of whose mankind now has nowhere been excelled, we have a vantage-ground in any effort that may be quietly and unitedly put forth for the opening of closed doors, ecclesiastical or otherwise. I have long thought that the spectacle of well-nigh a hundred church closed, except at brief intervals when meetings were in progress, was a travesty of the warm-hearted gospel of Our Lord, and I rejoice to see that just as woman's influence grows stronger in the
church, those doors stay open longer, that industrial schools, Bands of Hope, kindergartens, reading-rooms, and like, may open their founts of healing and put a light therein the window, for thee, O brother."

The time will come when these gates of Gospel Grace shall stand open day and night, while womanly ministries shall find their central home within God’s house, the natural shrine of human brotherhood in action as well as human brotherhood in theory.

"Stay in the church and reform it" says one. "No, that is impossible; old churches and old parties are equally crystallized," says another. "Let the W.C.T.U. organize a church and we will join it, every man of us" is the declaration of an influential group. "No we have too many churches already" objects a listener, "let the wheat and the tares grow together until the harvest." Meanwhile many consultations with men and women high in church circles develop on part of some plan like this:

An organization to be formed, called the "Church Union" made up of those willing no longer to leave inoperative the protests of their souls against a government of the church by its minority; this church Union to be open to any and to all who would describe to the Apostle’s Creed, and the triple pledge of total abstinence, anti-tobacco, and social purity, none of them obliged to leave a church to which they now belong in order to join this; men and women to be on an equal basis, and women to be regularly licensed and ordained. The special work of this Church Union would be among the masses of people, still, alas, so generally ungodly and in foreign lands, especially among the women. In this country, buildings now devoted to entertainments and amusements to be utilized rather than new ones erected, and everywhere the steadfast efforts made to go, not send, and not to gorather than to stay at home and say "Come" to the great humanity that beats its life along the stony streets.

But for myself, I love my mother-church so well and recognize so thoroughly that the base and body of the great pyramid she forms are broader than its apex, that I would fain give her a little time in which to deal justly by the great household of her loving, loyal, and devoted daughters. I would wait four years longer, in fervent hope and prayer that the great body of her ministers and her membership may make it manifest to the world that the church of Lady Huntington, Barbara Heck, and Phoebe Palmer, does not hesitate to march with the progressive age it has done so much to educate, nor fear to carry to its logical sequence its life long teachings as to woman’s equality within the house of God. I say this frankly from my present outlook, though so often urged, and not little tempted, and sometimes quite determined to take a new departure. The time will come, however, and not any years from now, when, if representation is denied us, it will be our solemn duty to raise once more the cry, "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise," and step out into the larger liberties of a religious movement where majorities and not min-
critics shall determine the fitness of women as delegates, and
where the laying on her hands in consecration, as was undoubtedly
done in the early church, shall be decreed on a basis of "gifts,
graces and usefulness", irrespective of sex.

W.C.T.U. DEACONESES

I wish that we might here state with all consideration, but
with fearful honesty, our position on the question of women in
the church. But, as I have already said, women are, if possible,
even more to blame than men that they are discounted in the
church as well as in state at this late day. A majority of men
in this country and age have so far outgrown the ignorant not-	ion of their divine right to rule over women, that if we had
but the courage of conviction, and that sense of dignity that
ought to mark us as daughters of the Lord Almighty, men would
within a twelvemonth, seat us beside themselves on the thrones
of government in church and state, ruling the world jointly,
as He meant we should, when, as the Bible says, "He gave to them
dominion."

Truly we have what we take the most pains for, and women must
be up and doing if they expect the cooperation and feality of
men in politics, ecclesiastical or secular. It also seems to
me we should, at this convention, provide for White Ribbon dea-
conses to be trained in our Evangelistic department, taught
to be skilled nurses at our National Temperance Hospital, and
employed by our local unions in preaching, teaching, and visit-
ing the poor and the sick. I am confident that there are men
of the best standing in the pulpit who will not hesitate to set
them apart to this sacred office and ministry in accordance with
the custom of the early church. There are thousands of women,
young and old, whose hearts the Lord has touched and who would
rejoice to find a vocation so sacred and so full of help within
the sheltering fold of the W.C.T.U.

"She spoke of God, and all the place
Was filled with His presence."

Of how many a sweet soul within our borders whose words are true?
What hindereth that they be set apart with every guarantee and
safeguard that can emphasize their gospel ministry? Oh how
many of them has it been said, "The people magnify them."

What a practical element the deaconesses would introduce into
religion. Doubtless, in early days, when conflict was between
idolatry and the worship of God, "divine service" may have
rightly consisted largely in sermon, song, and prayer, but to
call that service now, as is usually done, seems to me a mock-
erzy. There is a delight, a coveted blessed means of growth;
but service now is to our fellow-men, and he whose purse and
work are not invested there knows nothing about "divine service",
and might well name his place of Sunday lounging and aesthetics
the "Church of the Divine Emptiness", and the "Church of the Celestial Sugar Plum".

What the world most needs is mothering, and most of all in the spirit's natural home, the church, and the Sabbath day. It needs the tender sweetness of the alto voice, and the jubilant good-will of the soprano, in sermon as in psalm; tenor and bass become monotonous at last, and full of diapason of power and inspiration is impossible except we listen to the full chorus of humanity. God hasten that great chorus, in church and state alike, with its deep-heart's love and its celestial hope. The "sine qua non" of our success is mutual faith and fellowship. We must have fervent charity among ourselves.

It is not uncharitable to judge an act as good or bad but we should be very slow to judge the actor bad. Only by rising to the sublime sense of our sacred sisterhood with every woman that breathes, be she good or bad, foreign or native, bond or free, shall we find our individual pettiness covered and flooded out of sight by the most inexorable force of all the universe, the force of love.

If I could have my wish for all of us, it would be that in our measure we might merit what was said of that seraphic woman, Elizabeth Barrett Browning. It is an ideal we shall all delight to share: (quotation omitted?)

Envy and jealously light and the intensest fires that ever burn in human hearts; gossip and scandal are the smoke emitted by them. If, as has been said, these passions could, like some modern chimneys, be consumers of their own smoke, a purer and better atmosphere would then prevail.

In all the battle of opinion that rages, and must rage until a better equilibrium is reached in this great nation, be it ours, beloved sisters, to remember that "when either side grows warm in argument, and the wiser man gives first."

Good breeding has been called the apotheosis of self-restraint but the higher evolution is not to need restraining, but to have that inward quietness which, when God giveth it, "who then can make trouble"? All strife in manner, word, and deed, grows out of worldliness, and to this there is but just one antidote, and that is other Worldliness.

One look into the silent heavens, and all our earthly jargons seem unworthy; one deep tone of the forest's mystical aecolian, and our hearts respond in tenderness; one solemn strain that something out of the sea's unutterable anthem, and the soul hears in it that something greater that speaks to the heart alone.

All true soul know that this is true. "Let my soul calm itself, O 3od, in Thee" sings the stormy spirit in St. Augustine. "Live without father and mother, but not without 3od" cries Tolstoi from Russia, that center of the world's unrest.
FRANCES E. WILLARD
Nomination Speech for Gov. St John
at the Republican Convention--1884
Pittsburgh, July 23, 1884

Preface: A pleasant surprise came to me when the Kansas Delegation asked me to represent its members in seconding the nomination of Governor St. John for the Presidency. The stenographer thus reports my words:

Mr. Chairman, Brothers and Sisters in America's Battle for a clear brain; The thing that has been shall be. History repeats itself. Thirty-three years ago, only eight years before the nomination of Abraham Lincoln under the increased impetus of the same movement, John P. Hale and Geo. W. Julian were chosen in this hall.

During their campaign a little girl, a farmer's daughter on the prairies of Wisconsin, sat up until unprecedentedly late at night to "Hear the news from the Free-soil meeting which her mother and brother had gone miles to attend because Hale and Julian were to speak, and she will never forget the eagerness with which she listened to that recital. But how little did she dream that in the interval between those days and those the world would hori-en, and women some forth into public work like singing birds after a thunder-storm! Least of all could she imagined that a royal, free state like Kansas by unanimous invitation of its delegation in the second great "Free-soil" gathering in Lafayette Hall, would accord to her the honor of seconding the nomination of Kansas' greatest leader. But so it was to be!

The heroes of America have been from the first, and will be to the last men of the people. The name of John P. St. John, of Kansas, has already passed into history. His is the rare and radiant fame that comes of being enshrined, while yet alive, in that most majestic of Pantheons, the people's heart. Our action here today will neither lift nor lower his position, for he is "Fortune's now and Fame's; one of the few, the immortal names that were not born to die". His history half heroic, half pathetic has always touched my heart, and I rejoice to rehearse it briefly here today.

Brother and sister delegates, picture to yourselves a lonesome little fellow in the wilderness of Indiana fifty years ago, trying, single-handed, to make his way in the world.

Picture an adventurous youth as, with but a dollar in his pocket, he crossed the "Big Muddy" bound for Pike's Peak, and driving an ox-team over the Rockies and footed it to California.
See him next delving in the mines day by day and studying law
by the camp-fires at evening.

See him at the outbreak of the civil war, waiting for no draft,
hiring no substitute, but baring his own breast to foemen who,
thank God, today are friends! See him next in the senate of
Kansas, then twice elected governor, keeping always near the
people and trusting them in spite of a thousand warnings from
political leaders. I saw him first at Bismarck Grove, Kansas,
in presence of a great concourse, when the campaign for con-
stitutional amendment was at heights. As he came forward,
every man’s hat and every woman’s handkerchief waved in the air,
and while the loud hurrahs resounded, I saw many tear on many
a face on many a gentlewoman of mother, sister, wife, because
they knew he was defender of their endangered homes. They
told me in Topeka, where he had lived for years, that he was
always in his place at church and prayer meeting, no matter
how official duties pressed upon him. They told me how he went
to Leavenworth when letters threatening his life warned him to
stay away, and being met en route by a temperance delegation
whose anxiety was so great they had come to protect him, he
showed them the letters which, until that moment, no one had
been aware, saying: “Our cause must have its martyrs as well as
heroes, and I might as well be ready.”

It seems to me the world must have in every age the object-
lesson of new lives dedicated to all the most exalts humanity,
and here we have this one which God has set up high where all
may read.

I never heard John St. John traduced, saved by the myrmidons
of the saloon. The party that now reviles would have adored
him had he been a little less loyal to our cause. The Senate’s
open door would have been before him if indeed had entered it
already. But now, forsooth, he is “an office seeker” when he
holds on high the standard for us who can give him nothing but
gratitude; when he lays his lofty fame a sacrifice upon the
altar of our holy cause!

I yield to none in admiration of these glorious veterans, John
Russell, James Black, and Gideon Stewart. History will place
their names beside those of Phillips and Garrison upon her roll
of honor; they were the adventurous pioneers who struck out in-
to a forest of prejudice and blazed the trees. But to make our
way across the Sierras of difficulty they still separate us from
the Eldorado of success, we want a “Pathfinder” and we believe
the “Fremont” of our battles to be John St. John.

For Dr. R. H. McDonald, I have the highest esteem, his lofty
character and generous help command my admiration and my
gratitude; but as between two noble men we must choose the one
who, as a sun-glass, will focus the most votes, and I believe
Governor St. John to be the man.

Dear women of the white ribbon here assembled, you know that from all this land went up the voice of supplication when the call for prayer was made just before the first of these party conventions, in May last! We prayed that America might have a plank in some platform declaring for national prohibition for the sake of home protection, and a candidate whose character and personal habits mothers might safely commend to their sons. In Governor St. John we have an answer to that prayer. When I think of what he is to the temperance folks of the nation, I know that in ten thousand homes these words of England's laureate will strike responsive chords! (poem omitted).

On behalf of the Kansas delegation, I second the nomination of John St. John, of Kansas.
FRANCES E. WILLARD

The Greatest Party

1888

From "Glimpses of Fifty Years" pp. 447-453.

Preface: "I had been invited to make a Decoration Day speech before the Army of Blue and Gray. Here follows the substance of this address:

Here side by side sit the Blue and Gray. No other than the Prohibition party ever dared to be so great as to ordain a scene like this. I speak the words of truth and — soberness.

What a circle we have here! Sweep the compasses of thought its circumference. Prohibition, first of all, the fixed point whence we calculate all togethers. The Blue and the Gray, the working-men, and the women. Inclosed and shielded by this circle is the home — that goes without saying; and beyond its shining curve is the saloon, out-matched, out-witted, and out-voted, which, in a republic, is best of all. For the fiat of the greatest party has gone forth, and we are here simply to set our seals to it; no saloon in politics or law, no sectionalism in law and politics, no sex in citizenship, but liberty, equality, fraternity in politics, and law, now and forevermore.

This is our platform in a nutshell, and it is a platform of four ideas, at least.

When, in all history, were such matchless issues espoused by such magnanimous men?

There are two other parties; big, but not great; multitudinous, not masterful. Their issue is adipose, not muscular. The issues of the one are made literally out of old cloth, of all-wool tariff, warranted to wash in yet one more campaign, and the ensanguined shirt warranted never to be washed at all. Those of the other are spoils and Bourgonism. They will soon rally their respective clans to their stereotyped, old-fashioned conventions in Chicago and St. Louis, prepared to fight, bleed, and die for their country and its offices once more. Not a woman will be in their delegations. A woman might displace a man. Not a word about the home. No decisive utterance as to the greatest of our national perils.

Probably women would not attend these conventions, even were their presence sought. They certainly could not hold their own at the bar of the saloon, while in the greatest party they are only required to hold their own at the bar of public opinion.

Meanwhile, as if to set before these brethren a loftier example,
the greatest party welcomes here the home-folks to equal oppo-
portunities and honors, and rallies here to a remnant of the
noble veterans who have learned that is it good to forgive,
best to forget, attesting by this splendid and fraternal object-
lesson — one that indeed includes "the people of these United
States" — and that the Blue and the Gray are to us emblems of
nothing less than the blue sky that bends its tender arch above
us all, and the gray ocean that enfolds one country and one flag.

Grant would have rejoiced to look upon a scene like this —
he whose most memorable words were, "Let us have peace!" by whose
sick-bed stood General Buckner of the Confederate Army and to whose
recent birthday celebration rallied Fitz H. Lee and other
Southern braves.

The leaders of the party that was great when great Lincoln was
its chief, are pleased in these days of its fatal degeneracy
to call us the "St. Johnites." He is our patron saint — Heaven
bless him! — who laid himself upon the altar of our sacred
cause, and in the flame of partisan wrath that followed the de-
feat of 1884 proved to be a whole burnt-offering, yet I pre-
sent him to you here tonight, one of the most gallant Union
soldiers, "without the smell of fire upon his garments".

That party dare not gather Blue and Gray at its convention lest
they should spoil its ammunition and tip one chief plank of
its platform into the last ditch. What would it do if thus
ruthlessly deprived of the time-worn utterance about "a free
ballet and a fair count," which in its long years of supremacy
it has proved itself impotent to secure while the greatest party,
by dividing the white vote into two hostile camps on the pro-
hibition issue, is opening a straight path for the black man
to polls.

The women who uniformed their sons in Southern gray, and said,
like the Spartan mother of old, "Come ye as conquerors or come
ye no more," are here tonight with those other women who belted
Northern swords upon their boys in blue, with words as pit-
iful, as brave. The women who embroidered stars and stripes
upon the blessed flag that symbolized their love and faith
today have only gentle words for those who decked their "bonny
flag of stars and bars" with tenderness as true and faithful as
and fervent. The greatest party seats these women side by
side tonight, and we all wear our snowy badge of peace above
the hearts that hate no more, while we clasp hands in a com-
pact never to be broken, and solemnly declare, before high
Heaven, our equal hatred of the rug power and our equal loyalty
to God and home and native land.

What hath God wrought? Surely a winsome thing is the human
heart. It went against the grain for us to hate each other,
did it not, dear Southern friends and allies? Never in history
was there a war involving so little personal animosity. The
French by nature hate the English, and speak about "perfidious Albion," and we know that "lands intersected by a narrow fifth abhor each other," but our great unsevered continent was meant for an unsevered people, and "man breaks not the medal when God cuts the die." One Anglo-Saxon race, having one heritage of a queenly language and a heroic history of hardships mutually borne -- it was hard for us to hate each other. The soldier learned that first, brave and chivalric fellows, and they helped to teach us stay-at-home the gracious lesson fraternity. How often was the rude wreath of leaves placed on the grave of a Confederate by the Union soldier who had killed and yet who had wept over him! The fury of the non-combatant was almost the only fury that survived Grant's brotherly words to Lee at Appomattox.

Devoted to the stars and stripes, the sentiment of patriotism having been, from childhood, like a fire in the bones with me, I have wept over the flag for love of which great Stonewall Jackson and gallant Albert Sidney Johnston died. Nor do I envy the Northern patriot who can read without a tugging of the heart that wondrous poem by Father Ryan, the Southern Catholic priest, about the "The Sword of Lee" and I can hardly trust myself to repeat his requiem of the Southern flag: (poem omitted).

Not that I loved that flag. No, brothers. I loved the slave too well not to desire its downfall; but then, so many brave hearts bled for it, so many gentle women wept for it, that I could be sincerely sorry for their grief, and yet be loyal to an emancipated race and my own glorious North. When troops were mustered in 1865, we little dreamed that less than ten years latter the home guards of the land would be mustered in to the war of the crusade. God bless the crusade state, the veteran of our army!

As the genius of that mighty movement, God's pentecost of power upon the nations, behold the women who, only a year ago, went to the polls to persuade men to cast their ballot for prohibition in Oregon and Texas, in Michigan and Tennessee. If the voters of the greatest party are true to us as we have been and will be true to them, ten years hence we will help those who were beaten in four states that stood for constitutional prohibition in 1885, with our guns that are ballots, as we are now helping with our bullets that are ideas.

I never expected to speak with pride about the Solid South as such, but surely I may do this now that is becoming solid for the "dry ticket," and you who dwell there may be glad that the Northern heart is fired once more, this time with same war-cry as that which fires the Southern, and it "protection for our homes." That is the spell to conjure by. That is the rallying cry of North and South, Protestant and Catholic, of
white and black, of men and women equally. Bourbon Democrat and Radical Republican will seek in vain to stifle that swift swelling chorus, that "chorus of the Union," for which Lincoln vainly prayed in his first inaugural. Do you not recall this marvellous concluding sentence (I quote from memory): (quotation omitted). The angel is the temperance reform, and the fulfillment of that prophecy we have lived to see.

The greatest party stands for nationalism as against sectionalism; it stands for the noblest aims and aspirations of the wage-worker as against the monopolies that dare to profane that holy word, "trust"; it stands for the future in politics as against the past, the home vote with an educational test against the saloon vote with a beer-breath as its credentials; and best of all, it stands for the everlasting and absolute prohibition of sin as against any alliance between sin and the government. For while the greatest party will never hesitate to be the champions of these causes good and great, so closely linked with its own central purpose, neither must it fail to put prohibition by law and prohibition by politics so far in the lead that no candidaman can for a moment question the august supremacy of these overwhelming issues. We are firmly persuaded that the separation of the people into two distinct armies, one voting for men who will outlaw the poison curse and the other for men who will legalize it, must, come and that such separation can not come too soon. We are here to speak harsh words of armies rallied under ensigns, but simply to declare that in this great emergency we can not depend upon them. Party machinery and the ambition of party leaders today stand between the people and their opportunity. We would clear track for prohibition. We are bound to do it. For that were we born, and for that came into the world.

When I think of Lexington and Paul Revere; when I think of Bunker Hill and the dark redoubt where General Warren died; when I think of Washington, that greatest of Southerners, upon his knees in prayer at Valley Forge; when I think of Stonewall Jackson praying before he fought; of Robert Lee's and Sidney Johnston's stainless shields; when I remember Sheridan's ride to the sea with the boys in blue behind him, and Grant fighting the battle out and on to the glorious triumph of our Northern arms, then my heart prophesies with all a patriot's gratitude, America will win in her bloodless war against the awful tyranny of King Alcohool and King Zambrinus, and proud am I to have a part in it, for, thank God, "I — I, too, am an American.

Bound together by our mutual faith in Mary T. Lathrop, of Michigan and Sally F. Chapin, of South Carolina; cemented by the martyr's blood of Iowa's George B. Haddock and Mississippi's Frederick Dau Zambrill; made one by the pride we feel in these grand old pionners, John Russell, the father of our party; James Black, its earliest presidential candidate; Hideon T. Stewart and E. W. Tompson, St. John and Daniela, the heroes of a new
a new day and a more dreadful crisis; Green Clay Smith and Samuel Dickie, Hopkins and Brooks, Clinton B. Fish and George W. Rain, and glorious old Neal Dow, the father of prohibition for the world, surely temperance people of the North and South may well say to each other, "Whither goest thou I will go; where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God. The Lord do so to me, and more, also, if aught but death part me and thee."

Here, upon Indiana's genial soil, midway between the sections that shall ere long be sections no more, but part of the greatest party's family circle, gracious and great, let us say unit ed to the fire-eaters on the one side and chasm-diggers of the North on the other; (poem omitted).

In the spring of 1863, two great armies were encamped on either side of the Rappahannack river, one dressed in blue and one in gray.

A twilight fell, the bands of music of the Union side began to play the martial strains, "Star-Spangled Banner" and "Rally 'Round the Flag," and this musical challenge was taken up by those on the other side, who responded with "Bonnie Blue Flag" and "Away Down South in Dixie." But after awhile it was borne in upon the soul of a single soldier in one of those bands of music to begin a sweeter and more tender air, and slowly as he played it, they joined with all the instruments on the Union side, until finally a great and mighty chorus swelled up and down our army, "Home, Sweet Home." When they had finished there was no challenge o'er yonder, and every Confederate had taken up that lovely air, so attuned to all that is holiest and dearest, and one great chorus of the two great hosts went up to God; and when they had finished came from the boys in a fray a challenge, "Three Cheers For Home," and as these cheers went resounding through the skies from both sides of the river something upon the soldier's cheek washed of the stain of powder.

Fellow soldiers in the fight for a clear brain, I am proud to belong to an army which makes kindred of those who once stood in arms against each other. Let us cherish North Carolina's motto from Isaiah's words: "Fear not, I am with thee; I will bring thy seed from the east and gather them from the west; I will say to the North, give up, and to the South, keep not back; bring my sons from afar, and my daughters from the ends of the earth." I am glad to these good times, and I think we women are in them, equal members of the greatest party, as we have been since the day of its birth.
Social Purity


I trust you will all feel there is an absolute obligation laid upon you as the result of what has passed through your heart and brain this morning, enough to put your names to this petition. It has been circulated from one end of the country to the other, and notwithstanding a large portion of us who are present, have put our names upon it not, yet let us remember that it is a very important thing.

Now in closing this significant meeting, a poor little Protestant nun comes before you and feels that she hasn't much right to speak to you at all; feels that the high and solemn mysteries, that have been spoken of in such varied tone and manner today, are those that she ought not to try to deal with; feels more than ever the inadequacy of one whose life has been spent, to try to speak of these things. All the time the ladies have spoken so bravely, or so tenderly, on this historic morning, my thoughts have been at work. I have seemed to see those two who went forth hand in hand from Eden on the saddest of all mornings, after the fall, and I have said in my heart, Oh, if those clasped hands had never parted company, our poor world would (not) have been the place God wants to see, and the place Christ came to make it. I have said in my heart, would that the other half of the audience were here. This is only half the circle; we ought to have it built out and had the others here. So I have only to offer you the thought that every objection that has been brought forward, every philosophical statement that has been made, is based upon, that out of the aggregation of men by themselves, always comes harm; out of the coming of men and women into true, and noble, and high conditions, side by side, always comes good. Where it is that you have this curse most deeply rooted and most apologised for by men? In the camp of the soldiery. What would woman's coming forward into that life tend to bring about? The reign of peace. The mother heart that can not be legislated out would say: "I will not give my sons to be butchered in great battles" and we would have arbitration.

My noble friend who spoke so bravely, Mrs. Hoffman, said, I call marriage a contract -- we want to see it -- this question resolves itself into all the magnificent enterprises represented by these women who stand on this platform, while doubtless you are in the audience, stand just as true in your own circles. So that my heart is full of hope, and out of the long savagery, and darkness, and crime, I see you coming up and the brightness and the beauty of the new civilization. I
see the noblest men of the world's noblest race, the men of the
Age-Saxon class, who make this audience possible; the men who
have thus striven and worked side by side with us, to bring
about these great conditions, shall place upon woman's brow the
crown of Minerva, and lead forward to help them make a new
government, so I speak to you the words of hope. There is noth-
ing on this earth that I tried more earnestly to instill into my
girl's hearts, when I was teaching them, than a superior,
womanly self-respect. I doubt if we have it as the women of the
future will, or as we ought to have it.

My I pass signs in the street; I pass exhibitions of women in
the cigar stores and saloons that, if we were self-respectful
as we ought to be, couldn't stay there over night; I see a
beautiful women in beautiful robes walking the streets or
hear them in fine social surroundings, with a man at their
side, puffing tobacco-smoke in their faces and eyes; and I say
that it is a survival of past savagery and debasement and im-
olation of woman. If there is anything on earth I covet that
pertains to men it is their self-respect. No man would be
seen with a woman with the faintest tint or tinge of tobacco
about her; no man would allow himself to enter into marriage
with a woman of known habits of drinking or impurity; it isn't
thinkable. When I see women coming out before men, or when I
knew they do, see them, they are not women with whom I am so-
cially acquainted-revealing the sacredness of the pure symbol
and badge of their womanly nature, coming out so that the joke,
and jest, and jibe, are uttered in the ante-room where young
men smoke cigars and hob-nob together, I say I would weep my
life out that a woman thus appears, thus decked, thus dressed,
without that style from women the hem of whose garments, she
would ashamed to touch. Let us have self-respect. Let us be
clothed with a raiment of purity that ought to guard the vir-
gin, the mother, and the wife.

When we assemble socially and allow scenes to be put before us
that are indecorous and shameful, we passed from purity and
self-respect that must and shall characterize the woman of the
future. Oh, friends, these things are so deep in my heart;
girls come and ask me, "would you dance round dances?" "Oh, my
sister, my dear little sister, no; I don't dance round a dance."
The women of the future will not do it. I walked the aisles of
the picture galleries of Europe. I saw men in those historic
paintings, with their ear-rings, and their fingers covered with
rings, bedecked with ruffles, and dressed in all hues that the
peacock and the rainbow could supply. That was the time King
Louis XIV said, "The State is I." They are nothing but a par-
cel of courtiers. When a woman shall be able to say to the
State, "I am part of you just as I am part of anything that
breathes;" when she shall say, "I am part of society; I
am part of everything that man values,"; then the calm equipoise
shall come; and for that I would like to live; for that I would
like to speak. Persons who know more about it than I do tell me
that women who give their lives to shame, women who are on the
street corners with their invitations at night, are women who
have from the very look of the face and configuration of the
head, the symbols and emblems of no self-respect. The super-
ior, queenly woman is the one that has the most self-respect, and
sees its application to everything around her, and makes every
man feel that he would as soon die, as offer her an insult.

The brothers of the women—the Arabs love to say of a pure man
that he is a brother of girls—the brotherly men will come
forward to meet and respond to the sisterly woman. When we are
not toys, when we are not dolls, but duchesses, when we stand
before them royal, crowned with heart of love and brain of
fire, then shall come the new day. I ignore nothing that has
been said. I am in hearty sympathy with all. IBut, in my own
thought, this has come to be the key-note that must be struck.
3d grant that we may be so loving, and so gentle in it all,
that there shall be no vanity, no pride, for the grandest nat-
ures are the humblest.

Let me speak a word of hope. I heard this statement from a
woman who has come from Germany, a woman who for years a stu-
dent in the universities. She says the professor's wives tell
her that the new science has developed this thought and that
the professors are saying of the young men, "If you want a
scintillating brain, if you want magnificent power of imagina-
tion, conserve every force, be as chaste as your sister, put
your power into your brain that throbs like an untired engine."
I do not know how you feel, but I want to take this woman by the
hand, this sweet-faced and sweet-voiced English woman, who,
last night when all of us were asleep, went out into the holin-
ess of the moonlight and saw that our capital was not so bad
as London; this woman who went to see the little girl that had-
't been taught and hadn't been helped, and came from her coun-
try home and was getting tangled up in the meshes of Babylon.
3d bless you, Mrs. Chant, you are welcome to America. I thought
while you were speaking, of what Whittier said of the countrie.

We women are clasping hands. You know not how much of it means.
I have sought this woman from over the water. I wanted her to
come over here with her large experience in the work. I have
not seen so many sorrowful girls, and I don't know how to reach
them in a natural way, and I have asked her if she will stay
and teach us, and she says she will stay in America if we want
her. Are you glad? So understand that the W.C.T.U. is going
to keep Mrs. Chant here and send hereabout her sweet evangelism.
Now, I think dear friends, that we have certainly this morning
boxed the compass of this wonderful thought.
We only wish to turn all the bullets into printer's type; we only wish the war to be a war of words, for words are wings; they are full of lighting. Every brain the open furrow, every word the seed cast in, and you have humanity brought to a different plane; but you can't do it alone; you can't do it unless you come alone together; it is easier to climb up by taking hold of hands.

Somebody who has studied these things a great deal said to us: You can tell harmonious and organizing nature, because the involuntary position of the hands will be like that "(folded together).

See a little, loose, stray snowflakes come down through the air; it falls and melts and is no more. Now see others come along talking in that noiseless, gossiping way together, and as they come down more and more they have evidently got something on their minds. After awhile these are joined by others, and, their organized attack will make a drift thirty feet high that will stop a fifty-ton engine.

Now, women are snowflakes. And the organized attack is against this old, hoary-headed, materialistic, conservative way of doing things. And the mighty breeze that is shall set them flying is the new sense of sisterhood, and it will bring in all that is good, and true and pure. It has been the curse of humanity in the past that half the wisdom, more than half the purity and more than half the gentleness did not find any organic expression. Now it is getting expression, and we are here not only to see it and sit by, twirling our thumbs and watching it come, but we are here to put in all our mighty force to make it come. Each woman that has just sat here and lent a kind attention has helped it. Each one who has gone away and spoken a kind word has helped it. Each one that has lifted an aspiration toward the great Heart that holds the world has helped it.

The highest power of organization for women is that it brings them out; it translates them passive into the active voice; the dear, modest, clinging things didn't think they could do anything, and is and behold! they found out they could. They come to you with a quiver of lip, and look at you so hopeful and expectant; and wonder if they could do something; and a year or two after, you hear them with a deep voice and perfect equipoise telling...
I will tell you how it is with me; I go like a bee into the
gardens of thought; I love to listen to all the voices, and I
go buzzing around under the bonnets of the prettiest flowers
and the most fragrant, just like this bee, and when it is a
lovely life and a sweet life, like the lives of those who
have spoken to us today, it seems to me I get a lot of honey;
but I have wonderful bee-line fashion of carrying it all home
to my own Methodist hive. I couldn't do any other way. I am
made that fashion; it is part of me. It is worked into the woof
and warp of my spirit, the result of the sweet old ways in which
I was brought up. I should have to deny myself in my in-most
heart, if I didn't believe what mother had taught me at her
knee, if I didn't, above all the teachings and all the voices,
reverence that voice that calls to me from the pages of the
Bible; if I didn't, above all things and always, in my men-
tality and spirituality, translate God into terms of Jesus
Christ. I cannot rest except there. And so I frankly tell
you how it is with me this sweet Easter day. The inmost voices,
deep down in my heart, says: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!
Receive it as I set here listening to women whom I love and
revere and honor for their loyalty to what they believe is the
highest and best. Receive it as I go forth into the crowded
ways of life with so many voices calling me on every hand.
Receive my spirit!" It will be the last thought that this
brain will think, it will be the quiver of this heart that has
ached and rejoiced, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!"...
If to all things like this our brothers and war, "It is not because you are inferior that we don't want you to vote, but because you are too good and nice and pure to come into politics," then I say to you: "My friends, we don't expect to leave political affairs as we find them; not at all. You, our brothers all alone by yourselves and no women with you, have constructed this "filthy pool" that you talk about so much, and that you don't admire, and you can't make it any worse. You know that into the witch's broth they pour all the ingredients together. Now, you have all the ingredients there are, except women's votes. Turn them in; it may be the branch of sweetness that it needs; and certainly it can't be any worse." So I want to say to by brothers, that we are coming in, as we believe, just as we should go into a bachelor's hall. We should take along a broom and dust-brushes and dust-pans, open the windows and ventilate the place, and try to have a general "clarin" out and that is exactly what we want to do in Old Aunt Columbia's kitchen. Brother Jonathan hasn't kept house very good, and if the place ever needed a "clarin" out we think it is the kitchen of Uncle Sam. So we have made up our minds and you will see us coming in, and nothing on this universal earth will keep us out of it. It seems to me just the difference between the smoking car and the parlor-car; and how everything but wholesomeness and nice it is in the smoking-car. It seems to us women that every great thought must be incarnated, that disembodied principles and every principle seeks a hand that can cast its ballot into the urn, where a republic manufactures its own destiny. And so we believe that into this magnificent scene we may well enter, because the weapons are not carnal, but spiritual. We believe that when coal in the mine and not in the grate will warm you; when flour in the barrel and not in the loaf will feed you; when wool on the sheep's back, and not woven into cloth will cloth you; when public sentiment that is lying around loose and not gathered up through the electric battery of the ballot box, or sent tingling along the wires of law, will change the ways of men.

God made woman with her faculties, her traits, her way of looking at all great questions from the highest to the lowest, and he made her to be a helpmate for man, and he made man to be a helpmate for her; he made them to stand side by side, sun-crowned; he made them to stand in a republic, as I believe
bearing equally its magnificent burdens. I like to see how
men are grandly meeting the uprising of womanhood. I recog-
nize, and so do we all, that it was a man that encouraged us
when we made our first ventures; that it not with any special
purpose to keep us down that men do not let us enter politics,
but that they are sort of considering it; they are waiting for
us to be a little more anxious. They are waiting themselves
to get wanted to the notion, and they are growing rapidly.
The time is not distant, and every man knows it who hears men
But I do not forget that if we come, you and you only must open
the door!

You are told that public opinion seems to demand the saloon,
and as a White-Ribboner I ask, "Whose public opinion? That of
the home?" "Oh, no; the home is a solidly against it." "Whose
public opinion? That of the church?" "Oh, no; two-thirds of
the church is made up of women." "Whose public opinion?" That
of men who drink and men who sell, and men in professional
business and political life, who don't like to get the ill-
will of those who drink and sell. Thus, as the outcome of
deliberate choice, based upon motives wholly selfish, these men
have saddled the liquor traffic on this nation. But the nation
has great guns of power pointing sublimely up into vacancy.
We want to bring them to the level of our use, and send their
shout banging into the eyes of the foe. It is this purpose of
arming women with the ballot that makes me so perfectly at home
on a platform like the present. It is this which brings me to
do homage to these grand pioneers, just as you do, and no one
can pay them too much gratitude and honor.

Let us be grateful that our horizon is widening. We women
have learned to reason from the effect to the cause. It is
considerable a fine sign of a thinker to be able to reason from
cause to effect. But we, in fourteen years' march, have learned
to go from the drunkard in the gutter, who was the object lesson
we first saw, back to the children, as you will hear tonight;
back to the idea of preventive, educational, evangelistic, so-
cial, and legal work for temperance; back to the basis of the
saloon itself. We have found that the liquor traffic is joined
hand in hand with the very source of the national Government.
And we have come to the place where want prohibition, first,
last, and all the time. While the brewer talks about vested
interests, I lend my voice to the motherhood of the nation that
has gone down into the valley of unutterable pain and in shadow
of death with the dews of eternity upon the mother's brow, given
birth and being to the sons who are the "vested interests of
America's homes.

We offset the demand of the brewer and distiller, that you
shall protest their ill-gotten gains, with the thought of
these most sacred treasures, dear to the hearts that you, our brothers, honor -- dear to the hearts that you love best. I bring to you this thought tonight, that you shall vote to represent us, and hasten the time when we can represent ourselves.

I believe that we are going out into this work, being schooled and inspired for greater things than we have dreamed, and that the spirit de corps of women will prove the grandest sisterhood the world has ever known. As I have seen the love and kindness and good-will of women who differed so widely from us politically and religiously, and yet have found away down in the depths of their hearts the utmost love and affection, I have said, what kind of a world will this be when all women are as fond of each other as we strong-minded women are?

So, friends, we, as I think of the New America, the good times coming, when He who is the best friend that women ever knew, the Christ of God, shall rule in our hearts and lives, not outwardly, but by its spirit -- as I think of it all I say to myself, I am glad I am alive, I am glad I was not alive till this last part of the nineteenth century, I am glad I shall be alive when the golden hinges turn and roll wide open the door of the twentieth century that shall let women in; when this bighearted brotherhood of broad-shouldered men who have made it possible for us to have such a council as this, who listen to us and are more pleased with us than we are with ourselves -- and that is saying a great deal -- and who, if we write a book that is interesting, or a song, or make a speech, are sure to say, "That is good; go on, and do better next time; we will buy your books and listen to your speeches," -- when these men shall see that it was not to the harm of the home, but for its good we were working for temperance and for the ballot.

Home is the citadel of everything that is good and pure on earth; nothing must enter there to defile, neither anything which loveth or maketh a lie. And it shall be found that as society needed to make it altogether homelike was the homefolks; that all government needed to make it altogether pure from the fumes of tobacco and the debaseing effects of strong drink, was the homefolks; that wherever you put a woman who has the atmosphere of home about her, she brings in the good time of pleasant and friendly relationship and points with the finger of hope and the eye of faith always to something better -- always to something better and farther on. As I look around and see the heavy weight of apathy under which so many still are stifled, who take no interest in these things, I just think they do not mean the hard words that they sometimes speak to us, or they wouldn't if they knew; and after awhile, they will have the same views I have, spell them with a capital V, and all be harmonious, like Farrar's happy family, a splendid menagerie of the whole human race -- clear-eyed, kind and victories.
Preface: This was the only time Miss Willard appeared before a Suffrage Committee in the capitol and she was heard with much interest. Beginning with the playful manner which rendered her speeches so attractive, she closed with great seriousness.

I suppose these honorable gentlemen think that we women want the earth, when we only want half of it. We call their attention to the fact that our brethren have encroached upon the spheres of women. They have definitely marked out that sphere, and then they have proceeded with their incursion by the power of invention. They have taken away the loom and the spinning-jenny, and they have obliged Jenny to seek her occupation somewhere else. They have set even the tune of the old knitting-needle to humming by steam. So that we women, full of vigor and desire to be active and useful and to react upon the world around us, finding our industrial occupations largely gone, have been obliged to seek out a new territory and to pre-empt from the sphere of our brothers some of that which they have heretofore considered their own.

I know it is a sentiment of chivalry in some good men which hinders them from giving us the ballot. They think we might not be what they admire so much; they think we should be lacking in womanliness of character. I ask you to notice if the women who have been in this International Council, if the women who are school teachers all over this nation, if these hundreds of thousands are not a womanly woman, and yet they have gone outside of the old sphere. We believe that in the time of peace women can come forward and with peaceful plans can use weapons which are grand and womanly, and that their thoughts, winged with hope and the force of the heart given to them, will have an effect far mightier than physical power. For that reason we ask you that they shall be allowed to stand at the ballot box because we believe there every person expresses his individuality. The majesty or the meanness of a person comes out at the ballot-box more than anywhere else. The ballot is the compendium of all there is in civilization, and all that civilization has done for us. We believe that the mothers who had the good sense to train noble men, like you who have achieved high positions, had the good sense to train your sisters in the same way, and that it is a pity the State has left that other half of the conservative power which comes from a Christian rearing and a Christian character.

I have spoken thus on the principles which have made me, a
conservative woman, devoted to the idea of the ballot, and one in heart with all these good and true suffrage women, though not one in organic community. I represent before you the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and not a suffrage society, but I bring these principles to your sight, and I ask you, my brothers, to be grand and chivalrous towards us in this new departure which we now wish to make.

I ask you to remember that it is women who have given the costliest hostages to fortune, and out into the battle of life they have sent their best beloved into the snares that have been legalized on every hand. From the arms which held him long, the boy has gone forever, for he will not come back again to the home. Then let the world in the person of its womanhood go forth and make a home in the state and in society. By all the pains and dangers the mother has shared, by the hours of patient watching over beds where little children tossed in fever and pain, by the incense of ten thousands prayers wafted to God from earnest lips, I charge you, gentlemen, give woman power to go forth, so that when your son undertakes life’s treacherous battle, his mother will still walk beside him clad in the garments of power.
Beloved Friends and Comrades in a Sacred Cause: "A difference of opinion on one question must not prevent us from working unitally in those on which we can agree."

These words from the opening address before the International Council convened in this auditorium three years ago were the key-note of a most tuneful chorus. The name of her who uttered words so harmonious is Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and it shall live forever in the annals of woman's heretic struggle up from sexhood into humanhood.

Our friends have said that, as President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, Mrs. Stanton leads the largest army of women outside, and I the largest one in side, the realm of a conservative theology. However this may be, I rejoice to see the day when, with distinctly avowed loyalty to my Methodist faith, and as distinctly avowed respect for the sincerity with which she holds to views quite different, I can clasp hands in loyal comradeship with one whose dauntless voice rang out over the Nation for "woman's rights" when I was but a romping girl upon a Prairie farm.

It has taken women of brains and purpose over forty years to find out that they could be true to the faith born with them (nourished at the bosom where their infant heads were pillowed, and taught them at their mother's knee, until its fibres are part and parcel of their own), could keep step with any soldier and heed the voice of any captain who was fighting.

"Would that Blucher or night were come!" said Wellington at Waterloo, and surely night without a morning would have come in the great final battle for the overthrow of that proud usurping Napoleon, better known as Brute Force, had not the two divisions of the conquering army of womanhood effected a junction in the last decades of this last Old Worshahantury.

In saying this let me distinctly disavow any banding together of women as malcontents of hostiles toward the correlated other half of the human race. Brute force, to my mind, means custom as opposed to reason, prejudice as the antagonist of fair play, and precedent as the for common sense. This classification blots out the sex line altogether; for, alas, what a horde of well-meaning women it arrays against the ideas for which this Council stands, and the huzza for the army of great hearts it sets in array among men, as our valiant allies in the thick of the fight;
It was a beautiful saying of the earlier Methodists, when they
advoked a holy life, "I feel nothing contrary to love." But the
widening march of Christianity has given a wonderfully practi-
cal sense of such words, and we actually mean here to-day that
whatever in custom or law is contrary to the love of one's neigh-
bor which would give to him or her all the rights and privileges
that one's self enjoys is but a relic of brute force, and is
to be cast out as evil.

And because woman in some of our American Commonwealths is
still so related to the law that the father can will away an
unborn child, and that a girl of seven or ten years of age is
held to be the equal partner in a crime where another and a
stronger is the principal; because she is in so many ways ham-
pered and harmed by laws and customs pertaining to the
past, we reach out hands of help especially to her that she
may overtake the swift-marching procession of progress, for its
sake that it may not slacken its speed on her account as much
as for hers that she be not left behind. We thus represent the
human rather than the woman question, and our voices unite to
do that which the President of our New York Sorosis so beauti-
fully said in a late letter to the Sorosis of Bombay:

"Tell the world was made for woman, too;"

Every atom says to every other one, "Combine," and, doing so,
they change chaos into order. When every woman shall say to
every other, and every workman shall say to every other "Com-
bine" the war-dragon shall be slain, the poverty-viper shall
be exterminated, the gold bug transfixed by a silver pin, the
saloon drowned out and the last white slave liberated from the
woods of Wisconsin and bagnios of Chicago and Washington.

For combination is "a game that two can play at;" the mill-
ionaires have taught us how, and the labor-tortoise is fast
overtaking the capitalistic hare. What was it Mrs. Stanton
said? "A difference of opinion on one question must not pre-
vent us from working unitarily in those on which we can agree."

Illustrations of this great principle (so long universally re-
cognized by men, whether Jew or Gentile, orthodox or hetero-
dox, in all their humanitarian and patriotic work) are more con-
spicuously manifest in the programme of this Council than ever
before in the forty-year long annals of the woman movement, for
here we have nearly forty different societies represented by
delegated either regular or fraternal.

Could anything be broader than the basis laid for this great
organization? Its Preamble declares:

"We women of the United States, sincerely believing that the
best of our homes and nation will be advanced by our own greater
unity of thought, sympathy and purpose, and that an organized
movement of woman will best conserve the highest and good of the
family and the State, so hereby band ourselves together in a
confederation of workers committed to the overthrow of all
forms of ignorance and injustice and to the application of the
Golden Rule to Society, Custom and Law."

Its "general policy" is stated in these words: (quotation omitted)

Its constitutional requirements are simply that, having been
declared eligible by the Council's Executive Committee, the
intending auxiliary shall vote to be one actually and shall
send its dues to the treasurer. These are twenty-five dollars
plus a half cent once in three years from each member of the
auxiliary, or one hundred dollars for the entire society if pre­
ferred. The present form of organization is very simple, any
society of women that is National in scope or value being, when
the fore going arrangements are made, entitled to representa­
tion in the Executive Committee of the Council by its president
(who becomes a Vice-President of the Council) and in the com­
mittee of arrangements for the triennial meeting by a dele­
gate chosen by the auxiliary society itself.

Having stated the actual basis of the Council, let me mention
some objections made to by thoughtful and friendly women who
desire the success and highest usefulness of this most ambiti­
ous of all the efforts of American women in the department of
organization.

The objections may be included under four heads.

First, that the fee is too large to be paid by missionary and
other societies that collect their funds for specific uses and
do not feel at liberty to divert them into any outside channel.

Second, that it is a misnomer to declare one National society
"auxiliary" to another. The National W.C.T.U.(although it very
properly and dutifully joined us) urged this objection strongly,
contending with much show of reason that the National Council
should not expect the largest society of women in the world,
thoroughly organized and officered and having fourteen years
of systematic work behind it, to become one of its tributaries
in authority and in the payment of dues.

The third, that in effect the American Association for the
Advancement of Women with its "Women's Congress" annually held,
affords opportunity for a gathering of leaders, a discussion of
current topics, and a general reporting of progress through its
vice-presidents in each state.

Fourth, that to make the presidents of existing organization ex­
officio Vice-Presidents of the Council tends toward building a
hierarchy, and that the better way would be to let each auxiliary
choose its representatives on the Executive Committee of the
Council, thus more closely alllying the latter with the rank and file of women-workers throughout the land, and increasing the number and variety of leaders among women.

To my mind there is more or less of force in all these criticisms, and I hope that all will all be most carefully considered. Having been chairman of the committee that formulated the original plans, I may, with especial appropriateness, urge the careful study of all objections to the same. We have now worked three years under these plans and learned their defects as well as their excellences.

Let me then frankly say that I believe we should organize a miniature council in every town and city, confederationizing these in every state, and instructing the State Council to send delegates to the National Council. The plan would be to let these delegates form a lower and the heads of National societies an upper house, whose concurrent vote should be essential to the enunciation of any principle of the adoption of any plan. The president of this society should be (as has already been wisely ordained by this Council) eligible for but one term, and should have power to choose her own cabinet of seven from the ablest women in the country, representing the industries, education, professions, philanthropies, reforms, and the religious and political work of women. We should thus have within the National Government, as carried on by men, a republic of women, duly organized and officered not in any wise antagonistic to men, but conducted in their interest as much as in our own, and tending towards such mutual fellowship among women, such breadth of knowledge and sympathy as should establish solidarity of sentiment and purpose throughout the nation of women-workers, put a premium upon organized as against isolated efforts of human betterment, minify the sense of selfishness and magnify that of brotherhood, training and tutoring women for the next step in the evolution of humanity, when men and women shall sit side by side in Government and the Nations shall learn war no more.

The Upper Council, as it might be called, would, by this plan, consist of two delegates from each society which, in its judgment, was National in scope and value, one being the president of that society, the other chosen by ballot at its last annual meeting preceding the session of the Council (which I would have convened biennially). This Upper Council would answer to the Senate of the United States, and the Lower Council, made up of delegates chosen by the forty-four State councils from their auxiliaries, would be analogous to the House of Representatives. We should thus have an organization that would include all the various groups of women hitherto isolated (and, as a consequence, in some degree provincial), while its basis would be so broad, its aims so far-reaching, and its plan so unique that no other society could consider its realm in any wise encroached upon.

This same democratic basis of organization should extend to the
local council, i.e., each should be made up of two delegates from each local society of women in the city, town, or village, one being the president of said local society and the other chosen by ballot of that society. The State Council should be made up of two delegates each, chosen in like manner from the local councils, these to form a lower house in the State council, and the presidents, with one other representative of each State society, to form the Upper Council in each State, the President and Vice-President of the National Council to be elected biennially by a popular vote of all members of all local societies tributary to the National Council.

We have wished for a method of inducing women to cast their ballots on a large scale; this would be quite sure to arouse an enthusiasm that would "call out the vote".

As a financial basis, I would propose a dime a year to the National Council from each woman in each local organization of women in the United States. This would be burdensome to no one and would be paid outside of all other fees.

"Something solid, and superior to any existing society, is what we want." This is the commentary of women with whom I have talked, and the foregoing outline is offered as a possible help towards meeting this very natural and reasonable requirement. Such a National society would, indeed, incalculably increase the world's sum total of womanly courage, efficiency and expertize; widening our horizon, correcting the tendency to an exaggerated impression of one's own work as compared with that of others, and putting the wisdom and expertize of each at the service of all. Nor would it require a vast amount of effort to bring such a great movement into being, for the work of organizing is already done, and the correlating of societies now formed could be divided among our leaders, each one taking a State or a number of chief towns and cities.

Being organized in the interest of no specific propaganda, this great Association would unite in cordial sympathy all existing societies of women, that with a mighty aggregate of power we might move in directions upon which we could agree.

Moreover, the tendency would be vastly to increase the interest of individual women in associated work and the desire of local societies to be federated nationally, individual women and isolated societies of women being ineligible to membership in the councils, whether local, State or National.

But the greatest single advantage will perhaps be this, that while each society devoted to a specific end will continue to pursue its goals by its own methods every organization will have the moral support of all others, and will be in a position to add its influence to that of others, for such out side movements of beneficence as it may approve. For instance, without a dissenting voice the Inter-Council will record this effort. (quote omitted)
FRANCES E. WILLARD

Presentation of
Mrs. Hayes' Picture

From "Women Torchbearers" By E. Gordon. Mrs. Willard said:

Before we can at all estimate the significance to the temperance cause of the example of Mrs. Lucy Webb Hayes, we must turn away from the victories already gained and contemplate the mountains of difficulty that loom up ahead of our advancing hosts. There are three mighty realms of influence which the temperance reform, based as it is upon science, experience and the golden rule, has hardly yet invaded. The world of fine arts, of romance and of fashion still answers at total abstinence. From the days of Homer and Virgil to those of Tennyson and Longfellow, the poets have been singing in tuneful cadences the praises of wine. From Praxiteles to Powers, the sculptors have delighted to idealize the coarse features of Bacchus. From the antique frescoes of Pompeii down to those of Neissonier, the choicest pigments of the painter have been lavished to furnish forth convivial feasts. Heroes have been men might to drink wine and heroines have found their prototype in Hebe, a cup bearer of the gods. How be it remembered that the poet, the artist and the novelist, mighty interpreters of nature and the soul, will always maintain their empire over the human heart so long as it is a willing captive to the love of beauty and the beauty of love, so that until we win an assured place for the temperance reform in these supremely influential realms of thought and expression, our success cannot be considered permanent. Until Genius, with her starry eyes, shall be gently persuaded to lay her choicest trophies at the feet of temperance, there will remain for us much territory to be possessed. This beautiful portrait, soon to be displayed, painted by the noblest master of his art in all the land is the avant courier of many a trophy which our cause is yet to win.

Think what it means to the total abstinence cause that the first lady of the republic, instead of cherishing intoxication liquors as the emblem of hospitality and kindness and good will, banishes them from cellar, sideboard, and the table, as the enemies of her home and of the guests to whom she would do honor. Wine has freely flowed in the houses inhabited by the world's rulers. It was left for a Christian queen of American society to be the first one who did not only hear but heeded the voice of God. It has been like a torch held up in the gloom, a beacon flaming grandly on the most dangerous headland of the republic's coast, and it shall grow and gather light and mount up to the zenith like another sun shedding its genial rays into the darkest heart and most desolate home.
FRANCES E. WILLARD

Gospel Politics

Delivered at the St. Louis Convention in 1892. From "Glimpses of Fifty Years" pp. 403-5.

---

Dear Sisters — By the laws of spiritual dynamics this has been one of our best, perhaps because one of our most progressive, years. Stationary pools and people tend toward stagnation. The most senseless of proverbs is that about the rolling stone that gathers no moss. What does it want of moss when it can get momentum?

In the arena of National Prohibition we shall fight our hardest battles and win our most substantial victories. Nothing will alarm and anger our opponents like our effort in this field, because no effort less direct aims a blow so decisive as the very vitals of their trade.

Senator Blair, of New Hampshire, has made a more careful study of national prohibition, and with better opportunity to learn, than any other student of this subject in the nation, and he thus sums up his opinion: "For more than half a century, the working life of more than two generations, gigantic efforts have been put forth by noble men and women, by philanthropists, by statesmen, and by states, to restrain and destroy the alcohol evil through the operations of moral suasion and by state law. Public belief, it might have been crystallized into national law had the labor been properly directed. But if it failed, as it will always fail, so long as we save at the spigot and waste at the bung, if I may borrow an expressive simile from the business of an enemy. The temperance question is in its nature a national question, just as much so as the tariff is and more than slavery was. It is waste of time to deal with it only by towns and counties and states. All possible local efforts should be put forth against the liquor-death everywhere. The yellow fever should be fought in the by-ways and hospitals, by the physician and the nurses as well as by the quarantine of our ports and the suspension of infected traffic by national law, but the enemy will forever come in like a flood, unless the nation, which is assailed as a nation, defends itself as a nation. What temperance reform most needs is unification of effort, nationalization. Samson was not more completely hampered by withes than is this giant reform by the geographic lines of states; and if its supporters would but use their strength, they would at once find their natural arena circumscribed only by the natural domain. How shall this be done? By concentration upon the enactment of a national constitutional law. The nation can act in no other way than by law; and now there is no national law for the removal of alcoholic evil."
On the contrary, we have seen how, by guaranteeing the importation and transportation and permitting the manufacture, the national Constitution is the very citadel of the rum-power.

Existing parties can not in the nature of the case, take up the question. Not to this end were they born; not for this cause did they come into the world. Upon this issue the voters who compose them are irrevocably voted one way. Twenty years ago Governor St. John and Senator John Sherman voted one way. Now the latter champions the brewer's cause, and the former is Prohibition's standard-bearer. Party inclosures must be broken down, that men who think and vote alike may clasp hands in a political fraternity where the issue of today outranks that of yesterday or of to-morrow. A friendly editor uttered his word of warning to us in terms like these: "There is may amount of political lighting in the air, and if you are not careful a bolt will strike the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

Whereupon our brave Mary T. Lathrop replied: "Women who have been fighting Jersey lighting for ten years aren't afraid of the political kind.

Dear sisters, we must stand by each other in this struggle. Side by side, shoulder to shoulder, we must move forward, with no break in the ranks, no aspirations, no careless, harsh or cruel judgments, but the tenderest and most persistent endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit, if not of method, and, above all, the bond of peace. Let the criticising world see plainly that concord has the right way in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. In all the turmoil of the toilsome days, in which motives of which we never dreamed are foisted on us, words we never spoke attributed, and deeds we would spurn ascribed, may the law of kindness still dwell upon our lips and the spirit of a loving forbearance keep our hearts tender. Let me give you the sweet words my mother used to speak as the talismanic charm to still my turbulent spirit in girlhood days: "Nath any wronged thee? Be bravely revenged. Slight it, and the work's begun. Forgive, and 'tis finished." Permit me also to give you golden words, spoken by one of the purest philosophic minds of our own or any age. They may cheer you in this battle-hour as they have strengthened me: "Whoever hesitates to utter that which he thinks the highest truth, lest it should be too much in the advance of the time, must remember that while he is a descendant of the past, he is a parent of the future; and that his thoughts are as children born to him which he may not carelessly let die. He, like every other man, may properly consider himself as one of myriad agencies through which works the Great First Cause; and when that cause produces in him a certain belief he is thereby authorized to profess and act out that belief. - - - Not as adventitious, therefore, will the wise man regard the faith which is in him. The highest truth he sees he will fearlessly utter; knowing that, let what may come of it, he is thus playing his right part in the world.
We are slowly but surely attaining to the grandest mastership in all the world, mastership over our own spirits. Then noblest figure of contemporary history is Gladstone, England's governmental chief, because with the people ready to mob him one day and worship him the next, he holds right on his way quietly and patiently, but dauntlessly true to his convictions. God has set the Woman's Christian Temperance Union for a grander confession and defense of the faith than we have dreamed as yet; one which would blanch our cheeks, perhaps, and make our hearts heavy with fear, could we today know all that it involves. But if we are true and tender-hearted, holding fast the hand of Christ, we shall be equal to the emergencies as they arise, no matter how perilous or great. Let me give you De Tocqueville's words, for a motto in 1884: "Life is neither a pleasure nor a pain. It is serious business, to be entered on with courage and a spirit of self-sacrifice."
MARY ASHTON LIVERMORE
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Ladies and Gentlemen -- Mr. Beecher very pertinently said that women are allowed to know, but not to say; they may make all the preparations necessary to intelligent voting, but that they shall not vote. That is exactly what is doing a vast deal of mischief the world over. If they are not allowed to vote, and express their opinions upon the laws by which they are to be governed, and if they are not to have opened to them all proper fields of labor, they will turn their attention to dressmaking, and to millinery, and to all the other hot-beds of our fast modern life. It is doing great harm; and that is one reason I earnestly plead in their behalf for the ballot. Men say women shall not have the ballot. They must petition and beg for it. Have not petitions been already made? Have not 200,000 names been sent into Congress already? Then they say you must "organize;" and when that is done, and they find the country rocked by a traveling volcano, then they say, "All women do not want to vote; all the women in the country should ask for it, and beg for it, and petition for it."

Let me relate an incident that occurred in Boston at the office of Chief Justice Chapman, four or five weeks ago. A man, guardian, came there with a writ of habeas corpus, which placed in his two hands, charge two children in no wise related to him, and he asked that he might have the control of the children, in opposition to the claim of their mother, who desired to keep them. The facts were briefly these: the woman had been happily married; her husband died and left her a widow with two children. By the laws of the State of Massachusetts at that time, she was not allowed to be their guardian, nor the guardian of anybody else's children. So the judge of the Probate appointed a guardian for the children, who magnanimously allowed them to remain in their mother's care. After two or three years she committed the unpardonable crime of marrying again, a thing that no man was ever guilty of. The marriage was perfectly acceptable to her former husband's relatives, but the guardian was so displeased with it, that he got out a writ of habeas corpus, and demanded of Chief Justice Chapman that the children be remanded to his custody.

We are apt to boast of Massachusetts and its laws, but here was a case in which the Chief Justice, after hearing the case, actually remanded these children to the possession of that man. The courtroom was crowded; the excitement was intense; the poor mother sank down in a deadly faint. I say such laws are an outrage upon womanhood. This contempt is palpable throughout all the entire code of laws.
Another argument is that frequently made against the extension of suffrage to women is this: "If women go to the polls it is going to take them away from their homes and families." These arguments are urged with as much pertinacity as if the polls were open three hundred and sixty-five days in the year, and twenty-four hours each day, and that all that the people did was to lie around the polls and vote, and vote, and vote, and vote.

Another statement is, that it is because women have been kept out of politics that they are pure and good. Well, now, it is a poor rule that won't work both ways, and if disfranchisement has made such angels of women, suppose you try it a little on men. I have a firm belief that the men need, infinitely more than the women do, the influence that woman will bring with her to the ballot; not because woman is better, but because she is the better half of humanity. It reminds me of the account of the battle of Gettysburg, given by a colonel of a Western regiment. His regiment was placed among the reserves, on an eminence, where they could see the battle as it went on. "There we stood," said the colonel; "our brave men trying to serve their country; able to do it, and anxious to do it. Yet we were kept the whole of the first day watching the fight go on. On the second day another regiment, which had been much associated with ours, was called into action. We saw them marching, their guns aslant, as if there was no battle being carried on, or deeds of death and destruction -- and all the while, as they marched, the grape, and the canister, and the shot, and the shell, tore their ranks terribly; and men fell dead in all directions; and still those who yet remained carried their guns in the same position, and kept time, and closed up, had closed up, until my agitation became so unendurable that I forgot all else, and cried out, "Oh, God! why don't they call the reserves into action? We could help them."

When I look back to the days of our great war, I remember that women sprang up every day all over the country -- women of whom it was not before believed there was any patriotic blood in their veins. We all came together by one common instinct -- saying, "What shall we do?" I could tell you of women who have died from exposure and suffering in the war. Hundreds of the very best women of the Northwest went down voluntarily as nurses, and in other capacities, and assisted suffering and dying men, until they themselves were almost at death's door. "When women do military duty, they shall vote!" We did do military duty. We did not cease our labor till all the soldiers had come home, anded with their services. We have earned recognition at the hands of this government, and we ought to have it. Knowing, then, the qualities of woman and her courage and bravery under fire, I can never cease to demand that she shall have just as large a sphere as man has. All we want is this, that you shall leave us free to act.
Let the sphere of woman be tested by the aspiration and ability of their own minds, and let it be limited only by what we are able to do. Don't fear that women will not marry and make good wives if allowed legal equality with men. They even now make as good wives as men do husbands. Trust God. This talk of women getting out of her sphere is sheer lack of faith in God. He has given us our natures. The gentlest woman is transformed into a tigress when you go between her and her baby. There's no sense, therefore, in the fear that the paltry lures of politicians will draw women from the home circle. There is no necessity to enact laws to keep women women. Woman's sphere is that which she can fill, whether it be captain, merchant, school-teacher, or wife and mother.

Only two millions of women are among the producers of the country -- five millions are wives and mothers, and eight millions of men from the world of commerce and productive work; the deficit will be immediately felt. Add to the producers of the world eight millions of skilled women, and the quickening would be felt everywhere. East and West is a huge, ignorant, semi-barbarous mass, brought hither from European and Asiatic shores, needing the enlightenment and the quickening that would come from the addition to the polls of educated women.
MARY ASHTON LIVERMORE

What Shall We Do With Our Daughters?

Delivered over 800 times in 35 years in every part of the country. From "The Story of My Life," M.A. Livermore pp. 516-30.

It is more than fifty years since Margaret Fuller, standing, as she said, "in the sunny nook of life," wrote a little book, which she launched on the current of thought and society. It was entitled "Woman in the Nineteenth Century," and as the truths it proclaimed and the reforms it advocated were far in advance of public acceptance, its appearance was the signal for an immediate widespread newspaper controversy, which raged with great violence. I was young then, and as I took the book from the hands of the bookseller, wondering what the contents of the thin little volume could be, to provoke so wordy a strife, I opened at the first page. My attention was immediately arrested, and a train of thought started, by the two mottoes at the head of the opening chapter, — one underneath of the other.

The first was an old-time adage, endorsed by Shakespeare, believed in by the world, and quoted in that day very generally. It is not yet entirely obsolete "Frailty, thy name is Woman." Underneath it, and unlike it, was the other, — "The Earth waits for her queen". The first described woman as she has been understood in the past, as she has been masqueraded in history, as she has figured in literature; as she has, in a certain sense, existed. The other prophesied of that grander type of woman, toward which today the whole sex is moving — consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly — because the current sets that way, and there is no escape from it.

No one who has studied history, even superficially, will for a moment dispute the statement that, during the years of which we have had historic account, there has brooded very steadily over the female half of the human family an air of repression, of hindrance, of disability, of gloom, of servitude. If there have been epochs during which women have been regarded equal to men, they have been brief and abnormal. Among the Hindoos, woman was the slave of man, forbidden to speak the language of her master and compelled to use the patois of slaves. The Hebrews pronounced her the after-thought of Deity, and the mother of all evil. The Greek law regarded her as a child, and held her in life-long tutelage. The Greek philosopher proclaimed her a "monstrous," and "Accidental production." Mediaeval councils declared her unfit for instruction. The early Christian fathers denounced her as a "noxious animal," a "painted temptress," a "necessary evil," a "desirable calamity," a "domestic peril." From the English Heptarchy to the Reformation, the
law proclaimed the wife to be "in all cases and under all circumstances, her husband's creature, a servant, slave." To Diderot, The French Philosopher, even in the eighteenth century, she was only a "courtesan"; to Montesquieu, an "attractive child"; to Rousseau, "an object of pleasure to man." To Michelet nearly a century later, she was a "natural invalid". Mme. de Staël wrote truly, "that, of all the faculties which Nature has gifted woman, she has been able to exercise fully but one — the faculty of suffering."

The contemptuous opinion entertained of woman in the past has found expression, not alone in literature, but also in unjust laws and customs. "In marriage she has been a serf; as a mother she has been robbed of her children; in public instruction she has been ignored; in labor she has been menial, and then inadequately compensated; civilly she has been a minor, and politically she has had no existence. She has been the equal of man only when punishment and the payment of taxes were in question."

Born and bred for generations under such conditions of hindrance, it has not been possible for women to rise much above the arbitrary standards of inferiority persistently set before them. Here and there through the ages, some woman, endowed with phenomenal force of character has towered above the mediocrity of her sex, hinting at the qualities imprisoned in the feminine nature. It is not strange that these instances have been rare; it is strange, indeed, that women have held their own during these ages of degradation. And as, by the laws of heredity, the inheritance of traits of character is persistent in proportion to the length of time they have been inherited, it is easy to account for the conservatism of women today, and for the indifference, not to say hostility, with which many regard the movements from the point of their own advancement.

For humanity moved forward to an era were wrong and slavery are being displaced, and reason and justice are being recognized as the rule of life. Science is extending immeasurable the bounds of knowledge and power; art is refining life, giving to it beauty, and grace; literature bears in her hands whole ages of comfort and sympathy; industry, aided by the hundred-handed elements of nature, is increasing the world's wealth, and invention is economizing its labor. The age looks steadily to the redressing of wrong, to the righting of every form of error and injustice; and the tireless and prying philanthropy, which is almost omniscient, is one of the most hopeful characteristics of the time.

It could not be possible in such an era, but that women should share in the justness and kindliness with which the time is fraught. A great wave is lifting them to higher levels. The leadership of the world is being taken from the hands of the brutal and low, and the race is making its way to a higher ideal than once it knew. It is the evolution of this tendency that
is lifting women out of their subject condition, that is emancipating them from the seclusion of the past, and adding to the sum total of the world's wealth and wisdom, by giving to them the cultivation human beings need. The demand for their education, -- technical and industrial, as well as intellectual -- and for their civil and political rights, is being urged each year by an increasing host, and with more emphatic utterances.

The doors of colleges, professional schools, and universities, closed against them for ages, are opening to them. They are invited to pursue the same courses of study as their brothers, and are graduated with the same diplomas. Trades, businesses, remunerative vocations, and learned professions seek them; and even the laws, which are the last to feel the change in public opinion -- usually dragging a whole generation behind, -- even these are being annually revised and amended, and then they fail to keep abreast of the advancing civilization.

All this is but prefatory and prophetic of the time when, for women law will be synonymous with justice, and no opportunity for knowledge or effort will be denied them on the score of sex.

As I listened to the debates and attended their progress, and weighed the prophecies of evil always inspired by a growing reform, as I hear the clash of the scientific raid upon women by the small pseudo-scientists of the day, -- who weigh their brains and measure their bones to prove their inferiority to men, -- my thoughts turn to the young women of the present time. "What shall we do with our daughters?" is really the sum and substance of what is called, in popular phrase, "the woman question". For, if tomorrow all should be done that is needed and demanded by the wisest reformer and the truest friend of woman, it would not materially affect the condition of the adult woman of society. Their positions are taken, their futures are forecast, and their harnessed into the place they occupy, not infrequently by invisible, but omnipotent ties of love and duty. Obedience to the behests of duty gives peace, even when love is lacking; and peace is a diviner thing than happiness.

It is for our young women that the great changes of the time promise most; it is for our daughters, -- the fair bright girls who are the charm of society and the delight of home; the sources of infinite comfort to fathers and mothers, and the source of anxiety also. What shall we do with them, -- and what shall they do with, and for themselves?

"New occasions teach new duties, Time makes ancient good uncouth" --

and the training of fifty years ago is not sufficient for the girls of today. The changed conditions of life, which our young women confront, compel greater thought and care on the part
of those charged with their education than has heretofore been
deemed necessary. They are to be weighted with larger duties,
and assume heavier responsibilities; for the days of tutelage
seem to be ended for civilized women, and they are to think and
act for themselves.

Let no one, therefore, say this question of the training of
our daughters is a small question. No question can be small
that relates to half the human race. The training of boys is
not more important than that of girls. The hope of many is so
centered in the "coming man", that the only questions of inter-
est to them are such as those propounded by James Parton in the
"The Atlantic Monthly", -- "Will the Coming Man Smoke? "Will He
Drink Wine?", and so on to the end of the catechism. But let
it not be forgotten that before this "coming man" can make his
appearance, his mother will always precede him, and that he
will be very largely what his mother will make him. Men are
today confessing their need of the aid of women by appointing
them on school committees, boards of charities, as prison com-
missioners, physicians to insane asylums, positions which
they cannot fill without preparation.

Therefore, not only for their own sakes, but for the sake of the
human family, of which women make one-half, should we look care-
fully to the training of our daughters. Nature has so con-
stituted us that the sexes act and react upon each other, mak-
ing every "woman's cause" a man's cause, and every "man's cause"
a women's cause; so that we

"Rise or sink
Together, dwarfed or godlike, bond or free."

And they are the foes of the race, albeit not always inten-
tionally, who set themselves against the removal of women's disab-
ilities, shut in their faces the doors of education or oppor-
tunity, or deny them any but the smallest and most incomplete
training. For it is true that "who educated a woman, educat-
es a race".

Good health is a great prerequisite of successful or happy liv-
ing. To live worthily or happily, to accomplish much for one's
self or others when suffering much from pain or disease, is
attended with much difficulty. Dr. Johnson used to say that
"every man is a rascal when he is sick". And very much of the
peevishness, irritability, capriciousness, and impatience seen
in men and women has its root in bodily illness. The very morals
suffer from disease of the body. Therefore I would give to
our daughters a good physical education.

We shall by-and-by come to recognize of every child to be well
born, -- sound in body, with inherited tendencies toward men-
tal and moral health. We have learned that it is possible to
direct the operations of nature so as to have finer breeds of
If we would give to our daughters a good physiological training, we must attend carefully to their dress. The dress of women at the present time is about as unhygienic as it well can be. And many of our girls are made the victims of weakness of life, through the evils of the dress they wear from birth. The causes of their invalidism are sought in hard study, coeducation, too much exercise, or lack of rest and quiet in certain periods when nature demands it. All the while the medical attendant is silent concerning the "glove-fitting," steel-clasp corset; the heavy, dragging skirts, the bands engirdling the body, and the pinching, distorted boot. These will account for much of the feebleness of women and girls; for they exhaust energy, make freedom of movement a painful impossibility, and frequently shipwreck our young daughter before she gets out of port.

While it is undoubtedly true that the practice of tight lacing is regarded with growing disfavor, it is also true that the corsets in vogue at present are more objectionable than those worn a half a century ago. For those were home made, and while they could be very tightly laced, did not fit the figure well, were free from the torture of whale bone and steel front pieces, all stitched in; while broad straps passing over the shoulders supported them, and the clothing hung upon them. But the modern corset is so ingeniously woven that it presses in upon the body, the muscular walls, the floating ribs, the stomach, the hips, and the abdomen, compelling them to take the form the corset maker has designed in lieu of what God has given. Stiff whale-bones behind and finely "tempered steel fronts" pressing into the stomach and curving over the abdomen, keep the figure of the girl erect and unbending, while Nature has made the spine with joints and very supple.

Physicians have persistently condemned the corset for half a century, even when it was not so harmful an article of dress as it is today. The educated women physicians who are gaining in numbers, influences, and practice, denounce it unqualifiedly, lay to its charge no small amount of the diseases on whose treatment gynaecologists fatten, and declare that it enhances the peril of maternity, and inflicts upon the world inferior children. Men condemn corsets in the abstract, and sometimes are brave enough to insist that the women of their households be emancipated from them; and yet their eyes have been so gen-
It is a mistake on the part of our daughters that the corset will give them beauty of figure. The young American girl is usually lithe and slender, and requires no artificial intensifying of her slightness. The corset will give her only stiffness of appearance, and interferes with the grace of motion which is one of the charms of young girls. The basque under-waiste, made as a substitute for the corset, and beginning to supersede it, fits the figure trimly, revealing its graceful contour, and is kept in place -- not by bones, or slips of steel, or thickly stitched-in stiff cords -- but by the weight of the skirts buttoned on the lower parts. Over this under-waiste, the outer dress can be fitted; and its waists will be smooth and unwrinkled, - a desideratum to most women.

The stout woman, who wears a corset to diminish her proportions, only distorts her figure; for her pinched waist causes her broad shoulders and hips to look broader by contrast; the pressure upon the heart and blood vessels give to her face that permanent blowsy flush, that suggests apoplexy.

John Burroughs, in his "Winter Sunshine," expresses the fear that the "American is becoming disqualified in the manly art of walking, by a falling off in the size of his foot -- A small trim foot," he tells us, "well booted or gaitered, is the national vanity. How we stare at the big feet of foreigners, and wonder what may be the price of leather in those countries, and where all the aristocratic blood is, that these plebeian extremities so predominate!"

The prevailing French boots made for women, and exhibited in the shop-windows, are painfully suggestive. Pointed and Elongated, they prophesy cramped and atrophied toes; while the high and narrow heel, that slides down under the instep, throws the whole body into an unnatural position in walking, creating diseases which are difficult to cure. "Show me your boots said a physician, called to a young lady suffering from unendurable pain in the back and knee-joints, which extended and engirt her, till, to use her own language, "she was solid pain downwards from the waist." "There's the trouble!" was his sententious comment, as he tossed the fashionable torturing boot from him after examination.

While the clothing of our daughters should not deform the figure nor induce the health, it need be neither inelegant nor inartistic. No particular style of dress can be recommended, by each one should choose what is more becoming and appropriate in fashion material. With sacred regard to the laws of health and without too large expenditure of time and money, every woman should aim to present an attractive exterior to her friends and the world. "So, indeed, should every man; for it is the
duty of all human beings to be as beautiful as possible.

I have spoken at length of dress, because of the physical discomfort and hindrance caused by the prevailing dress of women, and because it is also a prolific source of disease, which, which becomes chronic and incurable. But foods, sleep, exercise, and other matters demand attention when one is intrusted with the education of girls. American children, unlike those which we see abroad, generally sit at tables with their parents, eat the same food, keep the same late hours, and share with them the excitement of evening guests, evening meetings and lectures, and the dissipation of theatres, operas, halls and receptions. This is unwise uncalled for indulgence. Children require simple food, early hours for retiring, and abundance of sleep, as well as freedom from social and religious excitements.

Signs multiply about us that the women of the future will have healthy and strong physiques. Dress reform associations are organized in the principal American Cities and agencies established to furnish undergarments, or patterns for them, demanded by common sense and vigorous health. For it is the undergarments that the dress proposes to change. The outer garments may be safely left to the taste of the individual who has accepted the principles of the dress-reform in the construction of the undergarment.

Health is a means to an end. It is an investment for the future. That end is worthy work and noble living. And life has little to offer the young girl who has dropped to physical deterioration, which cuts her off from the activities of the time and makes existence to her synonymous with endurance.

It is hardly necessary that anything should be said, in advocacy of the higher intellectual education of our daughters. For the question of woman's collegiate education, is practically settled; and it is almost as easy today for a woman to obtain the highest university education, as it is for a man.

But no phase of the great movement for the advancement of women has progressed so slowly, as that which demands their technical and industrial training. To be sure, the last fifty years, which have brought great changes to the women of America, have largely increased the number of remunerative employments they are permitted to enter. When Harriet Martineau visited America in 1840, she found but seven employments open to women. At the present, according to Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Chief of the National Bureau of the Statistics of Labor, there are about three hundred and fifty industrial occupations open to women.

And yet it is true however, that women have received very little special industrial training to fit them for the work they are doing, or for a higher kind of work which will give them better pay. Perhaps almost the same may be said concerning the techni-
I cannot leave this topic of women’s industrial training, without speaking of our culpability in neglecting to give our daughters some knowledge of business affairs. With utter indifference on our part, they are allowed to grow to womanhood unfamiliar with the most ordinary forms of business transactions, — how to make out bills and give receipts; how to draw bank-checks; how to make notes, and what are the cautions to be observed concerning them; what is the best method of transmitting funds to a distance, whether by postal orders or bank drafts; what are safe rates of interest; how to purchase a life annuity, or effect an insurance on life or property, and so on.

If property is to pass into their possession, our daughters certainly need to know much more than this, they may be able to manage it with wisdom, or even to retain it securely. They need to know what are the elements of financial security; what may be considered safe investments; how to rent, improve, or sell property; what margin on property above the amount of the loan should be required, when it is made on real estate; what constitutes a valid title to property; what cautions are to be observed concerning mortgages; what are the property-right of married women in the states of their residence, with other like information.

We talk much of preparing our daughters to be good wives, mothers, and home-makers. Do we systematically attempt this? Do we conduct the education of girls with this object? Do we not trust almost entirely to natural instinct and aptitude, which, in the woman, is incomparably strong in the direction of wifehood, motherhood, and the home? For the mighty reason that the majority of women will always, while the earth stands, be wives, mothers, and mistresses of homes, they should receive the largest, completest, and most thorough training. It is not possible to state this too strongly; for these positions are the most important that woman can occupy. Education, religion, human affection, and civil law, all should conspire to aid her in these departments, to do the best work of which she is capable.

The very highest function of woman is to raise the family; it is the very highest function of man also. Indeed civilization has but this end in view, — the perpetuation and improvement of the race. The establishment of homes, the rearing of families, the founding of schools and colleges, the planting of institutions, and maintaining of governments, all are but means to this end. As Humboldt said years ago, Governments, religion, property, books, are but the scaffolding to build men. Earth holds up to her Master no fruit, but the finished man.

The duties of the mother begin long before the child comes into life, — ay, and the duties of the father also. She needs to know all that science can teach of the prenatal laws of being,
and the laws of heredity. Here acquaintance with physiology should not be the superficial knowledge, given in ordinary schools or colleges even. It should be a thorough exposition of the mysteries of her own physical being, and with a clear statement of the hygienic laws she must obey, if she would grow into healthy, enduring, glorious womanhood. She should be taught the laws of ventilation and nutrition; what constitutes healthful food; and care of infancy; the nursing of the sick; and in what the vigilant and scrupulous cleanliness consists; which almost prohibits certain forms of disease from passing under one's roof. Intelligence, system, economy, industry, patience, good nature, firmness, good health, a fine moral sense, all these are called into action. So is a knowledge of cooking, laundry work, how to make and repair clothing, together with the other industries of domestic life, even when one has means to employ servants to perform this work; for a woman cannot tell when she is well served, unless she knows what good work is. It requires a high order of woman to be a good wife, mother, and housekeeper; and she who makes a success in these departments possesses such a combination of admirable qualities, both mental and moral, that, with proper training, she might make a success in almost any department.

We should never forget that moral and religious training underlies and permeates all other training when it is wisely and judiciously given. The education of the will to the customs and habits of good society begins long before the child is old enough to reason on the subject. But its education to the law of right, its submission to the will of God, while it must be begun early, cannot be carried on to perfection until the child's reason is developed and its moral nature evolved sufficiently to feel how paramount to all other demands are those of right and duty.

Let our sons and daughters be taught that there are children of God, so divine in ancestry, so royal of parentage, that they must carry themselves nobly and not consent to meanness, low, selfish lives, and vice. Let them be taught that to love God is to love whatever is good and just and true; and that loving brothers, sisters, schoolmates, and humanity as a whole, is also loving God since God is our common Father, "we are all brethren."

They should be trained to regard earthly life as the first school of the soul, where there are lessons to be learned, tasks to be mastered, hardships to be borne, and where God's divinest agent of hope if often hindrance; and that only as we learn all the lessons given us here, may we expect to go joyfully forward to that higher school to which we shall be promoted where the tasks will be nobler, the lessons grander, the outlook broader, and where life will be on a loftier plane. The low fears and dismaying pressages that weight down so many souls, will be dispersed by a clear atmosphere in which they will dwell. "Because He lives, I shall live also."
Every problem must be wrought out in the department in which it belongs. We do not take a purely mathematical question into the chemical laboratory for solution, nor do we take problems of chemistry into the observation of the astronomer. While the various divisions of scientific knowledge and research sometimes overlap, and are always more or less nearly related, they are at the same time independent in themselves.

The great question of the continued life of the soul after death, — the problem of the immortal life, — cannot be solved by any logical process alone, nor yet by scientific demonstration. It receives its highest endorsement from our spiritual nature, and that is the last aminoblest development to which the human being attains. It is only reached by a conquest of the animal within us, by an unswerving love of truth, and by such love for our fellow-beings that our greatest happiness is found in helping them, and rendering them service.

This not an easy condition to reach, nor to maintain. It is accomplished only by struggle, by discipline, and by earnest desire, and an honest purpose to grow steadily forward. It is the nature of man to grow intellectually, and also spiritually, but the progress is often very slow. We continually meet people who are so conscious of the pettiness of our daily life, as it is usually lived, so painfully aware of their own unworthiness, and of the groveling aims and methods of those by whom they are surrounded, that they have serious doubts whether it be worth while for the infinite to continue human life, when it ends on earth, — whether there is enough in man, at the best to warrant the bestowal upon him of immortality.

It is like the weavers of tapestry that we see in the old world. The weaver sits behind his web, or sometimes obliquely under it, with his pattern by his side, and weaves slowly by hand. As he compares his work with the pattern given to him to copy, he sees only jagged knots and ends, and an elongated and distorted caricature of the model, for he is looking at the wrong side of the tapestry. He thinks he is justified in condemning it: "This work is not worth doing," he might say, "in the same spirit in which he complains this life is not worth living. That waste of my time and strength! Who will care for this badly-wrought work, distorted and hideous, with its jagged knots and ends? It is folly to continue it; it would have been better if I had never undertaken it." But the superintendent of the factory, who has assigned the task to the weaver, and given him that for which he has capacity, looks at the work from the
upper side, and sees growing under the hand of the workman a
perfect transcript of the copy set before him.

We are like these weavers. We look at life and its occupations
from the underneath side, and rarely seem to be able to pro-
ject ourselves beyond this life, to get a glimpse of it from an
upper and higher standpoint.

Taking people as we meet them, their estimate of human life
varies according to the standpoint that they occupy, and this
is for the most part, petty and unworthy. What should we say
to a man who owned a large estate of wonderful beauty and fer-
tility, with a palatial mansion in the center that stretched
up into the blue some five or six stories crowned with an ob-
servatory on top, if he persisted in living in the basement of
his house? Artists seek him, and unrolling their sketches,
reveal to him landscapes of exquisite beauty, which they have
transcribed from his far-stretching domain. Poets sing to him
of the lake sleeping at the foot of the hills, of the green
valley where sleek herds are peacefully grazing, of the sham-
mering river hastening to the sea, of the leafy woodlands
which is a harborage of the birds, — and congratulate him that he is
the fortunate possessor of the rare grouping of natural scenery.
Looking out the windows of the basement, he mumbled;
"Mock me not, I beseech you! I am, alas, not the happy person-
age you assume me to be. I look out the window and see only
sticks and stones, and dirt and earth. The beauty of which you
rave lies only in your imagination. I know my estate and all
its belongings, for I can not at any time estimate them by
looking out the window! "What would you say to him? "My dear
sir, this is not the way to judge your estate. Leave the base-
ment of your house, and mount flight above flight, to the ob-
servatory on the roof, and then look off with far-seeing wisdom
and vision and your eyes will be gladdened by the beauty we
have seen."

We are like the man who lives in the basement of his house. We
are obliged to occupy the basement of our natures at times,
for we have animal wants that must be regarded. "What shall
we eat, and what shall we drink and wherewith shall we be cloth-
ed?" are the demands that must be answered not only for our-
selves, but for those dependent upon us. Too many of us are
content to remain in the realm of material and animal life.
Not until our low dwelling-place is invaded by floods of sorrow,
when our beloved one drops into the arms of death, or our ear-
thly possessions vanish like the mists of the morning, do we
realize that we have any other resort. Then, compelled to
flee to the heights in our desolation, we sometimes obtain a
glimpse of our great inheritance, and realize that while we
have lost all, we are yet rich.
"If a man dies shall he live again?" is a question propounded
so long ago, that it antedates chronology. It has echoed
down the ages ever since, and is urged to-day with as much
It is a remarkable fact that there has been a well-high universal hope of future life among all peoples in the past, as in the present. When we go back to one a future life among all peoples in the past, as in the present. When we go back to one of the oldest nations of antiquity, which was the great leader of the early civilization, of whom the Greeks learned practically wisdom, we find abundant proof that the Egyptians believed in a life after death; They embalmed the bodies of the dead, to prevent their decay, for they believed the soul lingered about its earthly tenement, while it resisted decomposition, and was interested in the events of earth that were transpiring, and so with unkind kindness they strove to make the body immortal, and but for the destructive vandals of civilization would have nearly succeeded. Then the mummy pits were opened by European investigators, and they cemeteries were removed in which the mummies had been unwrapped they found a cross marked on the last covering that enfolded the breast. What did it signify? I could have no reference to the Christian religion, for this was thousands of years before the advent of Christ. When the hieroglyphic, or picture language of Egypt was mastered, they found that this cross was simply a defiance to death. Its interpretation was an assurance to surviving friends that the soul had not departed, -- for the cross on the breast was the declaration, "I still live!"

Sometimes the mummified bodies were deposited in tombs hewn out of the solid rock. In many instances the walls of the interior were decorated with pictures representing the passage of the soul through various stages of being in the life beyond. In that dry rainless climate, these pictures have been preserved intact, and we learn from them that the Egyptians, who were a highly civilized people of their day, believed in an active life beyond the grave.

How it is with savage people, who are outside the pale of a high civilization? Some years ago when visiting Minnesota, I was a guest at the same hotel with the officers of a company of soldiers, who had assisted in the removal of a tribe of Indians to a new reservation. As the Indians were unwilling to
leave their own settlement for another new and less desirable, it became necessary for a company on infantry to escort them to their new home. Having accomplished their work, the soldiers were now on their return. I became much interested in the stories of the officers concerning these red aborigines, who had been compelled like other of their race to move, and were made willing only by a show of force. I was specially interested in the narration of the chaplain. Among the migrating Indians, was a mother of a sick papoose. When the child was kept in perfect quiet, it did not seem to suffer much, but when the mother carried it on her back it shrieked with pain. So, folding her blanket for a pillow, she placed the baby upon it, and bore it carefully on her outstretched arms, endeavoring to steady herself as she walked, that the child might not feel the motion of her body. But it still moaned and moaned, and appeared in great suffering.

At the last the savage father became enraged at the wailings of the little papoose, and waited until his wife came up with him, when he took the baby by the legs, and dashing out its brains against a gree, he threw the lifeless body on the ground. The poor mother made no complaint, and shed no tears. It would have been worse than useless and she knew it. She waited until the marching column has passed out of sight, the chaplain with her. He explained to her that her baby was dead, and that the only thing she could give it now was a decent burial. They followed a grave in the soft earth, the mother made a bed of leaves for the little one to rest upon, and then taking from under her garment a string of wampum, which had taken more months to make than her child had lived, she folded it between the little hands, and proceeded to fill the grave with leaves and earth. The chaplain remonstrated. "The baby is dead," he said, "but the mother looking up into his eyes mournfully replied, "I have put the money into my baby's hands, that she might be able to pay her passage, for she has gone into the land of the Great Spirit, where the pale faces will not drive their red brethren from their homes, and where fathers will not murder their children." Ignorant, debased, downtrodden, without instruction or opportunity, this Indian mother asserted positively that her baby, dead at her feet, was still living, and was going to its father, the Great Spirit.

Now it signifies something, when we find that all races and classes of people whether civilized or uncivilized, cultured or uncultured, believe in the continued existence of the soul after death. James Freeman Clarke used to say, "We do not try to prove the doctrine of the immortality of the soul because we disbelieve it, but because believing it, in spite of ourselves, we want to be able to give a reason for it and our faith." What is the explanation of this instinct of life within us? Where comes thing longing after immortality? It is sometimes the strongest at the very moment when the body and soul seem about to dissolve partnership forever. It is borne us up contin-
ally as our friends drop away from our encompassing arms, into those of death, and we are baffled in our efforts to follow them on their trackless path into the larger life and nobler experiences. Is not this hope, this strong assurance of eternity that life that springs up within us in our darkest moments, as much a part of our mental and moral constitution as is the instinct of love. Has the great Creator implanted within us this aspiration for immortality, only to dash us against the wall of blank annihilation, when the hour comes for Him to redeem his promise? Will not God keep faith with us?

We will suppose that a father is rearing a family of children in great poverty. They have insufficient food, and that of the coarsest kind. They are cheaply clad in poor fabrics, and lack even a sufficiency of this shabby clothing. The home which shelters them is but a cabin, through whose chinks there enter the wind and the storm, the rain and the snow. But the father promises the children that when they attain their maturity, there shall be a change for the better in their condition. You shall throw off the rage which now cover you, he assures them, and be clad in garments of enduring fabric, as beautiful as they shall be lasting. You shall gratify your appetite for food at a table that shall be spread with appetising viands, and shall know the luxury of good food, well-prepared. You shall step out of their poor hut into a spacious mansion, substantially built, and well furnished with every device for enjoyment and convenience. The children develop to maturity, and become men and women of great expectation. They will not allow themselves to be pauperised by their present bare surroundings. They are looking forward to the day when they are to enter upon their great inheritance, and live with dignity, and are not dragged down to the level of their wretched environment.

The day at last arrives when they attain their maturity and are palpitating with excitement and expectation. The father comes to them, not to fulfill his long-made predictions, but to confess himself a fraud. He coolly informs them that "the promise of a wonderful change in their condition must go unredeemed. I have never intended to verify it; I lack both the power and the inclination. If there is to be any change whatever in the future it must be for the worse; deterioration downward. I have simply cheated you all through the years of growth and development." What reply could the children make to so unfatherly a father? And what could we say of God, our Heavenly Father, if the promise He has implanted within us of a nobler career hereafter should be so ruthlessly mocked?

There is another thought. We are the children of God. In our spirits does his spirit shine as shines the sunbeam in the drop of dew. The possibilities of the human soul are therefore limitless. But our life upon earth is so brief, and the necessities of existence so frequently compel us to develop our lower natures first, that very few have anything alike fair un-
folding of their higher faculties. Life is not long enough and we lack opportunity to show what there is in us. Beethoven, the great musical composer, whose wonderful sonatas and symphonies sound the depths of all human feeling and passion, was yet good for nothing else, in life. He was so shabby a business man, and so imperious that his sight bothered everyone. The land-owner, Beethoven, the musical composer, hearing of this, wrote his name, "Beethoven, the brain owner," And if Beethoven the brain-owner had not lived, and written music that is so much the outcome of the human soul as to possess earthly immortality, we should not known that Beethoven, the land-owner had ever existed. There is no doubt in my mind but that Beethoven the brain-owner, the musician, had he lived long enough and been instructed, might have been developed as a business man, and would have accomplished a great deal in other departments of life.

Claude, the great painter, was a common menial until he was past thirty years of age. One day as he entered a studio with an armful of wood, he caught a glimpse of the pictures on the easels at which the students were working. "Why, I could do that if I were taught!" was his exclamation. "I make pictures with charcoal on fences and walls." So rapt was he in admiration that his pictures were examined, and it was found that he had a correct eye for drawing. He was put under instruction, and in a short time, surpassed his masters, and became the teacher of those who had taught him. Year after year our artists, who have learned all that modern instructors can teach, cross the Atlantic, and sit at the feet of Claude to learn all that modern instructors can teach, to learn thru of him in his pictures in the galleries. They try to catch the trick of his coloring, which is a vivid and tender as when he painted years ago. They seek to understand the method by which he snatched the glamor that lies on the earth and sea, and transferred it to his canvas, and by which the modern artist does not seem to attain. Suppose Claude had died before he was thirty, and had never made that much of a visit to the studio. What would have become of that undeveloped gift for depicting the beautiful which has given him a hold upon the centuries, and makes him a power in the world of art today? If death ends all, what would have become of Claude's God-Like endowment, if he had died when it lay latent within him?

Most of us who have reached adult life, have at some time stood in the chamber of the dying, as they have been making the passage of the valley of the shadow of death alone. We have seen them already transfigured, They have listened to music and song that our ears heard not. They have conversed with personages who were not revealed to our vision, and we have some time felt that a flash of the great glory into which they have entered has dazzled our eyes and forbade us to weep.
I am convinced that a belief in the existence of the soul after death depends very much upon our manner of living. The higher we attain, and the more we strive after what is best and noblest in life, the more we take hold of immortality, the surer we are of our heavenly destiny. And there are those whose lives are so noble, and so who go through life shining brighter and brighter, like the sun as it tends to the zenith, that they coast near to the heavenly shore, and need no wasted wasted on them in argument, since they already are convinced.

Victor Hugo, a man of great attainment, who had served the cause of liberty and truth, and rendered invaluable services to his fellows, when near the close of life said: (quotation omitted)
During the last fifteen hundred years, — if you count the last hundred, — the civilization of the world has received its character and direction from the nations of Central and Western Europe, — Italy, France, Germany, and England. I say, "if you count the last hundred years." For, during the last century, there have been certain unmistakable signs, all the while growing stronger and clearer, that the leadership of the world's civilization, which has changed hands many times in the past, is slowly changing hands again, and is passing away from the nations of the Old World, to this nation of the New World, this continent of the future.

Hon. Mr. Gladstone declares that "America has a natural basis for the greatest continuous empire established by man." And he predicts that "America will become the head servant in the great household of the world, the employer of all employees, because her service will be the most and the ablest." After his return to England from an extensive lecture tour through the United States, Matthew Arnold said, "A republican form of government is the only eventual form of the whole world, and America holds the future." Another intelligent Englishman, one of the most traveled and most cultured, Hon. Joseph Hatton, declares that "Ten years in the history of America is half a century of European progress."

Our fathers crossed the ocean to inaugurate the new departure in human government and human society which has accomplished this grand result. They left behind the traditions, usages, and customs of the Old World, for they would have impeded their progress, and put into the new government and new society much of themselves, — much of the genuine, sturdy, almost divine manhood they themselves lived out, and the result has been that the Republic has gone forward with mighty stride, while men have waked, and while they have slept. A century of its national life is worth more, in practical value, than a thousand years in the days of Solomon, Alexander, and Charlemagne.

The republic started on its national career with a population of three million, six hundred thousand of whom were black slaves, even then a menace and a source of danger to the young nation. It numbers seventy million people today, who are made akin by the railway and the steamship, the telegraph and the telephone. They carry to the remotest village news from the uttermost parts of the world, with the latest wonders of human effort and invention, and the last word of art, science, and literature.
It began its existence bankrupt in all save hope and energy, its towns and villages were in ashes, the flower of its young men had been slain in battle, or were maimed and crippled for life. It had neither an army, nor a navy, it lacked commerce, trade, and manufactures, there was not a market in the world open to it, it had nothing to sell, and neither money nor credit with which to buy. It had not a friend, nor a well-wisher among the nations of the earth, with the sole exception of France, whose friendship is based, in part, on the hope that her young ally would cripple her ancient enemy, England.

To-day our republic is the richest nation in the world, having long ago outstripped England in the acquisition of wealth, with its two hundred years of history and those thousands of years its civilization. In 1689, the actual wealth of the United States was declared to be $61,459,000, exclusive of public property, and of three billions of private property invested and owned abroad. We are on the outer verge of an ocean of in-computable wealth, which no one can calculate, because of the vagueness of the knowledge of our half-revealed resources. These are to prove a mighty factor in the ultimate supremacy of the Republic. Our grain-bearing lands, when fully developed, will sustain and enrich a thousand million. Half the gold and silver used by the world to-day is furnished by the United States. Iron ore is mined in twenty-three states, and our coal measures are simply inexhaustible.

The pulse and pace of humanity have been so marvelously quickened in our country, that in all the developments that pertain to nineteenth century civilization it has surpassed all other nations. The first steamboat made its trial trip in 1807. The first railway for passenger travel was built in 1830. The first steamship crossed the Atlantic in 1838. The first telegram was sent in 1844. And now these wonderful inventions have become commonplace, by the side of the marvelous achievements of the American inventor and mechanic, who is spurred on mightily by the combined forces of steam and electricity. The Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor for 1889 quotes Herbert Spencer as testifying that "Beyond questions, in respects of mechanical appliance, the Americans are ahead of all nations." Superiority of tools and machinery imply that we have the best mechanics in the world. We may, there, by a "scientific use of the imagination," easily believe that the wonder-working mind hand of our inventors and mechanics, aided by modern and future science, will make the United States the future mighty workshop of the world.

Add to this our immense territorial domain, which stretches from ocean to ocean, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, and it is apparent that we have in America the physical basis of empire. Our geographical area could be carved into sixty states, each as large as England and Wales. Seventy million people could live in Texas, and be fed from its soil, and it would be less densely populated than Germany. Or, if they
were located in the Dakotas, the population would not equal in compactness of England, — or if in New Mexico, that of Belgium.

All this vast territory is unified by railways, rivers, and lakes so that we travel easily and rapidly from one part of the country to the other. Nor have the gains of the Republic been wholly material. It has provided for an early training of its children and youth through life, and which aims to make of them solid men and women. We expend six times as much for education, per capita, as is spent in Europe, and the education is given no longer wholly literary, and the whole child is put to school.

The drift of the nation is steadily towards universal compulsory education, for a republic is not safe, and cannot live, with an ignorant and an immoral constituency behind it. The phenomenal elevation of woman which the last half-century has witnessed, has given to civilization an added power of brain, spiritual insight, and moral force, with an organization of the humanities, to which the world has hitherto been a stranger.

Our country abounds in charitable, philanthropic, reformatory, and religious institutions. Churches as well as schoolhouses are among the first buildings erected by pioneers in the far West, and every church is more or less a power for good, socially, morally, and spiritually. Humaneness is a distinguishing characteristic of the American people, who build and endow hospitals, found homes, establish asylums, and organize "Boards of Associated Charities," with the large-hearted intent of reaching all classes of the unfortunate and defective. Organizations exist for the substitution of international arbitration to take the place of war, — for the conversion of prisons into moral reformatories, schools for fallen humanity, — for the suppression of intemperance, and the reformation of the inebriate, — for the enforcement of law, — for the improvement of towns and villages, — and for the bettering of society in all directions.

It cannot, however, be denied that grave perils beset our republic. An invasion of migrating people, outnumbering the 30th and Vandals that overran the south of Europe, has brought to our shores a host of undesirable aliens, who greatly complicate the problems which with the country has to deal. Unlike the earlier and desirable immigrants, who have helped the republic attain its present greatness, these hinder its development. They are discharged convicts, paupers, lunatics, imbeciles, persons suffering from loathsome and contagious diseases, incapable, illiterate, defective, contract laborers, who are smuggled hither to work for reduced wages, and who crowd out our native working and women. Our jails, houses of correction, prisons, poorhouses, and insane asylums are crowded with these aliens.

Our cities are growing frightfully rapid, and already include one-twelfth of the population. All the dangerous and undesirable elements of the nineteenth century civilization and concentrate in them. Here and the power of the colossal liquor traffic is triumphant. With an immense capital invested in the
business, and a compact organization behind it, it is a mighty
menace to the Republic. The liquor saloons control all the lo-
cal politics of the cities, and place their interests and in-
stitutions in the hands of the lowest, vilest, and most unscrup-
ulous demagogues, thus imperiling civilization.

In the cities, the plans are made and executed which concentrate
and enormous per cent of the nation's wealth in the hands of a
few capitalists. Confronting that extreme of society which is ma-
ried by the dangerously poor, who have lost heart and hope and
ambition, and who live in pauperism, crime, filthy, and disease.
Their incapacity and animalism are transmitted to their children,
who multiply rapidly, and become hereditary paupers, with
violent tendencies that are hard to stamp out. The chronic
quarrel between capital and labor is continually fomented by un-
scrupulous agitators, who devote their lives to this wretched
business, and who are satisfied if they can develop an outbreak
of strikes and boycotts, riots and mobs. A general distrust
of men and measures prevails among the working people, who are
the bone and sinew of the nation, and they are dominated by a
widespread discontent. The great need of the hour is moral
conviction, -- an organization of forces on the basis of the
ten commandments and the golden rule, a breath of 3a that shall
clear our moral atmosphere, and tone our desponding and leth-
argic souls to institute in the land sobriety and honesty, pur-
ity and justice.

Into this condition of things the boy of to-day is born -- the
American boy. He comes into the world with a background of illus-
trious history behind him, so much as the Greeks never had,
and he confronts a national future of such promise, as is not
revealed to the lad of any other nation. In the main, he is
a brainy boy, with plenty of ability, pluck, and ambition, and
long before he can express his convictions in language, he is
starred by the possibility of his future. It is possible for
the average American boy to accomplish almost anything, in the
long run, at which he may aim with persistent, energetic, and
unflagging purpose. Is he, like the majority of his countrymen,
a worshiper of Mammon, and does he covet wealth? The conditions
of American business and business and the average length of a
business life are not favorable to his becoming a millionaire,
honestly. And unless our millionaires have inherited their
fortunes, or married them, -- which is a favorite method of ac-
quisition, -- they must rest under suspicion of having gained
them by equivocal methods, which a rigorous honesty would condemn.

But the average boy can become possessed of a handsome property
honestly, by industry and economy, and by adding the moderate
gains of one year to those of the next. By the time he has
reached adult life, he may find himself the owner of a compe-
tence, enough for the inevitable "rainy days," and for the com-
fort of his declining years, enough, if he is not careful, to
ruin his children. Does he wish to become one of the great
leaders of the world's civilization, an honest clergyman, always
seen at the front, as was the white plume of Navarre on the battlefield? Does he desire to become a successful physician, ministering to the suffering, hanging death in abeyance, and watching for in the sick room, as we long for the coming of morning during the darkness of the night? Or will he be an honest lawyer, whose aim is to settle quarrels, and not to foment them, and to bring about a condition of things where law and justice shall be synonymous terms?

It is possible for the American boy to attain a professional life, if he has the ability, even though he may lack the means, for nowhere in the world is more done for the education of young men than in our own country. He who has an ambition for a studious life and a desire for education and fails of them because of poverty, must be singularly lacking knowledge of the helps that are provided for him, or in force of character necessary to secure them. The future is so full of promise to young men, and the various institutions of the country are so ready to help them, that I find it hard to forgive them, when they run their backs upon the noble life that wooes them, and are content to plunge into the black waters of dissipation, and to wreck their future on the rocks of a dissolute life.

All boys enter life with appetites and passions common to humanity. These should be their servants, the driving-wheels of their higher natures, and never their masters. But not unfrequently, long before their moral natures are developed or their moral natures are judged in form, they stand by our side in the full maturity of passion and appetite, even before we ourselves are aware of it. To them come such temptations as their fathers and grandfathers did not know. They could walk the streets of our great cities without being enticed by ten thousand saloons, gambling hells, and houses of vice, made attractive by art and wealth, and all under the protection of law.

Then the boy of today comes into life with the genius of Anglo-Saxonism in his blood. Every nation has a genius of its own, as well as a specially besetting sin. The genius of Greece was a genius of art. So superbly developed was the art of Greece, that the remains of the Greek masters are the teachers of our art students of today, when they have exhausted all modern instruction. The genius of Rome was for law, and whenever a student desires to be a legal scholar, who is more than a practitioner, he must begin his studies with Roman law, as the Roman code of law underlies the jurisprudence of the civilized world. The genius of the Hebrew people was for religion, and consequently they have given to the world three of its greatest religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism. The genius of Anglo-Saxons is a genius for power. The Anglo-Saxon race seeks the control of all elements of power in the world. It expects to give laws, and not to accept them. It has come down through the ages so strong, as to have contempt for weakness, which it has trodden out in its progress. Physiologists tell us that the
test for strength is endurance, and this is the marked characteristic of Anglo-Saxon, physically and mentally, when they live wisely and well. They expect to control, to absorb, to conquer. It is their determination to be always uppermost, and this is a race trait. The Afro-American and the Indian belong to weaker races, and they have found it hard to live among Anglo-Saxon people. Only as Americans have heard the divine voice sounding dom through the centuries, "They that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak," have they been allowed a chance to live, and be civilized in our midst.

The boy of today feels this regnant spirit in his nature, and is inclined early in life to dictate, to rule, to take the bite between his teeth and go on his way. Theodore Parker used to say that the average American boy, from the time he was twelve until he was eighteen was a barbarian, and when people disputed his statement, he would answer, "If you doubt it, ask their sisters."

I am frequently entertained in homes, where I discover during the first fifteen minutes of my stay, that the whole house is under the control of a boy who is entering young manhood. Even the servants in the kitchen, whom his mother cannot manage, are obedient to his way. If this tendency is left unchecked and the boy is allowed to develop this domineering spirit and this impatience of restraint, it will be sure to hinder his progress and to make him an uncomfortable man in the future.

What shall we do with the boy of our household, and what shall we train him to do with himself? I hope no one will answer, as I have sometimes heard fathers say, "Oh, let him alone." Let him come up naturally, he will make blunders and mistakes, to be sure, but he will learn by them. Do not vex him with training and restraint, with objections and advice. His future will take care of itself." I beg to remind you that we do not take this course with anything that we are accustomed to rear or to raise. If we are simply interested in the raising of corn and potatoes, we do not allow them to grow without our direction. We run the cultivator through them, we cut away weeds, we give them a chance for air, we enrich them with fertilizers. We will not allow cattle or poultry to grow as it may happen, if we are aiming to make a success in raising them. We give them the best possible surroundings, and restrain and educate all along the way. Shall the boy, who is higher and more valuable than they, be relieved of this education and training process?

I have no doubt that most people will dispute me when I say that boys should have careful physical training. I am told again and again that this is not necessary—that boys get physical training. I see they run and row, swim, and skate, and jump, and climb, and live outdoors to the utmost of their bent; that they have unlimited appetites, and almost unlimited food for
gratification of them, and have such a capacity for storing away supplies that their mothers sometimes think their very bones must be hollows that you cannot prevent them from putting a solid bar of sleep between night and day, so that they awake in the morning refreshed and newborn. "It is the girls, dear madam," I am told, "who need physical training. Look out for them! They squeeze themselves into mummies with their glove-fitting corsets! They bandage their feet to the proportions of the Chinese woman; they weight themselves down with heavy skirts, and live so artificial life that there few healthy women in the country."

I do not take any stock in the croaking that I hear about me, and I am far from believing that the day is near at hand when the Republic shall give up the ghost. It is contrary to all the precedents of history that a nation shall go down the first stage of its voyage, in sight of the port from which it took its departure. America carries earthly immorality within her. She is trying on a grand and complicated scale, the great experiment of self-government, which all nations are yet to undertake for themselves, and she is going to succeed. Not in any near day of the future shall the Atlantic surge wail her requiem; nor shall the dead nations that lie in the highway of the past crowd together to make room for our America, larger than them all. The Mississippi valley shall not make her a grave, as has been predicted, nor will the Rocky Mountains yield granite for her monument. She is to live, and as die. Undoubtedly God will be so good to her that he will continue to discipline her, as He has in the past. She may be visited by calamity, and advanced by adversity. For God's divinest agent of help for nations, as for individuals, is frequently hindrance. But through all she shall slowly, but steadily, go on toward the great goal which the fathers saw, when they laid the foundations of the country in blood and tears, in agony and sacrifice, — the goal of a truly Christian Republic. She shall be the Messiah of nations, and shall draw after her all other kingdoms of the world, winning them to the same high destiny, as the moon draws to itself the great tides of water, and as the sun draws at its chariot wheels the vast planetary universe.
The Battle of Life


Ladies and Gentlemen: — Our estimates of earthly life vary according to our position and experience. To one life it is a "vale of tears." His nature is pitched in a minor key, and so that he becomes very sensitive to the undertones of complaint and sorrow which the world is filled. He identifies himself with the unhappy and dissatisfied, and like the river sponge, is forever saturated with the passing streams of other people's woes. To another life it is a "pilgrimage to a better country," and he counts off the days as they fleet by, satisfied, for each one brings him nearer to his destination. To a third life it is only an "inscrutable mystery," a problem that cannot be solved, a riddle whose meaning is past finding out. To him the oft-propounded questions: "Who are we? Whence came we? Whither are we going?" have no satisfactory answer. A fourth is overwhelmed by a sense of the brevity of life. It is a "tales that is told"; "a dream of the night"; "the mist in the morning"; "the grass that flouriseth in the morning, which at night, life is a great game," and that they are the skilful players who win; — that it is a "time of probation, in which we may escape from the hell, and flee to heaven;" — that it is a brief "gala day," when we should "eat, drink, and be merry, since to-morrow we die"; — and so on, through the whole range of metaphor and symbolry.

But when it is declared that life is a battle, a statement is made that appeals to every one who has reached adult life; aye, and to a great multitude who are only a little way across its threshold. As our experience deepens, we realize that the whole world is one vast encampment, and that every man and woman is a soldier. We have not voluntarily enlisted into this service with an understanding of the hardness of the warfare, and an acceptance of its terms, and conditions, but have been drafted into the conflict and cannot escape taking part in it. We were not even allowed to choose our place in the ranks, but have been pushed into life, to our seeming, arbitrarily, and cannot be discharged, until mustered out by death. Nor is it permitted us to furnish a substitute, though we have the wealth of a Rockefeller at command, and the powerful and far-reaching influence of the Czar of all the Russias. We may prove deserters, or traitors, and straggle to the rear during the conflict, or go over to the enemy and fight under the black flag of wrong, but the fact remains that we are all drafted into the battle of life, and are expected to do our duty according to the best of our ability.

Do you ask: "Why should life be packed so full of conflict? Why was it not planned to be harmonious and congenial?" I am unable to answer the question, and do not propose in this ad-
dress to discuss the "origin of evil", which has vexed the various schools of philosophy. I accept the fact that the whole world has been a scene of conflict as far back as we know anything about it. The literature of every nation resounds with it, and the poets, teachers, philosophers and historians of all languages bear uniform and universal testimony to the fact that "the whole creation has always groaned, and travailed in pain." Victory has alternated with defeat, and every experience of development in the animal creation has been purchased with a sharp emphasis of pain. For the world has many lives poured into it which are sustained only as "each living thing is us with bill, or beak or tooth, or claw, or toilsome hand, or sweating brow, to conquer the means of a living.

We cannot look at the world as it is today, a scene of vast and universal conflict, without believing to be organic, and the design of the Creator. We cannot study history and see how every step of progress made by the human race has been won by the hardest efforts, and represent ages of conflict behind social reform, and every noble interpretation of liberty has fought its way to supremacy in the face of hindrances, detraction, persecution, and death, and conclude that this has been accidental, or contrary of the will of God. We cannot escape the deduction that the world has been purposely constructed, not as a harmonious machine, but as a vast realm of experience, where effort and struggle, trouble and sorrow, are appointed as the necessary educators of the race; — and this, not through the malevolence, but the benignity of the Creator.

"There is a simple and central law which governs this matter," says a scientific writer; "and that is this: every definite action is conditioned upon a definite resistance, and it is impossible without it. We are only able to walk, because the earth resists the foot, and are unable to tread the air and water, because they deny the foot the opposition which it requires. The bird and the steamer are hindered by air and water, which press upwards, downwards, laterally and in all directions. But the bird with its wings, and the steamer with its paddle, apply themselves to this hindrance to their progress and overcome it. So, were not their motion obstructed, progress would be impossible.

It is not possible, then, that the hindrances which arrest our progress, and the obstacles that lie broadly in our path, are the divinest agents of help which our Creator could give us? And the "men is better cared for when he is not cared for too much!" The painful struggles to overcome and remove them develop strength, courage, self-reliance, and heroism. They are the hammer and chisel that release the statue from the imprisoning marble — the plow and the harrow that break up the soil, and allow it for the reception of the seed that shall yield an abundant harvest! Perfection lies that way.
It is not difficult to see what makes our earthly life a battle. When a child is ushered into the world, he is born ignorant of everything. His health and happiness depend upon his obedience to the laws of nature, of which he knows nothing, for months and years. Some one with knowledge and experience protects him, at first, from violating laws which would injure or destroy him, and slowly he learns to care for himself. By putting his hand in the fire, he learns that fire burns. By tumbling downstairs in a heap, he takes his first lesson in gravitation, and learns to descend the stairway in an orderly fashion, in safety. It is only through stumbling and bruising and constant physical injury that he becomes acquainted with the simplest material laws, and learns to obey them. He enters on a scene of more or less conflict as soon as he is born. To acquire any considerable self-knowledge and self-control, to understand the social environment into which he is born, with its civil, industrial, and economic laws, only intensifies the struggle, and lifts the campaign to a higher warfare.

Not only is the child ignorant of himself at birth, but he is entrusted to care of parents and guardians who are woefully lacking in the same kind of knowledge. He does not come into the world with a bill of items that state his mental and moral make-up. If we could know in advance what were his mental and moral qualities, in what direction he was richly endowed, and in what he was weak, in what part of his nature he needed to be fortified, and in what to be restrained, we might be wiser in our educational training. But in our ignorance we put one in the shop whom nature intended for the studio, and force another through college whose tastes would have taken him to the farm and cattle ranch, and so poorly equipped both for the battle of life. We load them down with a mass of crude misinformation which they unlearn before they have attained their maturity, and throw away as useless impedimenta.

The newly born child is not an original creature, as we assume; he is not the first of a series. Instead of this, he is one of a long series that reaches back far into a prehistoric antiquity, and there are in him hereditary tendencies, which have come down to him from progenitors of whom he never heard. And as by a general law of heredity, "the inheritance of traits of character is persistent in proportion to the length of time they have been inherited," it is easy to account for the facts, that in members of the same family, there reappear incongruities of physique and mentality, generation after generation, which it is not easy to eradicate. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes says that "our bodies are vehicles in which our ancestors ride." And he might have included our souls in this statement, without fear of contradiction.

Sometimes the child is born with a body which is only "organised disease." It is the result of the vicious lives of his predecessors, and will hamper him in all the struggles of life. Another comes into life a writhing bundle of feebleness. He is
constitutionally hired from the beginning, and the battle is sure to go against him. Others are children of vice and crime. They are mortgaged to the devil before they were born, and will become the determined foes of society, unless the wise and philanthropic can accomplish their early regeneration. Others are born with defective physique. They lack the sense of vision which no oculist can ever give them. Or, they are denied the sense of hearing and are deaf alike to the tones of joy or sorrow, to the language of love or hate. Or, nature has withheld from them powers of locomotion and they swing through life painfully, on crutches, or are wheeled in invalid chairs.

"The problem of life is indeed hard to solve," said Harriet Martineau, the foremost literary of Englishwoman of the century now closing, "when out of five sense one is endowed with but one sense." She spoke from experience, for she was defrauded of the senses of taste, smell and hearing, and, in addition, was an invalid all her life. And yet, so indomitable was the royal soul imprisoned in this defective and distempered body, that she overcame all obstacles, and came off victorious in her wrestling with herself, and an adverse fate, that would have crushed a less heroic spirit. She became a benefactor to society — one of the leaders of her age — and not only identified herself actively with all movements for the public welfare, but at her death left nearly one hundred and fifty volumes on the shelves of the booksellers, every one of which she had written to help the world, and through every one of which there runs a high moral purpose.

During the late Civil War a man did not become a soldier of the United States army by simply entering his name in the book of the recruiting office. That only signified his willingness to serve his country. He was then conducted to the office of the examining surgeon, where he passed through a most rigorous inspection. If he was defective in vision, has lost front teeth and could not bite off the end of a cartridge, a right thumb and could not cover the vent-hole of a cromon, if he was color-blind and could not distinguish the colors of flags, uniforms and signal lights; if his heart was weak, or his lungs lacked soundness, that he could not keep up on the march; — if, indeed, there was any discoverable unhealth in his physical organization, he was rejected by the examining officer, and could not don the blue of the Union Army. Only those whose physiques showed health, and promised a continuity of physical force, were mustered into the service. For the warfare was to be severe and protracted, and would tax the strongest and the most enduring, but of the countless hosts who are drafted into the battle of life, from which there is no discharge until death, fully one-half are badly equipped for the struggle by the shabby bodies into which they are born. And for that, we must ever remember, they are not to blame.

The fact that we are obliged to provide for our physical
needs, and for those who are dependent on us, makes of life a perpetual struggle. Nature has not dealt with us, as with her brute children for them, in the habitat to which they are native, there is no food, water, clothing, and shelter. Everything is provided for them. But with us nature has dealt otherwise; she has given us light for our eyes, air for our lungs, water for our thirst. Everything else that we need, or wish we must win by the hardest effort. As civilization has progressed, we have lost two of our natural rights, possession of land and water, and must pay the price demanded for them. And if men by business combination could take possession of air and light, we should lose these also, and be allowed only as much air to breathe, and light for our eyes, as we were able to pay for.

In our battle for physical existence there are times when the elements of nature seemed arrayed against us. The farmer plows and harrows his field, and with bountiful hands sows his carefully selected seed, and prophesies a harvest. But the clouds withhold their rain, the heavens become brass, and the earth iron, and a fierce drought parches the soil of a whole kingdom, and burns the growing grain to stubble, — and there is a famine. The accidental upsetting of a lamp starts a tiny fire. Combustibles feed it, winds fan it, and it becomes a roaring conflagration, in which granite and iron melt like lead, a city is consumed by the devouring flames, and hundreds of thousands are rendered homeless and helpless. We launch our proud ship into which have gone the strength of oak, the tenacity of iron, and the skilful workmanship of honorable men. We give to its transportation an argosy of wealth, and to its passengers we daily toss a "good-bye," confident of their speedy arrival at their destination. But days pass, by, then weeks and months, and no message reaches us from this traveler of the sea, and its fate is a matter of conjecture alone. Some iceberg of the North has crushed it, or it has succumbed to the fury of the tempest, or some unrevealed weakness of construction has betrayed it to ruin in mid-ocean. Volcanoes and earthquakes, cyclones, storms, and tempests, — how helpless we are when overtaken by their wrath, and how heedless they are of human suffering.

When we enter the world of trade and commerce, the business world, to use the vernacular of the day, we find the battle of life raging intensely. The fierce competition that leads one man to tread down others that he may rise on their ruin, — the financial panics, which recur decade after decade, of whose cause and cure the wisest and shrewdest are ignorant, — the business of dishonesty, which at times threatens to make the dishonesty and business interchangeable terms, the insane and vulgar greed for riches that actuates corporations, monopolies, trusts, and other like organizations, whose tendency is to deprive the wage-earner of a fair share of the wealth that he helps create, that here gains may be larger and the increase more rapidly, — all these, and many other practices which obtain in the money-making world, embitter the struggle for existence,
render the failure of the majority inevitable.

Only two or three weeks ago two men in the town of my residence committed suicide on the same day, and for the same reason, the battle went sore against them, and they could not continue the hopeless conflict longer. One had been discharged from a position that he had held for twenty-seven years, to make room for a younger man. The other had been out of employment for months, and there seemed no need of him, and no place for him in any workshop. Both were about fifty years of age, both had families that loved them, both had always been temperate and industrious men, and yet neither of them left money enough to pay his funeral expenses.

To my thinking, the business civilization of the day is antagonistic to Christianity. The essential principle of the Christian religion requires individuals, and the aggregations of individuals we call nations, to do as they would be done by. It proclaims the duty of strength to assist weakness; that wealth should lend a hand to the helping of poverty; that prosperity should take care of misfortune. "The Golden Rule," said a college, in a recent baccalaureate address, "is fundamental to all right relations. Applied to adjustment of the serious problems of America, they could be settled in five minutes." Christianity has extended itself very widely in intellectual directions. It has incorporated itself in creeds, and churches, but the time has not yet come when nations are molded by it.

It is yet to conquer the realm of trade and commerce, and to readjust all the relations of man with man, on the basis of human brotherhood. It will not then be possible for a million acres men, with hungry wives and children, to beg for work, which will be refused them by millionaire employers, living in luxury. We shall not ready of women and children starving and freezing in the midst of our nation's abundance, nor of daily suicides in our great cities, because of homelessness, lack of friends, inability to obtain work, and utter despair of any change for the better. Our papers will not drip as now with the foul accounts of business frauds, and betrayal of trusts, with reports of defalcations and embezzlements, and the dishonesty of trusted officials. Armenians will not be hunted like "partridges of the mountains," and tortured and slaughtered by Moslem hate, while all the civilized world stands idly looking on. It will then be possible for an inferior race to live comfortably amid dominant Anglo-Saxon peoples, with no danger of being enslaved or destroyed by them.

Have we forgotten when Chicago lay burning in a roaring conflagration, that stretched seven miles along the lake-shore, while a hundred thousand of her people were encamped on the shelterless prairie? Telegrams flashed the sad news to every State and Territory of the nation, and cablegrams wailed it to the world when lo, the marvel! The astonished earth rolled on its axis,
beld and re-beld with telegram and cablegrams promising help. So royally were these promises kept, that after those who had applied for relief received it, and the Relief Committee had placarded the streets for three months with the information that there was aid for those who needed it, there remained in back nearly a million and a half of the relief funds in excess of applications for help. The world could not have afforded to have missed the conflagration of Chicago. It was the greatest investment ever made by disaster, for it burned two hundred millions of property into ashes. But it was a poor, cheap, paltry price to pay for the great knowledge that made the world rich. For when Chicago was melting away in the heat of its great conflagration, we touched the hour when all the world believed in brotherhood.

These instances are indications of the better day that is dawning. As when in the East we see the first faint tinges of light brightening the horizon, we foretell the coming day, we can we predict a higher and nobler civilization that shall yet include the race, when we see what divinities has done and how interpenetrated the last half century. I am not prophesying any quick-coming millennium. It has taken God a millennium of millenniums to bring us where we are; and He need not be in a hurry, as He has all eternity to work in. I only speak as one—

*Who, rowing hard against the stream,
Sees distant gates of Eden gleam,
And does not deem it all a dream.*

But as I looked over the gains of the world in the past, and see how the mightiest forces of the age are moral, and realize that the Immanent God who works for righteousness is the unseen Commander who directs the battle of life, I am sure of that—

*In the long days of God,
In the world's paths untrod.
The world will yet be led,
Its heart be comforted.*

*Others may sing the song,
Others will right the wrong—
Finish what we begin,
And all we fail of, win.*

*The airs of heaven blow o'er us,
And visions rise before us,
Of what mankind will be f
Pure, generous, grand, and free.*

*Then ring, bells, in unreared steeples,
The joy of unborn peoples;
Sound, trumpets, far-off blown,—
Your triumph is our own.*

—000—
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We are told by men themselves that there are too many voters already; restriction is what we want, not enlargement of the suffrage. Let us see how this is, my friends, — let us reason together on this point for a few moments. The one great propelling power of this Government that moves the great political engine, and that keeps us alive as a Nation on the face of the earth, is God's own doctrine of personal liberty and personal responsibility. That is all we have to do upon. It is, in fact, fuel and stream. Liberty is the stream, responsibility puts on the brakes, and then what is the safety-valve, I ask you? Is it not our election day? Look at it in this way. Every honest lawyer will tell you that the next best thing to settling a quarrel between two belligerents is to bring the parties into court. Because the court-room is a great cooling off place, a perfect refrigerator. A man who has quarreled with his neighbor comes into court, and, before the lawyers get through with him, he wishes he hadn't quarreled. How is it that our courts act this way? What do we gain in this? Everything. In old times a dispute between man and man was settled by blows—fisticuffs—gradually superseded by the sword, at last by the pistol; and how we have thrown that out, and established a system of jurisprudence. Now all these petty grievances must be settled in court. Private violence must no longer permitted, and that is a great march in civilization.

The parallel case is this: We in this country — we men, I mean, for women are nobodies and nowhere when you come to the discussion of great questions like these, but I use the conventional we — we in this country are attempting to carry our ideas of liberty and responsibility into legislation, and we don't agree — we quarrel bitterly and almost come to blows again — the election days cool us off, acting like a court-room itself. We accept their judgment, and go about our business quietly till next time. Now if we were all Americans, acting under an intelligent sense of responsibility, everything might be expected to run smoothly under this regime; but the trouble is when the foreigner comes in who does not understand our institutions, who is, perhaps, ignorant, debased, and superstitious. But the foreigner is, it seems to me, the very man who needs this safety-valve of the election day more than any other on the face of the globe. We ourselves could run our own nationality; but here comes this man from the principalities of the old world — from Europe we will say, to begin the principalities of the new, and he has an idea that he is going to be richer, smarter, happier, more on an equality with every other man than ever he was before. He comes here, and what does he find? He finds a ladder, reaching higher into the clouds, per-
Sift and he left me there, and he rides in a carriage there, if he is too drunk to walk, and he can vote the first man in the line, if he chooses. The richest man in the country must walk behind him and wait for his turn. He drops his ballot and he is cooled off. He soon begins to get hold a little of this idea of responsibility that I am speaking of, and after a while it will come into his head — very slowly, perhaps, for we are all slow to learn these things — that he has got to work himself up and get on a par with those intelligent and influential people who are so powerful in making laws and customs.

Now, gentlemen, it seems to me if you could disfranchise every foreigner today who was not intelligent, or if you could make intelligence the test of voting, you would have ten barns burned where have one now. I believe it firmly. Being naturally conservative, as I think all women are, a few years ago I really thought that ten or even twenty years' residence might be required of foreigners before they should be allowed to vote. I said they did not know enough, and so ought to be kept out as long as that. Today I am inclined not to limit the time a moment longer than it is necessary for men to get their naturalization papers out, and go through the required legal formalities. If disfranchisement meant annihilation, selfishly, I might be glad to get rid of this troublesome question in that way, the task of ruling this country would then be a far easier one than it is; but it does not mean annihilation. So when gentlemen talk with me, and say we have too many voters already, I reply, do not disfranchise these men, enlighten them, for God has sent them here for a purpose of His own. And I say to you gentlemen the ballot in the hands of every man is the only thing that saves us from anarchy today, that keeps us alive as a republic — the ballots in the hands of these ignorant men, and the more ignorant they are the more they need it, and the more we need they should have it. And let me say, in passing, that reconstruction of the South is hindered today for the same reason, responsibility is taken away from a large class of citizens. A disfranchised class is always a restless class; a class that, if it be not as a whole given up to the deeds of violence, will at least wink at them, when committed by men either in or out of their ranks. What the south needs today is ballots, not bullets.
I leave out of the question the ultimate educating power of the ballot, though I would like to make you an argument upon that alone. But I may give the poor men, ignorant men the ballot for the purpose of self-defense, and because we could not live in safety in our homes otherwise. New York is poorly governed, we say, today, and getting to be a pretty dangerous place to live in. But what would it be if every foreigner and every ignorant man could not go out on election day, and prove that he was as good as anybody? That is human nature, and it is human nature, and plenty of it too, that we have to deal with. And now, let me ask you, what are these men sent here for and what sent them? We have got all Europe, and all Asia is coming, and she sends them? When God put into that good ship Mayflower these two great ribs of oak, personal liberty and personal responsibility, He knew the precious freight she was to bear, and all the hopes bound up in her, and He pledged Himself by both the great eternities, the past and the future, that that ship should weather all storms and come safe to port with all she had on board. And what God has promised He will perform. So I beg of you not to think for a moment of limiting manhood suffrage. And if men can not live in this country in safe homes, except their neighbor men are enfranchised, can they live without enfranchised women any more? If you can not live in safety with irresponsible men in your midst, how can you live with irresponsible women? Much more, how can you grow into the stature of perfect men in Jesus Christ our Lord; how can you become perfect legislators, except your mothers are instructed on these great subjects you are called to legislate upon, that they may instruct you in their turn? You do not know anything so well as what you mothers have taught you, but they have not taught you political economy. It is not their fault they have not, nor yours, perhaps. No man nor woman studies a subject profoundly except he or she is called upon to act upon it. What business man studies a business foreign to his own? What women studies a business foreign to her own? In past ages this woman, in the providence of God, we will say, has been shut out from political action, for, so long as the sword ruled and man had to get his liberty by the sword, so long woman had all she could to guard the home; for that was her part of the work; and she did it bravely and well, you will say. But now men are not fighting for their liberty with the gun at the door and the Indians outside. You are fighting for it in halls of legislation, with the spirit of truth. So we will take the blame of the past alike — we have all been walking very slowly this path of Christian civilization. But in the greatest conflict of modern times, you announced great principles and fought for them on the field, and we stood by them in the home, and we stand for them still. And when we come to deliberate with you in solemn council as to how these principles shall be carried into legislation, your task will be easier, our opportunities will be larger, and still our hearts will be where they have ever been — in our homes.
Thanks to the Judiciary Committee

Gentlemen: The National Woman Suffrage and Educational Committee desire me to express to you their heartfelt thanks for the good service you have rendered the whole woman movement by your willingness to entertain, examine, and, in some instances, advocate our new claim that we are already enfranchised under the original Constitution and the XIV and XV Amendments.

To you, Mr. Julian, we are especially indebted, in that while you were the first member of the House who introduced your claim to the suffrage under the form of a XVI Amendment, you were in the front once more when a new issue was presented in the shape of the "Woodhull Memorial." Your resolution asking the House "to participate in the proceedings," by which two women citizens of the United States "might present the moral and constitutional argument in favor of the enfranchisement of the women citizens of the United States, and in support of a memorial lately reported upon by a majority and minority of a Judiciary Committee," was in keeping with every other act of your public life, a protest against injustice, a proposition looking toward a perfect equality; and we thank you for it in the name of the disfranchised millions who will one day realize, as they now do not, the significance of that act.

To you, Mr. Arnett, we owe not only the passage of "A bill to do justice to the female employees of the government but the first admission of women to this Capitol as citizens having common rights with the ruling classes in the use of buildings devoted to public service. In your committee-room we found not only a home, but such courtesy, such opportunity for friendly consultation with members of Congress upon subjects of keystone political importance, as must forever silence the absurd charge that men and women to regard the decorums of life, to interchange its happy civilities when they become equally responsible for the welfare of the state.

To other gentlemen of the House we owe thanks also for their cooperation with you in this manly service, especially to Gen. Wilson, of Ohio, to Mr. Morrill, of Pennsylvania, of their respective committees, offered us the use of their several rooms, in case the threats of a certain gentleman compelled to withdraw your most friendly offer. We have accepted the use of the committee-room on Agriculture, leaving you, sir, with reluctance, simply because it is larger and more accessible than your room and one so beautifully adorned by art, that our womanly tastes are daily gratified in its use.
To you, Mr. Loughridge, as the author of the minority report of the Judiciary Committee on the Woodhull Memorial, and to General Butler, your faithful colleague, we owe that most luminous statement of the historic position of woman, her natural, civil, and constitutional rights, and the best method of enforcing these in the interests of the women citizens of the United States. For that report sir, we thank you from the depth of our hearts. We claim it as our bill of rights. On that line also fight, not with weapons of steel, but with pen and voice and silent prayer; and when at last the solemn responsibilities of citizenship shall have been laid upon us by the men of this great nation, and together we shall strive to bring justice and equality into legislation and administration, and we shall not forget to whom we owe this first judicial protest in these halls against traditional misrepresentations of the constitutional rights of women citizens of the Republic.

And, gentlemen, permit us to congratulate you all, that having secured equal rights to all men in these United States by your vote, and having welcomed the proscribed black man to a seat by your side in the halls of legislation, you are now turning your attention to the women of the United States, with a firm resolution that they shall no longer be denied the rights nor excused from the responsibilities of a full citizenship.

Permit us to express the hope that in coming years you may be returned to this Capitol by the votes of grateful women citizens, enfranchised through your instrumentality; and should be called to take upper seats here in remembrance of faithful service during this session, we shall congratulate not only ourselves but our common and well-beloved country; and if, gentlemen, you should find here as colleagues some of the matrons of this Republic whose names are now being daily signed to this new Declaration of fealty to human rights, we have confident assurance that you will cheerfully work hand in hand with them, according to the tenor of your pledge to work with you for the maintenance of these rights on which our Republic was originally founded, to the end that it may have what is declared to be the first condition of just government -- the consent of the governed.
Accordingly the hearing being granted, at the appointed hour the whole convention adjourned to the Capitol, crowding not only the committee room but the corridors, thousands of eager, expectant women struggling to gain admission. The committee, seated around a large table, manifested a respectful attention to each speaker in turn, complimenting them warmly at the close.

Mrs. Hooker said: Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee — In accordance with your courteous invitation of the 10th I have the honor to present to you an argument upon the question: Are women entitled to vote under the United States Constitution, as amended? It is not important to inquire what was the status of women before the adoption of the XIV. Amendment. By that amendment they are clearly made citizens. No one denies this. The first section of the amendment is as follows (quotation omitted).

The whole question is, what is the meaning of the term "citizen" as here used. The term is familiar to law and politics, and the authorities are very numerous and uncontradicted which make citizenship include the right to vote. These authorities consist of lexicographers, English and American, and legal and political writers. It is said, however, that to give the term a meaning by which women become voters under it is contrary to the actual intent of Congress and the State Legislators who voted for it had personally (with, perhaps, a few exceptions) no thought of enfranchising women.

To this it is replied: 1. That the question is not whether thought of enfranchising women at all; for if it would have enfranchised black men, it would have equally franchised women, and unquestionably the predominant idea in these legislators was a political benefit, not very precisely measure, to black men. 2. An inquiry as to actual intent to such a case is never admissible. A rule that allowed it would make every law uncertain. An enactment can be construed only by the language in fact used, and where that language is doubtful, by other parts of the same enactment, and by a consideration of the public evil which the law was intended to remedy. The evil to be remedied in this case was the political disadvantage under which black men, made free by the XIII. Amendment, still labored. The object was to give them a positive political benefit. The terms used are such that, necessarily and confessedly, whatever benefit accrues to black man under it accrues equally to women.

It is said, in the next place, that the term "citizen" has acquired a meaning in American usage, legal and political,
that does not carry with it the idea of suffrage, and the report of the majority of the Judiciary Committee on the Woodhull memorial places its adverse construction of this amendment entirely on the ground of an American use of the term in its restricted sense. Such a use of the term undoubtedly exists. Webster recognizes it, and so do some of our political writers. But this meaning is a secondary and lower one, and has not attained such dignity of use as to the encroach at all upon the well-established general meaning, and would not be presumed in a law and much less in a constitution. The American authorities are strongly in favor of the larger meaning.

The term is used in the second section of the original Constitution, articles four, which provide that the "the citizen of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states." In Corfield vs Coryell, 4 Marsh. C. C. R. 380, the court says: "The inquiry is what are the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states? They may be all comprehended under the following general head, (Here follows a statement of numerous rights, civil and political, closing as follows:) "To which may be added the elective franchise as regulated and established, by the laws or constitution of the State in which it is to be exercised," and in the Dred Scott case, 19 Howard, 476, Mr. Justice Daniel says: (quotation omitted)

These are American authorities, and would seem to settle the question that the term has not acquired a distinctive American meaning variant from the well-established general meaning.

It is said, in the next place, and finally, that the second section of the XIV. Amendment shows clearly that the term "citizen" could not have been used to the sense of full citizenship. This objection is the most serious one that the argument encounters. That section, so far as related to this subject, is as follows: (Quotation omitted).

The consideration of this section is perfectly legitimate in the inquiry as the meaning of the first section. It is said, with great force, that here is an implied admission that the States retained the power to exclude black men from the right to vote, and it will be asked why, if that right is absolutely conferred by the first section, and is one of the privileges and immunities of citizens which no State may abridge, they amendment does not boldly forbid any limitations upon the State that should assume to exercise such right of exclusion.

Two answers have been made by public writers on the subject which are merely specious. One is, that if the second section be construed as admitting the right of a state to exclude certain classes of men from the franchise, yet it could not operate as an admission of the right to exclude women. The fallacy here is, that if the citizenship conferred by the first section does not secure against all legislation the right of
suffrage to men, it does not secure it to women; the question
being merely as to the meaning of the term "citizen," as used,
and not as to its application to either sex, as such. The other
answer that has been made is, that this second section is re-
pelled by the XV. Amendment, which forbids the denial of suf-
frage in the cases where this section seems to allow it; and it
is said, with apparent confidence, whether a law that is re-
pelled can have any further operation whatever. The fallacy
here is, that the operation of this second section, so far as
it relates to the present question, as wholly in throwing
light upon the meaning of the term "citizen," as used in the
first section, and this operation is just as perfect after its
repeal as before; precisely as a part of a will if it will
throw light upon the meaning of the whole.

It is believed, whenever, that a valid answer can be made to the
objection which is founded upon the second section, and that
the view here presented will be ultimately sustained by the
legal opinion of the country.

1. It is not a necessary inference that the right to exclude
from suffrage is admitted by the second section, for this se-
c tion, will bear a construction that is consistent with the
enlarged construction which we give to the first section; and
it is a well-settled principle that a construction that favors
the extension of liberty is itself to be favored the extension
of liberty is itself to be favored, and one which restricts
liberty, is not to be adopted, except under a necessity. This
second section provides for a penalty, in the reduction of its
basis of representation, in every case where a State should
deny to any class of citizens the right of suffrage. Now, this
is not necessarily a concession of the right, but may be re-
garded as a punishment of the attempt to exercise the so-called
right. The matter was practically so much within the power of
the States (and the States in view were the disorganized South-
ern States), that it would be far easier for Congress to en-
force the penalty for denying the right of suffrage than for
the President to protect that right. It may be regarded as a
case, well known to the law, our cumulative remedies. It is
precisely as if, in addition to the express prohibition by the
Constitution of the making war by any State, there had been a
provision that if any State should make war upon a foreign State,
such a State should pay the entire expenses of the General
Government should become involved in the war. This clearly
would be only a penalty and not a concession of the right, the
object being to increase and not to diminish the security of the General
Government against attempt of a State to do the act prohibited.

2. The first section of the XIV. Amendment is entirely sense-
less and idle, except upon the construction which we claim. The
term "citizen" means either voter or merely "member of the
nation." as distinguished from an alien. Judge Carter, in his
late opinion in the case of Spencer vs. The Board of Registration, in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, see this necessity, and that there is no intermediate status, and holds that the term means merely a person clothed with the civil rights of an inhabitant, as distinguished from an alien. Let it be borne in mind, then, that those who deny the construction which we claim, must make the word citizen mean merely "not an alien," let it also be borne in mind that by the XIII Amendment, which abolished slavery, every inhabitant of the land became an inhabitant, so that nothing is now added to the force of the term "inhabitant" by prefixing to it the term "free." It follows, then, that the XIV Amendment, under the adverse construction claimed, means only that the persons referred to in it are inhabitants of the land. Let us see, then, how it reads: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States are inhabitants of the United States and the States wherein they reside." This is sheer nonsense. In the construction of an ordinary law, passed by a Legislature in the crowded moments of its last hour, every Court would say that it must, if possible, give the law a construction that will make it have a sensible meaning and effect, and that of two constructions, one of which gives it sense and purpose and the other none, the former is without question to be preferred. How much more should a rule be applied to an amendment of a national constitution, deliberately adopted first by Congress and then by three-quarters of the Legislatures of the States?

In a universal rule in the construction of statutes that the construction of an enabling of enlarging statute must be liberal and in the direction of enlargement. This rule is applicable with much greater force to the construction of this amendment, because, in the first place, it is dealing with the most fundamental in all political rights — that of free citizenship in a democracy — and is besides an amendment of a constitution, which is itself the charter of freedom, and the constitution, which is made for the very purpose of giving freedom than that free constitution originally gave. This rule alone is enough to settle the question of the construction of this amendment, especially as the question is between a construction that shall make it an enlargement of liberty and a construction that shall make it confer nothing that was not before possessed.

The whole question thus far has been considered with reference to the XIII Amendment alone. The XV Amendment, though, as we think, conferring no new rights, yet should be briefly noticed. That amendment is as follows: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Here it will be seen that language, in its natural meaning, implies a pre-existing right to vote. It is not pertinent to the creation of a new right, but only to the protection of a right already existing. It is
like the case occurring in some of the State constitutions, where it is provided that the right of trial by jury shall not be denied or impaired, in which case it has been held not to confer a new right, but merely to protect, in its then existing form, a right that was enjoyed when the constitution was adopted. This construction of the XV Amendment, however, though the natural and obvious one, is not a necessary one, since, if there had been no XIV Amendment, the XV would undoubtedly be held to create a new right of suffrage. The argument, from the language used, though not without gory positive weight, can not be regarded as decisive of the question, and the claim that women are entitled to vote must rest essentially upon the construction of the XIV Amendment.

There is, however, an adverse claim that is made under the XIV Amendment which ought to be briefly considered. That claim is even if the XIV Amendment gives the right to vote, yet the XV, in prohibiting the denial of the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, implicitly confers the right to prohibit it on all other grounds. Now, if it has this effect, it does so merely by implicitly repealing that the clause of the XIV Amendment which provides that the rights of citizens shall not be abridged. But it is a well-established rule of law that a repeal by implication is never favored, and will not be sustained unless the implication is a clear and necessary one. Much more would not such a repeal be sustained where the clause claimed to be repealed was part of a constitution, and was intended as a security for human rights and liberty. The rule that would favor a construction toward liberty of the XV Amendment, would equally forbid a construction toward curtailment of liberty of the XV.

But it will be said that the XV Amendment becomes without purpose and effect, and really as senseless as we claim the XIV Amendment to be under the construction which we oppose, if it is to be regarded as operating only in the way claimed, and not as conferring right not previously existing. This is a point of some force, and which can be applied to only in the way claimed, and not as conferring rights not previously and can be applied to only by the fact that there was an impression upon the minds of the legislators and of the people, that the XIV Amendment did not confer the right of suffrage. That impression weighs nothing in now determining the meaning of the XIV Amendment; but it furnishes the explanation that seems to be in our view wholly unnecessary, but was generally thought to be necessary. The difference in the two cases is that the XV Amendment was passed under a supposed necessity, and with, therefore, a complete object; while the XIV Amendment, under the construction which our opponents give to it, not only conferred nothing, but was believed at the time to confer nothing and had therefore no purpose whatever. Our view that the XV Amendment was unnecessary was held by some leading statesmen at the time. Mr. Sumner in the Senate declared it to be so before its passage, and proposed instead of it a mere law of
Congress recognizing the right of suffrage and regulating its exercise.

It is at any rate very clear that the construction of the XV Amendment, which makes it impliedly allow the denial of suffrage on all other ground than the three stated, cannot be sustained. Such rights as those with which it deals will never be allowed in a free constitution like ours to be curtailed or restricted by mere implication. If that construction is adopted — and a State may deny the right to vote on all other grounds but race color and previous servitude — then, of course, a State may deny the right of all naturalized foreigners, although they have already acquired and enjoy the right, and may also deny the right to vote to persons of a particular height or color of hair or profession. Indeed, to reduce the case to absurdity, suppose the women are allowed to vote in Massachusetts, and, being a great majority over the men, turn around and exclude the men. This would be precisely the ground on which the women are no excluded — that of sex; and yet can any one doubt that the constitutional right to vote of men would be sustained?

It is worth noticing that the Act of Congress of May 31, 1870, to carry into effect the provisions of the XIV and XV Amendments, is entitled, and "An Act to enforce the right of Citizens of the United States to vote in the several states of this Union,"

Our conclusion, stated in a few words, is this: All women are citizens. Every citizen, in the language of Judge Daniel in the Dred Scott case, has "the actual possession and enjoyment of the perfect right of acquisition and enjoyment of an entire equality of privilege, civil and political." The right to prescribe qualifications rests with the States, in the absence of any law of Congress prescribing them. These qualifications involve time of residence, age, and other matters that are entirely within the reach of the citizen by acquisition or happen of time. Mr. Sumner has demonstrated in a manner that cannot be answered that the qualifications thus left for the States to prescribe must be those under which the citizen can become a voter, and can not be such as would permanently exclude him from the right of suffrage.

It has been said, what it is not fair for women to take advantage of a right to vote, no matter how clearly given them, which there was no actual intention to give. This objection does not touch the argument we have been making, but it may be well to say a word upon it. The law has to do far deal so unfairly with women that it would seem as if they should not be severely criticised for taking advantage of the law when, though by mere accident, it happens to favor them. But it is especially considered that their claim is in accordance with the whole spirit of the Constitution and in harmony with all the fundamental principles of our Government, while the denial of
suffrage to them is in opposition to those principles. If anything is settled in this country as an abstract general principle, it is the right of the tax-payers to have a voice in the legislation that is to determine their taxes and in the appointment of the officers who are to levy and expend them, and that the members of the nation should elect its rulers. Our error (and the day is not far distant when we shall all see its absurdity) is in making these fundamental rights the rights of men alone and in denying them to women. The latter have equal intelligence, patriotism, and virtue, and their fidelity to their country has been well proved as that of men, and it is difficult to see any good reason why they should no voice in deciding who shall be the rulers of the nation, what its laws, what its taxes and how appropriated, what the policy that is to effect, for good or evil, the business interests that they are becoming more and more largely engaged in. With all this equity in their favor, may they not be allowed, without cen sure, to avail themselves of a legal right? If the freedom of the slave could have been declared in our judicial tribunals under some guarantee of freedom in the National Constitution, originally intended only for white men, all lovers of freedom would have rejoiced. When Alvan Stewart, thirty years ago, attempted to get such a decision from the supreme court of New Jersey, there was not a cavil heard among the opponents of slavery. So when, in the fact of the whole legal opinion of England, Tranville Sharpe got a decision in favor of the slave Somerset, forever overthrowing slavery in England by an application of latent principles of the English constitution, the whole world applauded, and does to this day. It was thus, as we understand it, that slaves were overturned in Massachusetts, a lawyer claiming before its courts the application to a slave of a clause in its bill of rights supposed to have been intended only for white men. We would add that it would not accord at all with the good sense and directness of method that especially characterize the American people, for the friends of woman suffrage to labor years for the passage of a further constitutional amendment when they already have all that such an amendment could give.

Having attempted a strictly legal view of this question, permit me, gentlemen, to say that in my heart my claim to vote is based upon the original constitution, interpreted by the Declaration of Independence. I believe that Constitution comprehensive enough to include all men and all women. I believe that black men needed no other charter than white men. I recognize the stress laid upon Congress, by reason of the infancy of that race, their past bondage, and the duty of protection toward them. But the great principles of liberty and responsibility contained in the Declaration and the Constitution should have afforded protection to every human being living under the flag, and properly applied they would have been found sufficient. For my own part, I will never willingly consent to vote.
under special enactment conferring rights of citizenship upon me as upon an alien. Like Paul, I was free-born. "With a
great sum obtained I this freedom," said the Roman centurion
to this old patriot apostle, but he replied "I am free-born." There is music in these words to my ear. They are deep vibra-
tions of a soul that loves its country as itself.

You sit here, gentlemen, in judgment on my rights as an Amer-
ican citizen, as though it were something different from your
own! By whatever title you sit in these seats and make laws,
wise or unwise, just or unjust, for this great people, and by
that same title do I claim my share in this great responsibility,
owing allegiance to God and my own conscience alone. I may
have been born with less capacity than the least among you,
with small chance of growing to your mental stature, or reach-
ing your moral standard of elevation; but I have a perfect
right to sit here in your midst, pigmy that I may be, since I
am one of "the people" who did ordain in this glorious old con-
stitution, and one of "the governed," whose consent is made
the business of a government that can be called just.

It is for this reason that I and my fellow memorialists have
asked to be protected in the use of our present rights, rather
than endowed with any new ones; and we do pray you, gentlemen of
the committee, to give immediate attention to our claim, and to
report to the Senate within a short time, favorably if you can,
adversely if you must, because we not only wish, in common
with thousands of other women citizens, to vote for the next
president, but to have a potent voice in his nomination, and we
wish to know, therefore, how far Congress will aid us, and how
far we must work out our own salvation. For we can wait no long-
er. We feel that we have neglected our duty already, else
what means this appalling official corruption that is bringing
dismay to the stoutest hearts among men, and leading them to
doubt the wisdom of republican institutions, the strength of
great doctrines of liberty and responsibility on which our
government is founded? We do not doubt that great doctrines, we
know what they mean and where to they tend. Our Ship of State
carries two engines, gentlemen, and was built for them, but
heretofore you have used only one, and now you have reached
the place where you only two seas meet, but all ocean currents
are struggling together for the mastery. The man power alone
will not save you, but put on the woman power, and our gallant
ship will steadily itself ride on the waves triumphantly for-
evermore.

Gentlemen, we come to you with petitions no longer. Here is
our declaration and pledge, issued a year ago this day, signed
already by thousands of women, and eager names are coming every
day.
We did hope to present this to Congress itself in the Senate Chamber to-day! Believe we that women, being unrepresented in that body, are entitled to appear there by their memorialists in person, and we have so asked. But Congress has referred us to you, and you have declined even to submit our proposition officially to that body. You find no precedent for this, you say—forgetting, gentlemen, that history makes its own precedents. The men of America made their in 1776; the women of America are making their today, and may God prosper the right.

In the month of August, 1774, that eminent statesman and true patriot, Thomas Jefferson, in a little tract entitled "A Summary of the Rights of British America," used certain words which I will take for my text. "The whole art of government consists of in the art of being honest." And again, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time; the hand of force may destroy, but cannot disjoin them.

I ask your patient attention while I attempt to show, first, that under a proper interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, which he had so large a part in preparing, women have a right to vote — today, now, this moment — on precisely the same terms with men; and, secondly, that they ought, for various reasons, to exercise this right without molestation, and men ought to help them to do so by every means of their power.

In the Constitution of the United States there is not a line nor a word forbidding women to vote, but, properly interpreted by the Declaration of Independence and the assertions of the fathers, it actually guarantees of women the right to vote in all elections, both State and national. The preamble to the Constitution is a key to what follows — it is the concrete statement of the great principles which subsequent articles express in detail. It says: (quotation omitted). "Women are "people" surely, and desire as much as men at least, to establish justice, and to insure domestic tranquillity; and brothers, you will never insure domestic tranquillity in these days to come, unless you allow women to vote who pay taxes and bear equally with yourselves all the burdens of society, for they do not mean any longer to endure patiently and quietly such injustice, and the sooner men understand this and graciously submit to become the political equals of their mothers, wives, and daughters — aye, of their grandmothers, for that is my category — instead of their political masters as they now are, the sooner will this precious domestic tranquillity be insured.

Women were surely "people" when these words were written, and were as anxious to establish justice and promote the general welfare, and no one will have the hardihood to deny that our foremothers did their full share in the work of establishing justice, providing for the common defense, and promoting the general welfare in those early days. When liberty had to be gained by the sword and protected by the sword,
men necessarily came to the front and seemed to be the only
defenders of these liberties; hence all the way down, and
so women have been content to do their patriotic work silently
and through men, who are fighters by nature; but now at last,
then it is established that ballots instead of bullets are to
rule the world, it is high time that women ceased to attempt
to establish justice, promote the general welfare, and secure
the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity through
the votes of men, because they cannot control these votes and
turn them to high moral uses in government.

The Constitution, which became the law of the land in 1789,
embraced in its provisions women, as well as men, and the word
"people" so frequently used always included them. This is true
of the four articles which I will consider, and of every other
article in the Constitution where the word "people" is used.
Article of I of the amendments is: The right of the people to
peaceably assemble and petition for a redress of grievances,"
etc. No one doubts that women have that right equally with men;
in fact it is about the only political right that is cheerfully
accorded us today, because it is so easy to get rid of us and
silence us that way. For years and years women have been peti-
tioning Congress and the State legislatures to take down the
political bards which men have put up, contrary to the whole
spirit of our government, and to become active co-
workers in promoting the general welfare; but the reply has
been, "Leave to withdraw," or its equal, simply because these
petitioners had no power to cut off the heads of these Congress-
men and assemblymen, their political heads, I mean, because we
do not believe in bloodshed of any sort. So long ago as 1871,
I got an order from a Senator to search the Secretary's office
for petitions then on file, and the clerk found the names of
30,000 women slumbering in the dusty pigeon holes of his office,
and the honorable gentleman who asked me with a smile of con-
tempt, "How many women really wanted to vote?" was surprised
at the record, which was not a tenth part of the number that had
been wearyly petitioning our legislative bodies year after year
since 1848.

Article II, with its provisions for "the right of the people
to keep and bear arms," etc., which right women assuredly have
equally with men, and which, unless some new protective ele-
ment is brought into society, women will be compelled to use
then in self-defense; for the crimes against woman in her very
womanhood are becoming unendurably frequent all over the land.
The one protective element is the ballot in her own hands,
since it is already in the hands of the ruffians who make night
hideous, and who virtually close the thoroughfares of our cit-
ties and villages...

Judge Hunt decided that the right of voting is a right or privi-
lege arising under the Constitution of the State and not of
the United States," and this in the face of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, ratified by three-fourths of the states, and thereby made as much the law of the land as any other part of the Constitution. The Fourteenth reads: (quotation omitted).

Here we have the Constitution of the United States saying in plainest terms, (quotation omitted). Thus you perceive, a majority of present voters in any State may disfranchise any other voter who has gray hair, or blue eyes, or any physical peculiarity but a black skin; may disfranchise all men over forty years of age, or all men worth less than $50,000 or all men of the temperance party, or the Labor party, or the Democratic or Republican Party; in short, everyone but themselves, the then majority of voters. And Judge Hunt accepted this conclusion and declared that this is the Constitutional law of the United States as interpreted by him in his capacity of Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States.

He did this because he was so imbued with the theory of States rights as against national rights, and so filled with prejudice against the rights of women in government, that he was determined to interpret these amendments in behalf of black men alone, although the working of these leaves no room for question that they embrace all people of the United States, according to the meaning and intended of that word, "people," in all the previous articles of the national constitutional.

And yet in this but half, and the least criminal half of his unjust decision on the case of Miss Anthony. Not content with misinterpreting the law of the United States by proclaiming, that the right to vote of every citizen but black citizen was subject to loss at the pleasure of a bare majority a voters he denied her the right of trial by jury — that is, decided the case himself, and caused the clerk of the court to record the decision of guilty, without reference to the jury empaneled for the case, and who alone were legally competent to bring in a verdict upon it. And when Miss Anthony's counsel asked leave to address the jury, he was denied; and when he asked the jury be polled — that is, that each member might be asked by name if this was his verdict, he was again denied, and then Judge Hunt instructed the clerk to take the verdict, and the clerk said, in the usual form, "Gentlemen of the jury, hearken to the verdict as the court hath recorded it. You say you find the defendant guilty of the offense charged. So say you all."

No response was made by the jury, either by word or sign. They had not consulted together in their seats or otherwise. None of them had spoken a word. Nor had they been asked whether they had or not agreed upon a verdict. No juror spoke a word during the trial from the time they were impaneled to the time they were discharged, and as soon as the judge refused to
poll the jury, he said, "Gentlemen of the jury, you are discharg-
ed," and the jurors left the box, and one of them declared to
a bystander that "guilty" was not his verdict, neither was it
the verdict of the other eleven. "Could I have spoken," said he, "I would have answered "not guilty', and men in that jury-
box would sustained me." It seems, friends, that he and the
other jurors had a right to speak and to demand that the ver-
dict be submitted to the jury. But they did not understand their
rights in this respect, and were naturally in awe of a judge
of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the judge must
have known that they would be awed, or he would not have dared
to transgress the ordinary rules of law. And for this act
deserved impeachment, and had the accused been a foreign-born,
though naturalised citizen of the United States on trial for
fraudulent voting, which is a criminal offense, you know,
punishable by heavy fine and imprisonment, and had he been
denied a verdict from the jury, the press would have rung
out the injustice all over the country. And this simply be-
cause this man, being an acknowledged voter, would have had a
political party behind him, whose interest it was to protect
him and every other citizen, whether free-born or naturalized,
in his right to vote.

Thus you see, how in this right to vote, is wrapped up the
great volume of our cherished rights. Judge Hunt began by
denying to women their citizens' right to vote, and, by an
easy step, passed on to denying that right regarded as most
sacred of all—the right to trial by jury. And the crime of Ju
dge Hunt in refusing Miss Anthony her right of trial by
jury was all the greater because there was no appeal from his
court to a higher one as is customary in all other courts.
A circuit court judge may review his own decision, but there
is no appeal from his final decision, and the judge refused
even to consider the case, though strenuously urged to do so
by Judge Selden, his counsel.

And now permit me to give you briefly the argument of women's
rights to vote in our State elections as well as national,
in consequence of the passage of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth
Amendments of the Constitution of the United States; it is
simply this: "Before the war, and reconstruction acts follow-
ing it, the word "citizen" was not fully defined, some jur-
ists contending that all persons owing allegiance to the Gov-
ernment and protected by it were properly citizens; and others
that only those who were credited legal voters could properly
be called citizens. Then when the Republican party desired to
enfranchise the black man, partly for the sake of securing
their votes (I do not say this was the sole motive) in the next
presidential election, it was not willing to deface the na-
tional Constitution by such words as these "All black men,
formerly slaves are citizens of the United States"; and "No
State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the
privileges or immunities of the black men"; and again, "The right
of black citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied nor abridged by any State," and therefore, it was driven to the announcement of a general principle of citizenship, applicable to all persons at all times, and this was the principle, that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. This is a grand assertion, in harmony, as I have already shown, with the spirit and letter of the whole Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence, and, like them, it embraced all women as well as all men, and secured to all women no less than to all men, their right to vote. Mark the words "secure and "right to vote". Our claim is that the original Constitution gave no right to vote to any man or woman but it simply secured to every man and woman his or her original, natural right to govern himself or herself except so far as he or she should delegate this right to others, for purposes of civil life and national action. And these amendments, following the spirit of the Constitution in preamble and articles, declare that all persons are citizens, and that the citizen's right to vote shall not be abridged by any State. Can anything be plainer than that woman, being a person, is a citizen, and, being a citizen, has the citizen's right to vote?

Formerly each State had charge of its own elections, and the United States had no right to interfere with them in any State, even though the election was for national officers, but in the eagerness of the Republican party to enforce the amendments which would bring black votes to their aid, they gave a new power to Congress in this section: "Congress shall have the power to enforce this article." vis., "The right of citizens of the United States to vote, without denial on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." And Congress passed what is called the Enforcement Act of 1870, which is entitled, "An act to enforce the rights of citizens of the United States to vote in the several states of the Union, but of all the citizens of the United States." And the first eighteen clauses of the act are very minute in their provision for the protection of these black men, whose votes were wanted; and then there was a nineteenth clause that was intended solely to hinder from voting, white rebel men who had been disfranchised during the war, and this clause reads thus: (Quotation omitted).

And under this clause of the Enforcement Act of 1870, which was made expressly to punish white male rebel citizens for voting, after they had been disfranchised for rebellion, Judge Hunt condemned Susan B. Anthony for the crime of voting "without having a lawful right to vote." This woman, the blackest of black Republicans, who had, with others like herself, furnished Mr. Sumner with half his ammunition, in the shape of petitions from hundreds of thousands of citizens in behalf of the black man — names which it is an enormous task to col-
leth, but without which all appeals to Congress to do justice would have been in vain — this woman, who had violated the infamous fugitive slave law every time, by giving the cup of cold water to the panting fugitive and speeding him on his way to free soil in Canada — she, thank God; of all women in this land; was selected by this government of the United States to be prosecuted, dragged from one court to another, harrassed during the space of nearly a year, tried, at last, in another city than her own and fined for the crime of voting for the President of the United States and a member of Congress, under an act entitled "An act to enforce the rights of citizens of the United States to vote in the several States of this Union," and under a clause of that act that made it a crime for a rebel to vote, because he had been deprived of his citizen's right to vote, by special act of Congress, in consequence of his crime and rebellion.

And, friends, do you know that no citizen can be lawfully disfranchised, either by State or by nation, except for crime or rebellion, and then only by the judgment of his peers? But in this case of Miss Anthony, she was punished, not only as if she had been guilty of a crime or rebellion, or both, but she was, so far as the unjust judgment of the court could do it, disfranchised for evermore, and that without the judgment of her peers, in a double sense — for she was not only denied the verdict of the male jury sitting there, on purpose to render their verdict, but a jury of her peers she could not have, nor can any woman so long as women are denied the right to vote and to sit upon a jury. And in the case of Miss Anthony's jury, had they been allowed to render a verdict, it would have been a verdict not of her peers, but of her political superiors, and this would have been true of them, however ignorant or uneducated they were; whether the black men or white, drunk or sober, every man of them was her sovereign, with a power not only to make but to administer the laws under which she is compelled to live.

Do you ask, why recount this trial and so asperse the character of a learned and otherwise upright judge? I answer, because his decision has become a precedent, and on this account we have been compelled to relinquish temporarily, at least, our high vantage-ground of constitutional guarantees, and resort to the advocacy of an amendment to the national and State constitutions and to the womanhood of the country.

I believe with a distinguished Senator from my own State, whom I have been proud to claim as a personal friend for many years, that "Our Government involves a great deal of labor for us. 'Liberty is a burden, not a release,' a French philosopher has said, If you want ease, appoint as good a king as you can find, give him good counsellors, and tell them to save you all trouble
you will have cast; but if you desire real freedom, it means
labor. The twelve million sovereigns of this country are bound
each to know something of the responsibility that is constant-
ly taught in caucus, town-meetings, etc. The caucus should be
only a meeting of honest citizens to see what had best to be
done. And as there are thousands of women quite ready to assume
this responsibility and of seeing what had best be done in the
primary meetings of all the cities and villages of our land,
and thousands more who will do it conscientiously, though re-
linstantly, when called to do it by the invitation of their
fathers, brothers, husbands, and sons, we desire, most ear-
estly, that the approaching second century of male legislation,
should witness a reversal of this unjust decision of Judge
Hunt, and proclaim the freedom and responsibility of all the
citizens of these United States. Let our brothers, then, con-
secrate this opening century of constitutional government by
an act of justice that shall be a supreme one, and that shall
make our national Constitution forever a charter of the highest
human rights.

I said in the beginning that women ought to exercise their con-
stitutional right to vote, and men ought to help them to do so
by every means in their power. And this for two reasons: 1.
Because questions of legislation are largely questions of
moral, and men alone are incompetent to deal with the morals
of a community, however wise they may be, and however honest in
their desire to promote the general welfare. Education, sec-
ular, and religious temperance, chastity, police regulations,
mental institutions and reformatories — who has more interest
than women? All these questions, and more wisdom to bring to their
solution. 2. There can be no true manhood nor true womanhood
when men rule and women merely obey. Every mother in her home,
every teacher in our public schools is at a discount today,
because of her political subordination. Every boy knows this,
and consciously or unconsciously acts accordingly.

True political economy, which is only another name for the
science of government, can never be taught until women are
intelligent and responsible thinkers upon the subject, equally
with men, and are able to carry out their convictions at the
-ballot box. Hence, I repeat, it is the plain duty of every
woman to want to vote, and of every man to remove the obstacles
in her way.

I will only answer one objection. It is said "We have too many
voters already. It is unjust, to be sure, to exclude all wo-
men on this account, but we cannot help it, men will not consent
to be disfranchised, so we must make amends for our mistake
in inviting all men to vote, by forbidding all women." This is
too much like Charles Lamb, who, being reproved for going so
late to his desk in the morning said, he made it up by going
home early in the afternoon. But have we too many voters? In
other words is the doctrine of the fathers of this republic an
unsound one, that personal liberty and personal responsibility
are the only foundations of integrity, whether in the individual or the nation? No it is not unsound. It is just as true today as it was at Sinai and Plymouth Rock.

"Thou shalt" and "we will" reads the Decalogue and the covenant of that old-time Jewish people, and thus, in spirit, speak also the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence; it is a grand and wholesome doctrine, and one we can not afford to lose sight of for a moment. But those do lose sight of it who say we have too many voters already. No, we have not too many. On the contrary. To take away this ballot, even from the ignorant and perverse, is to insite discontent, social disturbances, and crime. The restraints and benedictions of this little white symbol are so silent, yet so genial, so atmospheric, so like the snowflakes that come down to guard the slumbering forces of the earth and prepare them for springing into bud, blossom, and fruit in due season, that few recognize the divine alchemy, and many impatient souls are saying we are on the wrong path — the Old World was right — the government of the few is safe; the wise, the rich should rule; the ignorant, the poor should serve. But God sitting between the eternities has said otherwise, and we of this land are foreordained to prove his word just and true. And we will prove it by inviting every new-comer to share our liberties so dearly bought, and our responsibilities now grown so heavy that the shoulders which bear them are staggering under their weight; that by the joys of freedom and the burdens of responsibilities they, with us, may grow into the stature of perfect men, and our country realize at last the dreams of the great souls who, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions, did "ordain and establish the Constitution for the United States of America" — the grandest charter of human rights the world has yet conceived.
Politics in a large sense, meaning the science of government, includes of course jurisprudence, or the science of law; but treating these two separately we will consider politics as a method of administration, that being the more common use of the term, and enquire how party management will be affected by general participation of women in the use of the ballot.

I can only indicate the general spirit of the changes that may be expected. I have no gift of prophecy — only a clear perception of the constitutional differences between men and women in their adaptation to public affairs; 1. Women are more spiritually perceptive than men, because of their more sympathetic nature, and this grows out of their maternal instincts which are tender, watchful, and patient. Being thus especially sympathetic, they will feel so keenly the evils of the social body that they will be driven to seek remedies at whatever cost to themselves of self-renunciation — a comparatively easy thing to them as mothers — and being made prescient through this enkindling of sympathy, always an eye-opener, they will discern remedies hitherto unthought of. Precisely what these remedies will be, and just how applied, it is not necessary that we be able to foresee; but just so surely as man’s public achievements in the past have been achievements of the war power within him, whether aggressive or protective, so surely will the achievements of woman be the result of her brooding, protecting, yet spiritually aggressive nature. And there will arise no discord from the union of these elements at the ballot box, on the contrary a grand concord, wherein the heavy bass will lose nothing of its usurping power by its intimate blending with the more delicate strains of the complex harmony.

The admission of so large a number of untrained voters will embarrass and discourage the serving politicians, and perhaps at last put an end to the whole system of rings, caucuses and wire pulling legislation. Women will work so gradually into the machinery of government that their distinctive influence will not be felt consciously but atmospherically, and this is the highest form of influence; but at first the hugeness of the task of manipulating some hundreds of thousands of unpractised voters will appall the stoutest demagogue, and for a time politics will take care of themselves as never before. And this will be the great gain in many ways — chiefly because the real voice of the “people” conceived of in the Declaration of Independence will quietly speak at the polls — and it will be like the still small voice which Moses heard from the flaming bush of sacred history. Politicians of the lower order feel this already and the air has a hindering significance just now.
which their keen, hounding sense has already sniffed, and saw
the nobler politicians are willing not to meet the shade of
universal liberty which a truly free ballot suggests to their
minds.

said one of the truest patriots to me not long since after
meditation a moment of my assertion that the men had no deeper
love for his country than I myself had, while his experience in
family government had been as naught to mine, since he was
childless and I a grandmother. "But there would be no such
thing as forecasting the result of an election—things would
be all in a muddle." "Ah, my friend," I said, "that is pre-
cisely what is needed that you wire pullers, the best of you
should not be able to predict the results of an election. When
any of you are duly elected to office by the men and women of
your district you will know it and that is all that is necessary.

3. Something less clumsy than primary meetings will be invented
by the joint wisdom of men and women, or these meetings will
be held in opera houses under the inspiration of the best music,
and courteous discussions of the great underlying principles
of a democratic government and of the best practical methods
of administration will precede the nomination of candidates
for office.

4. The character of candidates for office will become of sup-
reme importance and fealty to party will fall below fealty of
principle. This is not so much because women are wiser or bet-
ter than men, as because neither fathers nor mothers will
choose to offer a debauched name to their daughters as a can-
didate for office; and under the growing conviction that worth
of character in the citizen is the only safety for republics
the moral standard of men will become the same with that now
adopted for women. Upon this latter result of the presence of
women in government it is impossible to speak with too much
emphasis. Whenever the time shall come that the young man shall
consider himself excluded from contaminating resorts, pre-
cisely as he would exclude his sister, the republic is safe.

Turning now to jurisprudence we find that according to Webster,
this is, a "knowledge of the laws, customs, and rights of men
in a state or community necessary for the due administration
of justice." The administration of justice is through the of
the courts, which are composed of judges and juries, and in-
clude as incidents, witnesses, lawyers, and clients, which
last may be criminals, or suitors. Heretofore the only con-
nection women have had with the courts and therefore with the
whole science of jurisprudence has been as suitors, criminals,
and witnesses; consequently their knowledge on the whole sub-
ject has been very limited as a rule they have felt but little
interest either in making good laws, or the just interpretat-
ion of and administration of them. This ignorance is not con-
fined to women alone by any means; many men making pretensions
to political knowledge have not been able to recognise the clear line dividing the jurisdictions of the legislature, and the judiciary. But men as a class have obtained this far more than women. Today, however, women are studying both law, and politics, and when they become voters, they will undoubtedly accept their share of judicial duties. They will sit on juries, they will plead causes, they will pronounce judgments from the bench; and in performing these duties, all of them of a highly moral and intellectual character, they will be greatly assisted by those sympathetic and perceptive faculties of which I have "Put yourself in His Place" has been the key note to many a just decision uttered by a judge of only moderate intellectual grasp, but of a feminine delicacy of feeling, for there is no test like this in determining the real justice or injustice of any particular decision. The abstract principles of law may be settled by precedent or legislation, but the application of law to a particular case so as to make as near an approximation to absolute justice as possible, requires a heart that understands, and sympathizes with the great heart of humanity as well as a brain that can comprehend the science of law. That, may we not hope then in the say of opinions filled with common sense, and restitude of purpose when the minds of women whose hearts are so receiving constant culture in the government of the family shall have added to this the study of the history of legislation and jurisprudence, and shall set themselves to devise not only less cumbersome machinery for the administration of justice, but what is far greater importance, more delicate discriminations in the application of law. For the adscendence of law professes to the founded, and to the honor of our common humanity as I believe really founded, and to the honor of our common law of justice, however imperfect have been the conceptions of justice and the realization of the idea in the ages that have passed.

And this will be only a part of their contribution to the work of the bench. Their peculiar influence upon the men who will be their associates and judges will be very great, and receiving in return a reciprocal influence, the consultations on profound studies of law in its humaneat sense, as the human expression of the divine will, which will go far toward illustrating the truth of the words of that great thinker whom the world has crowned "The Judicious," who said, "of law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world.

I am well aware that just here my argument will meet with heavy opposition, and that on making this claim for woman we shall be treated to caricatures of vacillating woman, now asserting the majesty of law, now weeping with the criminal, or embracing the acute counsel, who has effected his deliverance from unjust punishment. Nevertheless I maintain that the present very common idea that the technical rigidities of law constitute its chief power and that the noble science of jurisprudence is
Incapable of interpretation, and application in the interests of absolute justice, is an idea of the past which has as its origin in that unassisted masculine wisdom that has devised all these cunning schemes of theology, under which innocent babes were condemned to eternal flames for the crime of having been born of sinful parents, and through which a world of heathendom has been similarly condemned, that world being the outside the particular organization to which they themselves belong.

I claim that the divine principle of doing to others as you would that they should do unto you, is as applicable in the interpretations and applications of law as theology, and that the man who sits in judgment of his fellow men striving to stay himself on the Creator of souls, and to love all men as brethren, and that by just so much as women confessedly have been able to approximate this standard more nearly than men, by just so much will they be able, when, disciplined by an intellectual training that has hitherto been denied them, not only to pronounce righteous judgments, but to assist in clearing the whole atmosphere of our halls of justice of those mists, in which justice has so often been lost sight of, and which have been too often made darker by an accompanying moral pollution.

And there are not wanting in the decisions of the past illustrative instances of the principles I am contending for. When Lord Mansfield, in defiance of the prevailing legal opinion of his time, declared the slave Somerset to be free, on the ground that a man could not be a slave in England, he stood upon those great integrities of law, fully announced for the first time in the history of nations, in the American Declaration of Independence; and the verdict of the civilized world has confirmed his prescient judgment. And in the swift coming future, when our Supreme Court, the most august tribunal the world has yet seen, shall have honored itself by sustaining the claim of woman that she, — though long a supine spectator of this great experiment of self-government, has a right to be a participator in it — we shall be able to recognize anew the sublimity of the doctrine of equality propounded by the Fathers of the Republic, which is but an application to the political society of the great command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

I have spoken of the higher judicial offices. We are not able to appeal to experience and observation here; but in regard to the lower, yet most responsible, offices of jurors and justices of the peace we are not left to speculation. The results of several years' experiment in TEXAS lie before us and have gone beyond our most sanguine expectation. That Territory was notoriously under the reign of the pistol and bowie-knife, and the number of adult women was small in proportion to the population. The call to vote and to sit on juries was so sudden and unexpected that they had no time for preparation for these new and responsible duties. Their remarkable success is,
to my mind, a proof of the special capacity of women for the administration of law no less than comforting prophecy concerning the manner in which all women may hope to meet the heavy responsibilities that are sure to devolve upon them in the not far distant future.

Chief Justice Howe, of the Supreme Court of Wyoming, in a letter to Mrs. Myra Bradwell, of Chicago, in 1872, wrote: (quotation omitted).

Later still, Judge Kingman, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, wrote: (quotation omitted).

Early in 1870, hearing that Mrs. Esther Morris had been serving as a justice of the peace, I wrote her a letter of inquiry and sympathy, and received the following answer: (quotation omitted).

Thus you see, friends, that the only preparation women really need for discharging faithfully their duties of citizenship, even the judicial, is a sense of responsibility, and I believe that when opportunity is offered to the women of the whole country, they will not allow themselves to be outdone by the women of Wyoming.
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All fundamental principles have their birth in germs cells of human thought. The main business of all branches of science is to discover these cells, study them, and draw new conclusions from age to age as experience has proved the value of the successive theories when practically applied. The main thoughts underlying a democratic form of government are the freedom of the individual and his duty to society; personal liberty and personal responsibility. These had their first expression in definite form and practical exemplification in the state of Connecticut, so long ago as 1636, and the agency was Rev. Thomas Hooker—a man born in England in 1586, and who came to this country to join the Massachusetts Colony with 100 of his followers in 1635, and left that colony in 1636 with his church to found a new home on the banks of the Connecticut, because of the prevailing aristocratic idea of the Massachusetts Colony that "the best part is always the least, and of that best part the wiser part is always the lesser." These were the words of Winthrop, the distinguished governor of Massachusetts, of whom it was truly said that he was one of the noblest souls that ever lived, transparently brave, strong, high-minded, gentle, unselfish, caring for nothing but the honor of God and the best good of man—a genuinely great man. Continuing the discussion of the great question whether the people should make the laws and elect the magistrates, or only a select body, Winthrop wrote to Hooker in 1638, affirming "the unwarrantableness, and unsafeness of referring matter of council or judicature to the body of the people, because the best part is always the least and of that best part, the wiser part is always the less." The old law was! Thou shalt bring the matter to the judge. To which Hooker rejoined that in respect to matters referred to the judge and the sentence left to his discretion, I ever looked at it as a way which leads directly to tyranny and so to confusion; and must positively prevent. If it was in my liberty I should choose neither to live nor to leave my posterity under such a government. Let the judge do according to the sentence of the law. Beak the law at its mouth. The heathen man said by the light of common sense. "The law is not subject to passion, and therefore ought to have chief rule over rulers themselves." It is also known that counsel should be sought from counsellors. But the question yet is, who these should be. In matters of greaty consequence which concern the common good, a gener-
all council chosen by all to transact business which concerned all. I conceive most suitable to rule and most safe for the relief of the whole."

Here you have it, friends - the substance of our claim - that a general council chosen by all the people is most suitable to rule and most safe for the relief of the whole. And we like the Rev. Thomas, would choose neither to live nor to leave our posterity under any form of government different from this. If you ask just here whether Thomas Hooker included women in the term "people," I concede that he did not in the sense we now claim. But the principle remains the same. This he announced and bravely defended, and it is for us to make the application. All great ideas have first their seed time and later on the harvest, but repeated sowing and patient tillage for years, perhaps for centuries, preceded all grand evolutionary triumphs. Even a prophetic eye could hardly have discerned the great future so wonderfully portrayed by Tennyson, whom I count the greatest of modern poets, because he was pre-eminent the discoverer of the hearts and stood firm as a rock for the grand equalities between man and woman out of which is to come celestial harmony. (Quote of Tennyson's "Princess" omitted).

Which means I think that for long years women were content to be recognized as silent partners in the social organization. It was ages before men undertook to participate in government as individual men. As time progressed and they gradually assumed political rights and duties, women, having confidence in their wisdom and in their ability to conduct the affairs of state in the fear of God and for the benefit of the human race, quietly administered the affairs of the family, and gave thanks in secret that they were allowed the high privilege of bringing to birth such noble sons and rearing them to their high manhood. Still we must not forget the quaint words of my fellow townsman, Mark Twain, who, commenting on the courage of the women of the Mayflower, remarked that they do not only breast the stormy Atlantic and endure the hardships of a New England winter with scant housing, but had also to endure the hardships of the pilgrim fathers themselves.

A few words concerning the personality of this remarkable man. When he died in 1647, (two hundred years before the assembling at Seneca Falls, of the first Women's Rights Convention of the world), John Winthrop, with whom he had so differed in counsel, said of him, (quotes from Winthrop). And Cotton Mather of Boston, in his Magnalia, has these words: (Quotation omitted). According to tradition he was a man "physically of a singular beauty of countenance, massiveness of mold, and mingled stateliness and grace of aspect." Better still, it was said of him, (quotation omitted).

To Connecticut belongs the conceded honor of giving the world
its first formulated and written constitution, and the germ of this has lately been discovered and deciphered in a few notes taken from a sermon of Thomas Hooker by one of his parishioners. They are as follows: (quotation omitted).

Of this sermon Rev. Dr. Bacon of New Haven, one of the greatest preachers and statesmen of this century, says; (quotation omitted).

Some two years later, the Constitution of the State of Connecticut was launched, and of this Constitution a late distinguished historian, Prof. Johnston of Princeton, has this to say: (quotation omitted).

Beside all this, history records that to Connecticut is due that reconciliation of discordant minds in the convention that framed the system of our Federal government and gave birth to the Constitution of the United States. It was the grafting of the Connecticut system of commonwealth and town rights, on the stock of the old Confederation (called the Connecticut Compromise) that brought forth a similar combination of National and State Rights, and this Johnston declares "is the crowning glory of the system which Hooker inaugurated in the wilderness and of the Commonwealth of Connecticut.

Not only this, but successively nearly all the States of our Union adopted similar Constitution, and how at last the South American Republics one by one are coming into the same compact, and each declaring that "We, the People, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution."

Here permit me a personal reminiscence. During the six months of the Columbian Exposition I had the honor of serving my country officially as one of the Board of Lady Managers, and noticing in the papers one morning that Venezuela was to open her house to visitors at a certain hour that day, and remembering the profound interest with which I have long regarded these young republics, struggling for existence and looking to us as an example of free government, I went alone and early and without special authority to the unique building, and introducing myself to an officer as one of the Board of Lady Managers who desired an introduction to the commissioners, was at once made courteously welcome. After a while the ceremonies began by a short speech in English welcoming the United States and all foreign peoples to a cordial friendship and to the hospitalities of the occasion, and this was followed by a short speech in Spanish by Minister Bustamante, a man of singular gravity and of statesmanlike deportment, and immediately after the band in the rear began to play. I looked about me for members of our Commission who should respond to his cordial greeting, but not one was in sight nor even one of my own.
Board. I whispered to a gentleman standing near and said, "Is it possible there is to be no response from the United States?" "Apparently not," he said, "would you like to say something?" "Indeed I should if no one else appears," I replied. We spoke to the secretary and he to the Minister in Spanish, and watching his grave face I saw it lighted with pleasure and a messenger went swiftly to the band, which ceased playing instantly, and after a courteous introduction I said, still standing as we all were in a circle about the Minister, in substance this. (quote from memory only) "Listening to your exordiums upon our country and her form of government I am reminded of what has been the felicity of my life — for fifty years I have enjoyed the daily companionship of a gentleman who is sixth in descent from Thomas Hooker, the founder of the State of Connecticut. This Thomas Hooker, who as preacher and theologian stands foremost in the history of the New England church, was also a statesman, and to him is credited the substance and in part the form of the first written constitution of the world. That became the Bill of Rights of the State of Connecticut and upon it was framed the Constitution of the United States, as well as of many states of the Union. And now at last, having stood the test of two centuries, you gentlemen are making it in substance your own. One of your number has just given me a copy of it in Spanish and informs me that it is already being translated into English, and he kindly offers to send me a copy. When he does this I shall read it with care, for the study of constitutions seems to me the basis for the study of political economy — the science of government; and if I find there that you have improved upon our model, I will surely make it known to our people, and they will doubtless in due time incorporate it into our own constitution, for Connecticut wants the best and will be satisfied with nothing else. But speaking for the Board of Lady Managers, who should I think have sent you an official recognition, permit me to say to you there is one meaning to this great Exposition that I trust will not escape your notice — it is this — "Peace on earth, good will to men" This is our war's motto — this is the text out of which shall come the fraternity of nations that shall endure so long as time shall last. Carry this home to your constituents, gentlemen, let them know through you that the days of war are ended, at least on this continent, and that in the industries of peace shall be our only rivalry." The members of the Commission then gave me cordial greeting and the band went on without further interruption. Afterward, while enjoying the exquisite collation, a member of the Commission with whom I had had some previous conversation, said to me: "I enjoyed your remarks with one exception — this matter of peace. That can never be; it is useless to hope for it." "Why not?" said I. "Because of the nature of man," said he. "I have studied him scientifically and this business of cutting threats will never cease. I am sure of that." Seeing my look of amazement he said, "I go so far as this even — I believe
these death dealing guns will go on to such perfection that
nations will be swept out of existence -- one after ano-
other will yield to the stronger, till only one nation is left,
and then internal disputes will rage till only two men will
be left and when one of these goes down, the other will destroy
himself." Looking him steadily in the face I said, "I see
your meaning, and from your point of view it may be so, but
you have left out one factor of the problem - the women of the
race. They seem to have been forgotten in the past, and are
now in the ascendant, and we mothers are fast coming to the
fixed resolve that we will bring no mere sons into the world
to cut each other's throats. When then will the fighters come
from?"
To return to the Constitution of the United States, which was
adopted by three fourths of the States in 1789 - women were
contented, as I have said, to be silent partners to this com-
 pact until the year 1848, when a new Declaration of rights
was put forth in the little village of Seneca Falls, State of
New York, U.S., and a set of resolutions adopted which claimed
that women people no less than men people had always been
members of the body politic and were now no longer content
with the silent partnership, since they were taxed without rep-
resentation, subject to fine and imprisonment, and even the
death penalty, by a jury of men alone, and are also compelled
to leave the public education of their children to laws made
by men alone.

Sixty-eight women signed this document. All honor to them
here and now. The day will surely come when their descend-
ants will claim to be daughters and sons also of this new evol-
uation (a growth you perceive, and not a revolution) with as
great pride as they now count their descent from the fathers
of 1776, and the author of both the Declaration and Resolu-
tion was a young woman of 33 - Elizabeth Cady Stanton - the
rival statesman of Thomas Hooker - who cared less to put a king
in her pocket than to crown all womanhood with the queenly
rights of personal liberty and personal responsibility. Read-
ing anew these all embracing paragraphs I am amazed to find
that they cover all the rights we have ever claimed, more than
we havedared hope to realize in a century, but which, I am
convinced, are soon to be conceded by Supreme Court inter-
pretation and Congressional action. Let us dare to hope, that
the early years of this new century of ours shall behold a
country which, knowing no distinction of sex in its citizen-
ship, may therefore look for that inheritance so impressively
foreshadowed in the grand old dialogue - "Honor thy father
and thy mother that thy days may be long in the land which
the Lord thy God giveth thee."

Eight years after the convention at Seneca Falls, and they
were years of patient toil in the midst of ridicule and abuse,
the claim that women should have immediate admission to all the
rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the
United States, received partial confirmation in the famous
Dred Scott decision of 1856 which declared that "upon a prin-
ciple of etymology alone the term 'citizen,' as derived from
citizens, conveys the idea of connection or identification that
the State or Government and a participation in its functions.
But beyond this there is not, it is believed, to be found in
any actual experiment heretofore tried, an exposition of the
term 'citizen' which has, not been understood as conferring the
actual possession and enjoyment of, an entire equality of priv-
ileges civil and political."

Here you have the Supreme Court
of the U. S. asserting in full bench that all citizens of the
U. S. are by the original Constitution possessed of an entire
equality of privileges civil and political, and Lucretia Mott
and Elizabeth Cady Stanton took a long breath and saw a great
rift in the treating clouds of prejudice in such injustice.

But soon the anti-slavery conflict began, and with the unself-
ishness of womankind the whole strength of these present wo-
men was given to the emancipation of the slave, trusting that
the glorious principles of personal freedom and personal re-
ponsibility would triumph and include women in their sweep.
And so they did - for in the 14th and 15th Amendments citi-
zenship was again declared to include the right to vote and
men were acknowledged to be citizens. Looking over this
little red book which has been my study for many years (it is
the Congressional Manual) I rejoice to find that Connecticut
was the first State to ratify the 14th Amendment; in fact,
that while the resolution of Congress submitting the Amendment
to the legislatures of the several states was passed on the
16 of June, 1866 - the Amendment was ratified by the legis-
lature of Connecticut on the 30th of June of the same year,
fifteen days only from Washington to Connecticut. Shade of
Thomas Hooker, how did thy great heart rejoice over this Com-
monwealth of thine own founding? "Qui transtulit sustinet."

In 1871 we held a convention in the city of Washington, es-
pecially to push our claim under the Amendments. No one who
was present at our first hearing before the House Judiciary
Committee, will ever forget the audience of the arguments.
Of these latter Charles Sumner said to me, a day or two after,
"I was at a dinner party of twenty senators, and each was asked
in turn whether you arguments could be answered, and not one
suggested an answer. " And he added, "Mrs. Hooker, this is
the first time in my life that I realised that disfranchise-
ment means the same to you and "esse Anthony that it would to
me." I said, "It does, Mr. Sumner - it does. How will you
help us to carry on this peaceful war?" "No, I cannot,
I said, because my time and strength are still needed for the
protection of the black man, but I will send you my speeches
in this great struggle, and if you will put sex where I have
not color, you will have the whole argument, and in the end
you are sure to win." I have the pamphlets still, a sacred
trust, with the word "sex" in his own handwriting over the
word "color" - a perfect constitutional argument.
Our hopes were now high, and during that winter (which I spent at Washington in hard work, never accepting a single invitation to any social entertainment) we were offered no less than four committee rooms in the Capitol in which to come together for consultation and to prepare our arguments for printing by Congress, to be sent abroad, franked by members who were for the time at least convinced that our claim to all the privileges and immunities of citizenship was a just one. We chose the beautiful room of the Committee on Agriculture, and here I was permitted to inscribe in this large volume our new declaration and our pledge of fealty to the government of the United States.

This Declaration and Pledge I had the honor of transcribing in the large volume here before you, and the first two names subscribed were those of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott — the very same who called the Seneca Falls convention more than fifty years ago. Many others followed, and during the winter hundreds of autograph signatures on little slips of white paper, came like snow flakes to our Committee room, and were pasted into the volume. With tearful yet joyful eyes we watched their incoming, saying softly to ourselves the words of one of our greatest American poets concerning the ballot. (Quotation of Lowell omitted).

The day of our redemption seemed near when, in February, 1871, the Loughbridge and Butler report from the House Judiciary Committee was put into our hands from the Congressional printing office for distribution by the thousand. True, this was a minority report, but it was able, and it was unanswerable, it emanating from members of the highest committee of the House of Representatives. And they did read it to such effect that next year Susan B. Anthony was able to persuade the inspectors of election in her own State of New York, three in number, to duly register her name, and in November, 1872, she was allowed to vote for the U.S. Presidential electors and for members of Congress. This short triumph, however, became a new sorrow, for in 1873 Miss Anthony was arrested and held to trial for having "knowingly voted without having a lawful right to vote," and Judge Hunt of the Supreme Court of the United States, to his eternal dishonor, ordered the jury to find her guilty without submitting the case to them, and imposed a fine of $100 and cost for this pretended crime.

That you may more fully understand and appreciate the level of iniquity to which a judge of our highest court was willing to descend in his refusal to submit the case to the jury who had listened to able arguments of counsel on both sides and were prepared to render an intelligent verdict, I will read to you a few pages from the printed report of the trials (quotation omitted).
Madam, the Court will not order you committed until the fine is paid! Susan Anthony in jail for refusing to pay this unjust fine! Judge Hunt knew full well that this would toll the great liberty bell till it was heard all over the land and would rouse all true manhood to the rescue, so he quietly allowed the fine to go uncollected and the penalty unenforced. Nearly thirty years have passed and the fine and costs have not yet been paid, and never will be. Not only so, but I make the prediction that before many years Congress will make Miss Anthony an appropriation sufficient to cover, with interest, all that she expended in her defense, and probably enough more to make it a testimonial of the public admiration of her grand championship of a great right. She will be remembered with honor when Judge Hunt is forgotten, or remembered only as a disgraceful participant in this great wrong.

Lest you should accuse me of yielding to mere sentiment I will quote the words of my husband, an experienced lawyer, who was sixth in descent from Rev. Thomas Hooker, and who writes Miss Anthony thus after a critical review of the case: "I cannot but regard Judge Hunt's course as not only irregular as a matter of law, but a very dangerous encroachment on the right of the person to be tried by jury. It is by yielding to such encroachment that liberties are lost.

And so it has proved in our case, for since that unjust decision, which became at once a precedent, we have been compelled to fall back upon a 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution, instead of pressing our claims under the 14th and 15th, and this has been a most discouraging and almost hopeless task.

From 1873 to the present time we have given ourselves to educational work all over the land, and today with renewed energy and hope we are sending petitions to Congress to the following effect: (quotation omitted).

In reply we shall be asked to read the remaining clause of Article 1, Section 2, and here it is (quotation omitted).

But this does not alter the case, since we women people are able to qualify for this federal election precisely as men are. We can become of suitable age, we own have a residence and own property, we can read the English language; and as these are the only qualifications required of men they are the only ones that should be required of women. The error is in calling sex a qualification. A qualification is something that can be acquired, according to any dictionary in the language, and sex cannot be acquired. Fortunately we now have the Supreme Court with us in this interpretation of the Constitution, in the case of Minor vs. Happersett, 11 Wallace's Reports were these words are used by the Court: (quotation omitted). And in the famous Slaughter House Cases 16 Wallace, defining the scope of Federal Citizenship, this passage occurs: (quotation omitted). And in the famous Slaughter House Cases 16 Wallace, defining the scope of Federal Citizenship, this passage occurs: (quotation omitted).
Which means that women, being acknowledged by the Constitution as citizens of the U.S. are entitled to become voters for United States officers; not State officers you understand, but United States officers; and as the House of Representatives is by Section 5 required to be judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own members, it is plain that it can and ought to receive members elected by majorities made up in part of women duly qualified under the laws made for the men of their respective States.

Still farther, in the Yarbrough case, The United States Reports, the Court says: (Quotation omitted).

Our appeal then is to Congress for a Declaratory Act, which in fact is needed for the protection of white male citizens. At present the black man is (by the 15th Amendment) the only man absolutely protected against the invasion of his right to vote, and in the Yarbrough case the court reminds Congress of its duty in this respect in these words: (Quotation omitted). Such enactments are surely necessary now and timely, since half the loyal citizens of this so-called Republic, being women by birth, are already subject not only to all white men of whatever nationality, but to all black men, and to tax paying Indians, and may soon be called to acknowledge the sovereignty of Spanish Cubans and Sandwich Island Kanakas and all the male inhabitants of the Philippine Island. That I have used the word sovereignty correctly will be made plain to you by a short extract from a speech of Senator Hawley at Woodstock, Conn., on the 4th of July, 1885: (Quotation omitted).

This is precisely what we think. All honest citizens, both men and women, should come together as often as possible to see what is best to be done for the town, and common wealth and the whole country. But in 1885 twelve million adult male sovereigns only were allowed to come together for such purposes and twelve million adult female subjects were commanded to stay at home and obey their lawful rulers. There is no dodging these terms. Sovereigns or subjects, all inhabitants of this so-called free country, are today, and will continue to be until the word "people" is properly construed by Congress or by the courts, or until by revision of State Constitutions the odious word male is stricken from the Statute Books.

The question before you, gentlemen, is whether Connecticut shall lead the van in this great reform. Should you patiently study the evolution of the democratic theory of a government by the people you will discover that so far, practically, we have developed only a male oligarchy until in the year 1889, the territory of Wyoming became a sovereign State under a Constitution that declared in Article 1. (Quotation omitted).
Thus reads the Declaration of Rights of the Constitution of the State of Wyoming, and these sections are enforced by the first section of Article 6 which says: (quotation omitted).

Thus there was established for the first time in the history of nations a government "Of the People, by the People and for the People," in the words of Lincoln, the great emancipator.

Three other contiguous states viz.: Colorado, Utah and Idaho, followed the example of Wyoming, and are so satisfied with the results that they are sending official messages from their own legislatures to the legislatures of every state in the Union, recommending the constitutional adoption of woman suffrage as the best safeguard of a genuine Republic.

We therefore ask you, gentlemen, to submit to the man people of the State of Connecticut, since they alone are our rulers and we are simply loyal, obedient subjects, this proposition that they strike out the word male from Article 6, Section 3, so that it shall read "Every citizen of the United States who shall have attained the age of twenty-one years, who shall have resided in this State for a term of one year next preceding, and in the town in which he may offer himself to be admitted to the privilege of an elector, at least six months next preceding the time he may so offer himself, and shall be able to read in the English language any article of the Constitution or any section of the Statutes of this state, and shall sustain a good moral character, shall, on his taking such oath as may be prescribed by law, be an elector.

And add Section 3. The right of citizens of the State of Connecticut to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.
VICTORIA C. WOODHULL (MARTIN)
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Having respectfully memorialized Congress for the passage of such laws as in its wisdom shall seem necessary and proper to carry into effect the rights vested by the Constitution of the United States in the citizens to vote, without regard to sex, I beg leave to submit to your honorable body the following favor of my prayer in said memorial which has been referred to your committee.

The public law of the world is founded upon the conceded fact that sovereignty can not be forfeited or renounced. The sovereign power of this country is perpetually in the politically organised people of the United States, and can neither be relinquished nor abandoned by any portion of them. The people in this republic who confer sovereignty are its citizens; in a monarchy the people are the subjects of sovereignty. All citizens of a republic by rightful act or implication confer sovereign power. All people of a monarchy are subjects who exist under its supreme shield and enjoy its immunities. The subject of a monarch take municipal immunities from the sovereign as a gracious favor; but the woman citizen of this country has the inalienable "sovereign" right of self-government in her own person. Those who look upon woman's status by the dim light of the common law, which unfolded itself under the feudal and military institutions that establish right upon physical power, can not find any analogy in the status of the woman citizen of this country, where the broad sunshine of our Constitution has enfranchised all.

All sovereignty can not be forfeited, relinquished, or abandoned, those from whom it flows -- the citizens -- are equal in conferring the power, and should be equal in the enjoyment of its benefits and in the exercise of its rights and privileges. One portion of citizens have no power to deprive another portion of rights and privileges such as are possessed and exercised by themselves. The male citizen has no more right to deprive the female citizen of the free, public, political, expression of her opinion than the female citizen has to deprive the male citizen thereof.

The sovereign will of the people is expressed in our written Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land. The Constitution makes no distinction of sex. The Constitution defines a woman born or naturalised in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, to be a citizen. It recognizes the right of citizen to vote. It declares that the right of citizens of the United States to vote...
any citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Women, white and black, belong to races, although to different races. A race of people comprises all the people, male and female. The right to vote cannot be denied on account of race. All people included in the term race have the right to vote, unless otherwise prohibited. Women of all races are white, black, or some intermediate color. Color comprises all people, of all races and both sexes. The right to vote cannot be denied on account of color. All people included in the term color have the right to vote unless otherwise prohibited.

With the right to vote sex has nothing to do. Race and color include all people of both sexes. All people of both sexes have the right to vote, unless prohibited by special limiting terms exist in the Constitution. Women, white and black have from time immemorial groaned under is properly termed in the Constitution "previous condition of servitude." Women are the equals of men before the law, and are equal in all their rights as citizens. Women are debarred from voting in some parts of the United States, although they are allowed to exercise that right elsewhere. Women were formerly permitted to vote in places where they are now debarred therefrom. The naturalization laws of the United States expressly states the naturalization of women. But the right to vote has only lately been definitely declared by the Constitution to be inalienable, under three distinct conditions — in all of which woman is clearly embraced.

The citizen who is taxed should also have a voice in the subject matter of taxation. "No taxation without representation" is a right which was fundamentally established at the very birth of our country's independence; and by what ethics does any free government impose taxes on women without giving them a voice upon the subject or a participation in the public declaration as to how and by whom these taxes shall be applied for common public use? Women are free to own and to control property, separate and free from males, and they are held responsible in this, in every particular, as well as men, in and out of court. Women have the same inalienable right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness that men have. Why have they not this right politically, as well as men?

Women constitute a majority of the people of this country — they hold vast portions of the nation's wealth and pay a proportionate share of the taxes. They are intrusted with the most vital responsibilities of society; they bear, rear, and educate men; they train and mould their characters; they inspire the noblest impulses in men; they often hold the accumulated fortunes of a man's life for the safety of the family.
and as guardians of the infants, and yet they are debarred from uttering any opinion by public vote, as to the management by public servants of those interests; they are the secret counsellors, the best advisers, the most devoted aids in the most trying periods of men's lives, and yet men shrink from trusting them in the common questions of ordinary politics. Men trust women in the market, in the shop, on the highway and railroad, and in all other public places and assemblies, but when they propose to carry a slip of paper with a name upon it to the polls, they fear them. Nevertheless, as citizens, women have right to vote; they are part and parcel of that great element in which the sovereign power of the land had birth; and in it is by usurpation only that men debar them from this right. The American nation, in its march onward and upward, can not publicly choke the intellectual and political activity of half its citizens by narrow statutes. The will of the entire people is the true basis of republican government, and a free expression of that will by the public vote of all citizens, without distinctions of race, color, occupation, or sex, is the only means by which that will can be ascertained. As the world has advanced into civilization and culture; as mind has risen in its dominion over matter; as the principle of justice and moral right has gained sway, and merely physical organised power has yielded thereto; as the might of right has supplanted the right of might, so have the rights of women become more fully recognised, and that recognition is the result of the development of the minds of men, which through the ages she has polished, and thereby heightened the lustre of civilization.

It was reserved for our great country to recognize by constitutional enactment that political equality of all citizens which religion, affection, and common sense should have long since accorded; it has reserved for America to sweep away the mist of prejudice and ignorance, and that chivalric condescension of a darker age, for in the language of Holy Writ, "The night is far spended, the day is at hand, let us therefore cast off the work of darkness and let us put on the armor of light. Let us walk honestly as in the day." It may be argued against the proposition that there still remains upon the statute books of some States the word "male" to an exclusion; but as the Constitution, in its paramount character, can only be ready by the light of the established principle, ita lex Scripta est, and as the subject of sex is not mentioned, and the Constitution is not limited either in terms or by necessary implication in the general rights of citizens to vote, this right can not be limited on account of anything in the spirit of inferior or previous enactments upon a subject which is not mentioned in the supreme law. A different construction would destroy a vested right in a portion of the citizens, and this no legislature has a right to do without compensation, and nothing can compensate a citizen for the loss of his or her suffrage — its value is
equal to the value of life. Neither can it be presumed that women are to be kept from the polls as a mere police regulation; it is to be hoped, at least, that police regulations in their case need not be very active. The effect of the amendments to the Constitution must be to annul the power over this subject in the States, whether past, present, or future, which is contrary to the amendments. The amendments would even arrest the action of the Supreme Court in cases pending before it prior to their adoption, and operate as an absolute prohibition to the exercise of any other jurisdiction than merely to dismiss the suit.

And if the restrictions contained in the Constitution as to color, race or servitude, were designed to limit the State governments in reference to their own citizens, and were intended to operate also as restrictions on the federal power, and to prevent interference with the rights of the State and its citizens, how, then, can the State restrict citizens of the United States in the exercise of rights not mentioned in any restrictive clause in reference to actions on the part of those citizens having reference solely to the necessary functions of the General Government, such as the election of representatives and senators to Congress, whose election the Constitution expressly gives Congress the power to regulate?

And if the restrictions contained in the Constitution as to color, your memorialist complains of the existence of State laws, and prays Congress, by appropriate legislation, to declare them, as they are, annulled, and to give vitality to the Constitution under its power to make and alter the regulation of the States contravening the same.

It may be urged in opposition that the courts have power, and should declare upon this subject. The Supreme Court has the power, and it would be its duty to so declare the law; but the court will not do so unless a determination of such point as shall arise make it necessary to the determination of a controversy, and hence a case must be presented in which there can be no rational doubt. All this would subject the aggrieved parties to much dilatory, expensive and needless litigation, which your memorialist prays your honorable body to dispense with by appropriate legislation, as there can be no purpose in special arguments "ad inconvenienti," enlarging or contracting the import of the language of the Constitution.

Therefore, Believing firmly in the right of citizens to freely approach those in whose hands they have their destiny placed under the Providence of God, your memorialist has frankly, but humbly, appealed to you, and prays that wisdom of Congress may be moved to action in this matter for the benefit and increased happiness of our beloved country.
It was an honest zeal which has influenced me to appear before the public as a champion of a cause which receives alike the jeers of the common multitude and the railly of the select few. It is an honest zeal in the same, that inspires me with confidence to contest before it as its advocate; when but too conscious that I am of that portion of the people who are denied the privilege of freedom; who are not permitted the rights of citizen; and who are without voice in the pursuit of justice, and to whom it will be held accountable, as it holds all accountable who set themselves against Human Rights.

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

On the 19th day of December, 1870, I memorialized Congress, setting forth what I believed to be the truth and right regarding Equal Suffrage for all citizens. This memorial was referred to the Judiciary Committee of Congress. On the 13th day of January, I appeared before the house committee and submitted to them the Constitutional and Legal points upon which I predicated equality. January 30th Mr. Bingham, on behalf of the majority of said committee, submitted his report to the House in which, while he admitted all the basic principles Congress was recommended to take no action. February first Messrs. Loughridge and Butler of said committee submitted a report in their behalf, which fully sustained the positions. I assumed and recommended that Congress should pass a Declaratory Act, forever settling the mooted question of suffrage.

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

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

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

I come before you, to declare that my sex are entitled to the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The first two, I cannot be deprived of except for cause or by due process of law; but upon the last, a right is usurped to place restrictions so general as to include the whole of my sex, and for which no reasons of public good can be assigned. I ask the right to pursue happiness by having a voice in that government to which I am accountable. I have not forfeited that right, still I am denied. Was assumed arbitration authority ever more arbitrarily exercised? In practice, then our laws are false to the principles which we profess. I have the right to life, liberty unless I forfeit it by infringement upon other's rights, in which case the State becomes the arbiter and deprives me of them for the public good. I also have the right to pursue happiness, unless I forfeit it in the same way, and denied accordingly. It cannot be said with any justice that my pursuit of happiness in voting as rights as a citizen or as an individual. I hold, then that in denying me this right without my having forfeited it, that departure is made from the principles of the Constitution, and also from the true principles of government, for I am denied a right born with me, and which is inalienable. Nor can it be objected that women have no part in organising this government. They were not denied. Today we seek a voice in government and are denied. There are thousands of male citizens in the country who seldom or never vote. They are not denied; they pursue happiness by not voting. Could it be assumed because this body of citizens do not choose to exercise the right to vote, that they could be permanently denied the exercise thereof? If not, neither should it be assumed to deny women, who wish to vote, the right to do so.

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

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

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

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

Before government was organized there are no citizens but there were people, and these people had the human right to organize a government under which they could become citizens. In the absence of organized government, individual government alone exists, every individual having the human right to control himself and herself.
If a people—an aggregate or individuals—not having a government, undertake to construct one, wherein but one-half should engage the other half taking no part therein, and its functions should be exercised over the whole, it is plain that so far as the non-engaged part would be concerned, it would be usurped authority that disposed them, of the inherent right which all people have in an organized government. But so long as the unconsulted part quietly acquiesce in such a government, there should be none to question its right to control. At the moment, however, when the unconsulted portion should demur from such government, they would begin to assert the right of self-government, possessed equally by all. The fact that such right had not been made known by expression could in no wise invalidate it. It would remain an inherent possession, and whenever expressed it could be maintained and enjoyed.

The conditions of the people in this country today are thus:

I and the others of my sex find ourselves controlled by a form of government in the inauguration of which we had no voice, and in whose administration we are denied the right to participate, though we are a large part of the people of this country. Was George III's rule which endeavored to exercise over our fathers less clearly an assumed rule than is this which we are subjected to? He exercised it over them without their consent and against their wish and will, and naturally they rebelled. Do men of the United States assume and exercise any less arbitrary rule over us than that was? No, not whit the less. To be sure his cabinet were few, while they were many; but the principles are the same; in both cases the inherent elemental right to self-government is equally over-ridden by the assumption of power. But the authority King George's Parliament exercised was even more consistent than his in which they assume and exercise; his government made no pretension to emanation from the people.

When our fathers launched "Taxation without representation is tyranny" against King George, were they consistent? Certainly. Were they justified? Yes; for out of it came our national government and independence. The Revolutionary War which gave our country independence, grew out from tyranny. Was the war justifiable? Most assuredly it was. We find the same declaration of tyranny were raised by Congress in the lengthy discussions upon enfranchising the negro. Such sentiments as the following were oft-repeated, and with great effect: "A considerable part of the United States embraced under the preamble to the Constitution, "We, the people" are left without representation in government; but nevertheless held within the grasp of taxation of all kinds, direct and indirect, tariff and excise, State and national. This is tyranny, or else our fathers were wrong when they protested a kindred injustice. This principle is fundamental. It cannot be violated without again dishonoring the fathers, whose rights were so ably and eloquently asserted and defended by
James Otis, who in his "Rights of the Colonies" says, (quotation omitted). Could stronger words be found or used in favor of universal suffrage? They applied with sufficient force then to remove them, whose souls were fired with its injustice, to resist a powerful oppressor. It was one of the most forcible arguments by which the cause of the negro was advocated. It is any less forcible in its application to women! Is the tyranny now exercised over women, under some authority of the government — but we say without any authority — any less tyrannous than that over our fathers? Or is nothing tyranny for women? If a civil right is "not worth a rush" to a man when he is taxed and not represented, how much is it worth to a woman? If a "Man's liberty is gone" and he is "at the mercy of others" when thus taxed, that becomes of a woman's under the same tyranny? If "Every man of sound mind should be deprived of voting? Or are all women of unsound mind? Not exactly; they are found to be very proper persons at the assigns of men in many instances.

In the records of the early days of the Republic, there are found numerous authorities bearing directly upon this point such as that by the law of nature no man has a right in impose more than levy taxes upon another; that the free man pays no taxes as the free man submits to no law but such as emanates from the body in which he is represented. If the free man pays no taxes without representation, how is it that a free woman is compelled to do so? Not long since I was notified by a U.S. officer that I did not pay a certain tax to the government, and that if I did not pay, my property would be levied upon, and sold for that purpose. Is this tyranny, or can man find some other word to take the place of that used by our fathers so freely and by Congress, not so long ago forgotten, with such powerful effect? Has oppression become less odious, that in these days twenty out of forty millions of people who compose the sovereign people of this country must quietly submit to what has been, in all ages representative government, denounced as tyranny?

But let us hear more of the principle which actuated our fathers: "(quotation omitted)."

So it appears that our fathers declared that no one should by law be bound by any law in the making of which he had no voice. How would this principle operate today should I refuse to pay the taxes levied against me without my consent and in direct opposition to my wishes? Would I be justified, by declaring that I would not pay, I might be justified but I do not think I would escape the tyranny.

Franklin said, (quotation omitted)." I am subject to tyranny! I am taxed in every conceivable way. For publishing a paper I must pay for engaging in banking and
brokerage business I must pay -- of what is my fortune to acquire each year, I must turn over a certain per cent. I must pay high prices for tea, coffee, and sugar; to all these I submit, that men's government may be maintained, a government in the administration of which I am denied a voice, and from its edicts there is no appeal. I must submit to a heavy advance upon the first cost of nearly everything I wear in order that industries in which I have no interests may exist at my expense. I am compelled to pay extravagant rates a fare wherever I travel, because the franchises, extended to gigantic corporations, enable them to sap the vitality of the country, to make their managers money kings, by means of which they boast of being able to control not only legislators but even a State judiciary.

To be compelled to submit to these extortions that such ends may be gained, upon any pretext or under any circumstances, is bad enough; but to be compelled to submit to them and also denied that the right to cast my vote against them, is tyranny more odious than that which, being rebelled against, gave this country independence.

But usurpations do not stop here. The Constitution, as it stood on the day of its original adoption, under the interpretation of that day, guided by the principle of self government admits perfect equality among the people. There are no limitations contained in it by which any part of the people (unequally with any) from whom it emanated could be placed unequally with any other part. Permit me to quote from a speech delivered by Mr. Sumner, in the Senate of U.S. March 7, 1866 upon the following propositions: (quotation omitted).

In express terms there is an admission of the idea of inequality of rights founded on race and color. That this inequality, this unrepulican idea should be allowed to find a place in the text of the Constitution, will excite special wonder, when it is considered how conscientiously our fathers excluded from the text the kindred idea of property in man. Mr. Sumner says, "Is it less wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea of inequality of rights founded on race and color?" Is it not, I ask, a graver right, because they are women, to insist that one-half of the people of all races and colors have not an equal right, because they are women; and this too when there are no provisions contained in the Constitution which can by any possibility be construed to give the other half disfranchising power? Fathers, husbands, brothers, sons, does your blood tingle with shame in your veins at this ignoble distinction? How can you look in your sister's faces and declare they shall not enjoy the citizen's rights, granted to the lowest orders and classes in the human race?

Therefore, it is, that instead of growing in republican liberty, we are departing from it. From an unassuming acquiescent
part of society, woman has gradually passed to an individualized human being and as she had advanced, one after another, evident right of the common people has been accorded her. She has now become so individualized as to demand the full and unrestrained exercise of all the rights which can be predicated of a people construing a government based on individual sovereignty. She asks it and shall Congress deny her?

The formal abolition of slavery created several millions of male negro slaves citizens who, a portion of the acknowledged citizens assumed to say were not entitled to equal rights with themselves. To get over this difficulty Congress in all its wisdom saw fit to propose a XIV amendment to the Constitution, which passed into law by ratification of the states.

But there is an objection raised to our broad interpretation of this amendment, and that is obtained from the wording of the section thereof (quotation omitted). Consistency is said to be a bright jewel when possessed, but I doubt its possession by those who have the boldness to advance this as an argument in opposition to this point. We surely have the right to use the logic of our objectors in interpreting their own positions, and we therefore reply, its lex scilicet est.

If the Constitution meant nothing but what is expressed, how can it be assumed to infer anything from the use of the word male in the second section, except that what it expresses? The right of woman to vote, or the denial of that right to them is not involved by this section under the further fetched application.

This amendment is just as much a part of the constitution as though it had been one of its original provisions. The effect of the Constitution, as it now stands, upon the present citizens at the time of its original adoption, had it contained all its present provisions. Previous to its adoption there were no citizens of the United States. Immediately it was adopted, persons became citizens of the U.S. under it. Under these circumstances with these provisions in the Constitution, which declare the representatives shall be elected by the people, that all people are citizens, and that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, I ask Congress, and I ask them upon their solemn oath to give vitality to the provisions of the Constitution, and to guarantee a republican government to every state who among the people, persons, citizens, who resided in the state, could have denied the right to vote to Representatives? We must regard this Amendment as though there had been no negroes requiring franchiseism. We must divorce our minds from the negro and look at the Constitution as it is. We must not be biased by surrounding conditions. It must apply to these conditions and interpret them. It is the basis of equality constructed by all and for all and from which all partake of equal rights and privileges and immunities.
Because this Amendment was meant to apply to the African race and to black people and to those who had been slaves, it must not be concluded that it has no broader application. Whoever it may include, under logical construction, to them the right to vote shall not be denied. Take the African race and the black color and the previous slaves out of the way and what application would this amendment then have? This is the way to test these things, the way to arrive at what they mean. She will pretend to say that this Amendment would mean nothing were there no negroes, and there had been no Southern slaves? She will pretend to say that the Amendment would mean nothing in the coming election, provided that there never before had been an election under the Constitution? If you provide a Constitutional amendment, having one race specially in mind, it must not be forgotten that there are other races besides. 37 States constitute the United States. If you all included. If you speak of a part, of the United States you must designate which part in order to make yourselves intelligible.

The same line of reasoning applies to the word color, although some assume to say that color in this Amendment means black, as white is no color. But how should any know the specific color is meant in this Amendment? One might say it was intended to mean copper color; another a mulatto color, and still another, a Spaniard or an Italian. How can any one determine absolutely that the word race or color in this Amendment referred to the African race and to the black color? Hence you must see the complete absurdity of (any number) interpreting this to mean any special race or color, or any number of races and colors less than the whole number.

I have heard that high judicial authority has been invoked upon this question of law, and that this authority has declared that neither the XIV nor XV Amendments gave anybody the right to vote. I think I quote the exact words. I have not claimed that XV Amendment gave any one the right to vote. There is no language in either XIV or XV Amendment which confers rights not possessed; but I will state these Amendmen
to say, and if it is not equal to the declaration of to vote, I confess that my perception are at fault for I cannot perceive difference.

I come now to the previous condition of servitude, and there is much more in this than is first apparent. We had become so accustomed to regard African slavery as servitude that we forgot other conditions of servitude that we forgot that servitude is subjection to the will others. The negroes were subject to the will of their masters, were in a condition of servitude and had no power one authority as citizens over themselves.

I make the plain and broad assertion that the women of this
country are as much subject to men as slaves were to their mas-
ters. The extent of the subjection may be less and its sever-
ity milder, but its complete subjection nevertheless. What can
women do that men deny them? What could not the slave have
done if not denied?

Therefore I would have Congress, in the pursuit of its duty,
to enforce the Constitution by appropriate legislation, pass
a Declaratory Act plainly setting forth the right of all cit-
izens to vote, and thus render unnecessary the thousands of
suits of damages which will otherwise arise. What legislation
could be more appropriate than defining the rights of one-
half the citizens of the country, when they are in question?
This matter has passed beyond the states, they have delegated
this power to Congress by these Amendments. Could the Legis-
latures of the states think of legislating upon the question
of who are citizens? How can they think upon the rights
of these same citizens, which are no less clearly a part of
the Constitution than the fact of citizenship.
VICTORIA C. WOODHULL (MARTIN)

The New Rebellion
Given at the National Women's Suffrage Convention at Apollo Hall, May 11, 1871. Published by Journeymen Printers' Cooperative Ass'n. New York, 1871.

Since this is not a convention for the consideration of general political questions, I am not certain that I have anything to say which will prove interest or profit to you. But with your permission I will endeavor to state the position which the movement for political equality now occupies, and attempt to show therefrom the duties which devolve upon those advocating it.

Whatever there may have been spoken, written or thought in reference to the constitutional rights of women citizens of the United States, as defined by the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Supremes law of the land, the first practical movement under it to secure their exercise was made in the Congress of the United States during the past winter. A memorial setting forth the grievances of a woman citizen, who was denied the right of citizenship, was introduced into both Houses of Congress, and by them referred to their Judiciary Committees. Upon this memorial the House Judiciary Committee made two reports; that of the majority while admitting the validity of the foundation upon which the memorial was based, was adverse to congressional action thereon, naively attempts to ignore the force of the argument by thrusting and responsibility back upon the States, which have acted upon the point in question by the adoption of said Amendments. That of the minority, than whom there is no more conclusive judiciary authority in the United States, took issue with the entire pleading of the majority, and fortified their position by such an array of authority, judicial decisions and logic, as to fully establish the fact of the right of women to the elective franchise in every unprejudiced mind.

So forcible was the conviction which this report carried wherever analyzed, that even Democrats who, everybody well knows, are constitutionally predisposed against the extension of suffrage, acknowledge it as unanswerable. Besides this, there has been so much high judicial authority also expressing itself in the same terms of approbation, there can be no question whatever about the fact that women, equally with men, are entitled to vote. This conclusion, though at first received with great skepticism by very many who wished it were really so, is gradually spreading among the people, and settling into a well-defined conviction in their hearts. Many of your own journals even ridicule the matter, more I presume from dislike to the movers in it than from convictions of its incapacity to meet the required demand.
I am glad, however, to now announce that most of these journals have reconsidered the subject, since there has been such enthusiasm and action raised all over the country by it, resulting in bringing women forward to demand their rights which have been accorded to them in a sufficient number of cases to finally decide the true value of the movement. If I mistake not some of those who were instrumental in preventing the exercise of these claimed rights will have the pleasure of paying for their presumption in money, if not by imprisonment, both of which may be meted to them under the act which it seems was almost providentially passed by Congress in May, 1870, to meet just such cases as are now required to be met.

There are two ways by which the success already gained may be pushed on to ultimate and complete victory, both of which I count as legitimate and justifiable. One is to continue the appeals to the courts, until by a final decision of the Supreme Court, it shall be finally determined. The other is for Congress to pass an act declaring the equal rights of all citizens to the elective franchise. To this method some object that it nullifies the position that the Constitution already grants every thing we ask. But these objectors forget that by Art. 17, Sec. VIII, Art. 1 of this same Constitution it is made one of the duties of Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested by the constitution in the Government of the United States, and that one of the special powers vested in Congress is the right to make all laws necessary for enforcing the provisions of the XIV and XV Amendments. It seems to me that petitional action of Congress to enforce the provisions of these Amendments is eminently proper, and that any who object thereto either do not understand the powers and duties of Congress or do not wish to easy a solution of the franchise question, which solution cannot be expected from the courts, as a decision therein may be deferred for years.

The matter of time is an important element in this issue. I am aware that women do not yet fully appreciate the terrible power of the ballot, and that they have made no calculation as to what they will do should the right to vote be accorded them the next session of Congress. I hold that when women are fully decided in their minds that they are entitled by law to the elective franchise, it is their solemn duty to determine how they shall use this new power.

The enfranchisement of ten millions of women, is a revolution such as the world has never seen, and effects will follow commensurate with its magnitude and importance. Whatever the women of the country shall determine to do that will be done. It seems to me that nothing could be more wise and judicious than for them even now to begin to consider what they will do.

I have had ample occasion to learn the true worth of present political parties, and I unhesitatingly pronounce it as my
firm conviction if they rule this country twenty years to come as badly as they have for twenty years past, that our liberties will be lost, or that the parties will be washed out by such rivers of blood as the late war never produced. I do not speak this unadvisedly. I know there are men in Congress, great men — who know that unless change for the better comes this will.

What do the Republican leaders care for the interests of the people if they do not contribute to their strength. They have prostituted and are prostituting the whole policy of the government to their own selfish purpose. They have wrung the very last possible dollar from the industries of the country and are now hoarding it in the vaults of the Treasury. One hundred and thirty millions of dollars in actual cash is a great power, a dangerous power it might be made by unscrupulous men, and I do not think but that there are those near the head of the government who are ambitious and unscrupulous enough to take advantage of any favorable opportunity in which to make use of this power.

True the Republican party did a mighty work to which all future ages will look back with reverence. True that they opened the door, unwittingly though it was done, to our enfranchisement. True that they have made the name of slavery odious and added new lustre to that of freedom.

But having delivered us from one damnation shall they be permitted to sell us to another, compared to which the first is but a cipher? They have told us that the Southern slave oligarchy had virtual control of the government for many years, and that the terrible war which we waged was the only means by which this power could be humbled.

But do they tell us of a still more formidable oligarchy which is now fastening upon the vitals of the country? Do they tell us that they have given four hundred millions of acres of public domain, millions of dollars and tens of millions of credit to build up this new tyrant? Do they tell us that this tyrant is even now sufficiently powerful to buy up the whole legislation of the country, to secure the confirmation of any nomination which it desires made, and to bribe officials everywhere to the non-performance of their duty? Do they tell us matters have been so arranged that all the revenue they can extract from the people is turned over to this power, by which process the vitality of the country is being gradually absorbed? No, not a bit of it. This they will leave us to learn through bitter experience as we were left to learn what were the fruits of forty years plotting by the slave oligarchy. This new oligarchy has plotted less than ten years and it has already attained the most threatening and alarming proportions.

Shall we turn to the Democratic party with hope that they may
prove the necessary salvation from the wrath to come? Todo this would indeed be to show the dire extremity to which we are driven. I hold that the Democratic party is directly responsible for the late war. The Democratic party South would not have rebelled had not the Democratic North promised them their support. Can we expect anything better from them than from the Republican party? They are not now making themselves so antagonistic to the true interests of the country as are the Republicans, simply because they have not got the power to do so. But where they have the power, their leaders do not hesitate to make the most use of it to their own aggrandizement.

Therefore, it is my conviction, arrived at after the most serious and careful consideration, that it will be equally suicidal for the Woman Suffragists to attach themselves to either of these parties. They must not — cannot afford to be a mere negative element in the political strife which is sure to ensue in the next Presidential election. They must assume a positive attitude upon a basis compatible with the principles of freedom, equality and justice which their enfranchisement would so gloriously demonstrate as the true principles of a republican form of government. I do not assume to speak for any one. I know I speak in direct opposition to the wishes of many of you who surround me. Nevertheless, I should fail to do my duty, did I conceal what I feel to be the true interests of my sex, and through them, those of humanity will never be understood or appreciated until women are permitted to demonstrate what they are, and how they shall be subserved.

If Congress refuse to listen to and grant what women ask, there is but one course left them to pursue. Women have no government. Man has organized a government, and they maintain it to the utter exclusion of women. Women are as such members of the nation as men are, and they have the same human right to govern themselves which men have. Men have none but an usurped right to the arbitrary control of women. Shall free, intelligent, reasoning, thinking women longer submit to being robbed of their common rights. Men fashioned a government based on their own emanation of principles; that taxation without representation is tyranny; and that all just government exists by the consent of the governed. Proceeding upon these axioms, they formed a Constitution declaring all persons to be citizens; that one of the rights of a citizen is the right to vote, and that no power within the nation shall either make or enforce laws interfering with the citizen's rights. And yet men deny women the first and greatest of all the rightest rights of citizenship, the right to vote.
Under such glaring inconsistencies, such unwarrantable tyranny, such unscrupulous despotism, what is there left women to do but to become the mothers of the future government.

We will have our rights. We say no longer by your leave. We have besought, argued and convinced, but we have failed; and we will not fail.

We will try you just once more. If the very next Congress refuse women all the legitimate results of citizenship; if they merely so much as fail by a proper declaratory act to withdraw every obstacle to the most ample exercise of the franchise, then we give here and now, deliberate notification of what we will do next.

There is one alternative left, and we have resolved on that. This convention is for the purpose of this declaration. As surely as one year passes, from this day, and this right is not fully, frankly and unequivocally considered, we shall proceed to call another convention expressly to frame a new constitution and exact a new government, complete in all its parts, and to take measures to maintain it as effectually as men do theirs.

If for people to govern themselves is so unimportant a matter as men now assert it to be, they could not justify themselves in interfering. If, on the contrary, it is the important thing we conceive it to be, they can but applaud us for exercising our right.

We mean treason; we mean secession, and on a thousand times grander scale than was that of the South. We are plotting revolution; we will overslough this bogus republic and plant a government of righteousness in its stead, which shall not only profess to derive its power from the consent of the governed, but shall do so in reality.

We rebel against, denounce and defy this arbitrary, usurping and tyrannical government which has been framed and imposed on us without our consent, and even without so much as entertaining the idea that it was or could be of the slightest consequence what we should think of it, or how our interests should be affected by it, or even that we existed at all, except in the simple case in which we might be found guilty of some offense against its behests, when it has not failed to visit on us its sanctions with as much rigor as if we owed rightful allegiance to it; which we do not, and which, in the future, we will not even pretend to do.

This new government, if are compelled to form it, shall be in principle like the government which as an inspiration of our fathers, compelled them to indite in terms in the Constitution but from which they and their sons have so scandalously departed in the legal constructions and actual practice. It
shall be applicable, not to women alone, but to all persons who shall transfer their allegiance to it, and shall be in every practicable way a higher and more scientific development of the governmental idea.

We have learned the imperfections of men's government, by lessons of bitter injustice, and hope to build so well that men will desert from the less to the more perfect. And when, by our receiving, justly, or by our own actions, the old and false shall be replaced by the new and true, when for tyranny and exclusiveness shall be inaugurated equality and fraternity, and the way prepared for the rapid development of social reconstruction.

Because I have taken this bold and positive position; Because I have advocated radical and political action; because I have announced a new party and myself as a candidate for the next Presidency, I am charged with being influenced by an unwarrantable ambition. Though this is scarcely the place for the introduction of a privileged question, I will, however, take this occasion to, once and for all time, state I have no personal ambition whatever. All that I have done, I did because I believed in the interests of humanity would be advanced thereby.

had I been ambitious to become the next president I should have proceeded very differently to accomplish it. I did announce myself as a candidate, and this simple fact has done a great work in compelling people to ask: and why not? This service I have rendered women at the expense of any ambition I might have had, which is apparent if the matter be but candidly considered.

In conclusion, permit me again to recur to the importance of following up the advantages we have already gained, by rapid and decisive blows for complete victory. Let us do this through the courts wherever possible, and by direct appeals to Congress during the next session. And I again declare it as my candid belief that if women will do one-half their duty until Congress meets, that they will be compelled to pass such laws as are necessary to enforce the provisions of the XIV and XV Articles of Amendments of the Constitution, one of which is equal political right for all citizens.

But should they fail, then for the alternative.
Social Freedom

Delivered at Steinway Hall, New York, 1873. From "The Terrible Siren" by Emanie Sachs -- Harper & Bros., 1838, N.Y.

Preface: In a clear, even voice Victoria sketched the fight for individual freedom since the sixteenth century. When she came to the present time, she lifted her curly head, like a horse champing at the bit, charged with feeling in her voice, her voice deepened, and a thrill went through the crowd as she said:

The court holds that if the law solemnly pronounces two married, they are married. There is no analogy in nature. The law cannot compel two to love. Two people are sexually united, married by nature, united by 3od. Suppose after this marriage has continued an indefinite time, the unity between them departs. Could they any more prevent it than they could the love which came without their bidding? All compelling laws of marriage are despotic being remnants of the barbaric age in which they were originated and utterly unfitted for an age so enlightened in the general principles of freedom and equality as is this.

Suppose a marriage separation is desired because one of the two loves and is loved elsewhere? If the union is maintained by force at least two of them, probably three are unhappy. It is better to break a bad bargain than to keep it. All that is good and commendable now existing could continue if all marriage laws were repealed tomorrow. (the audience burst into applause, then into hissing) If anyone who is hissing will come to the platform — Victoria's own sister came and asked how she would like to have come into the world without knowing who her father was. —Victoria continued her speech:

You are shouldering on free love the results that flow from precisely its antithesis, which is the spirit, if not the letter of your marriage theory, which is slavery and not freedom. I have a better right to speak, as one having authority in this matter — since it has been my province to study in all its various lights and shades. Hundreds, aye thousands of desolate, broken-hearted men as well as women have come to me for advice. The tales of horror, of wrongs afflicted, compelled me to consider whether laws which were prolific of so much crime and misery should be continued. —— I came to recommend the grant of entire freedom to those who were complained of as imconstant; and by the frank asking for it by those who desired it. My invariable advice was, 'Withdraw lovingly, but completely all claim and all complaint as an injured and deserted husband or wife.' (a fury now broke out)
Yes, I am a free lover. I have an inalienable, constitutional
and natural right to love whom I may, to love as long as love
or as short a period as I can, to change that love everyday
if I please. And with that right neither you nor any law you
can frame have any right to interfere; and I have a further
right to demand a free and unrestricted exercise of that right,
and it is your duty not only to accord it, but as a community
to see that I am protected in it. I trust that you are fully
understood, for I mean just that and nothing else.

I deem it a false and pernicious mistake that shuts off discus-
sion and consequently knowledge upon these subjects. So to
the will and wish of men, they did not rebel; but the time
has arrived wherein they will rebel, demanding freedom, free-
dom to hold their own bodies from the demoralizing influence
of sexual relationships that are not founded and maintained in
love. And this rebellion will continue too, until love, un-
shackled, shall be free to go forth, it shall be respected as
holy, unwilling are made to render hypocritical obedience to
the despotism of public opinion, which, distorted and blinded
by a sham sentimentality, is a false standard of morals and
virtue, which can only be fostered and cultivated by freedom
of the affections.

Free love, then is the law by which men and women of all grades
and kinds are attracted and repelled from each other and
does not describe the results accomplished by either. These
results depend upon the condition and development of the in-
dividual subjects. Promiscuity is sexuality in simply and
anarchical stage of development wherein the passions rule
supreme. When spirituality comes in and rescues the real man
or woman from the domain of the purely material, promiscuity
is simply impossible. — The very highest sexual unions are
monogamous. — The highest kind of love is utterly freed from
selfishness — whose highest gratification comes from render-
ing its object the greatest amount of happiness — let that
happiness depend on whatever it may. An affection that does
not desire to bless its object the greatest amount of hap-
piness instead of appropriating it by selfish possession to
its own uses, is now worthy of the name love.

I dearly prize the good opinion of my fellow beings. I would
so gladly have you think well of me. It is because I love
you all — that I tell you this vision of the future, that
I disturb your conscience and confidence in the past.

The love that I cannot command is mine not; let me not dis-
urb myself about it, nor attempt to file it from its right-
ful owner. Shall I forcibly capture and truant and transfix
it with the barb of my selfish affection and pin it to the wall
of my chamber? Rather let me leave my doors and windows
open, intent only on living so nobly that the best cannot fail
to be drawn to me by an irresistible force.
I am the first woman who has ever presented herself before an appreciative public in this or any other country with the words of such significance. It may surprise you that I resort in this first instance to the German people. I am descended from the German stock and feel instinctively attracted to those of that nationality. I know that the Germans are especially receptive to cosmopolitan ideas. Under the amendments, women are already entitled to vote. It is part of my object to make this case a test.

Hartford Opera House (pp.125)

I had intended to say something in reply to Miss Catherine Beecher's article, but I remember that it is purely a personal attack, differing from the recent Governor Hawley's, which called into question something more than personality. Miss Beecher told me that she would strike me. She has done it, but now, instead of returning the blow, I will present her with my other cheek, with the hope that even her conscience will not smite her for speaking so unkindly of me as she has. She may profess Christ but I hope I may exceed her in living his precepts.

National Suffrage Ass'n. (pp. 147) She uses the third person.

The President of the National Association of Spiritualists stands as the present bearer of the standard of the Equal Rights Party. She has, as gallantly as she knew how, braved the dark clouds and storm that have arisen over path, but she has done so devoutly and reverentially, always recognizing that she is but a humble servant of those who command the armies of Heaven, and desire the conquest of the individuals of earth; though sometimes weary and fainting by the wayside, by the help of the good angels, she will never permit the banner to trail in the dust, nor resign it until victory is either won or another braver, stouter, and better shall be sent to bear it.

The New York Academy of Music (pp.151) -- The Impending Revolution.

A Vanderbilt may sit in his office and manipulate checks or declare dividends by which in a few years he amasses fifty millions of dollars from the industries of the country, and he is one of the remarkable men of the age. But if a poor half-starved child should take a loaf of bread from his cupboard to appease his hunger, she would be sent to the tombs.
An astor may sit in his sumptuous apartments and watch the property bequeathed to him rise in value from one to fifty million and everybody bows before his immense power. But if a tenant of (whose) his whose employed has discharged him because he did not vote the republican ticket, fails to pay his month's rent, the law casts him and his family into the street. Mr. Steward by business tact and the various practices known to trade, succeeds in twenty year on obtaining from customers whom he entrap into purchasing from him from fifty million dollars and builds costly beneficiaries, and straightway the world calls him a philanthropist. But a poor man who should come along with a bolt of cloth which he had smuggled into the country and which consequently he could sell at a lower price than Mr. Stewart, who paid the tariff, and is thereby authorized by law to add the sum to the price, would be cast into prison. Now these three individuals represent three of the principal methods of the classes have invented, by which to monopolize the accumulated wealth of the country.

(pp. 158) Apollo Hall

From this convention will go forth a tide of revolution that shall sweep over the whole world. What does freedom mean? The inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. What is equality? It is that every person shall have the same opportunities to exercise the inalienable rights belonging to the individual. And what justice? That the inalienable rights belonging to the individual shall be jealously guarded against encroachment. Shall we be slaves to escape revolution? Away with the stupidity! A revolution shall sweep with restless force, if not with fury over the whole country, to purge it of political trickery, despotic assumption, and industrial injustice.

After nomination

I thank you from the bottom of my soul for the honor you have bestowed upon me tonight. I feel it all the more deeply, as I have stood by you so long, sometimes meriting your applause, sometimes your rebuffs, but I have always been faithful to my principles and without saying more, I again thank you for the great honor you have shown me.

(pp. 528) Tenth Annual Convention of Spiritualists - 1873

A man questioning my virtue? I hurl the intention back in your face six, and stand before you and this convention. Have I any right as a woman to answer him back. I declare that I am not ashamed of any act of my life. At the time it was best that I knew. Nor am I ashamed of any desire that has been gratified, nor any passion alluded to. Every one of them are a part of my own soul's life, for which thank God I am not
accountable to you. When I came out of prison, I came out
a beggar. I appealed to the Spiritualists, to the reformers
of the country, to send in their money that I might send you
my paper. But did you do it? No, you let me starve in the
streets. I knew my paper had to live or I should assuredly
be sent to Sing Sing. I went to your bankers, the president
of your railroads, the gamblers, prostitutes, and got the
money that had sent you the paper you have been reading, and
I do not think you are any the worse for having handling it.
I used whatever influence I had in getting money and that's
my business and not yours; and if I devoted my body and my
soul to God that is my business and not yours.

The spirits have entrusted me with a mission and I have done
and always will do everything and anything that it is necessary
to accomplish that mission. Whatever that has been or may be
I am not nor shall be ashamed to proclaim it to the world,
standing side by side with my lover, who stands by me now,
holding up my hands when deserted by everybody else.

And are there any of you who have come forward and put your
bodies in the gap? If you will not, don't put me before you
as needing to confess anything that in your self-sanitized
spirits you may conceive to be prostitution. And this sex-
ual intercourse business may as well be discussed now, and
discussed until you are familiar with your sexual organs,
and discussed until you are familiar with you make up that a
reference to them will no longer make the blush mount to your
face any more than a reference to any other part of the body.

Take this as coming from the wisest of spirits. I have yielded
a willing and appreciative audience, I am commanded to de-
clare unto you that in despised problem of sexuality, lies the
key that shall serve to open the doors of materiality. Re-
pression by law and pretended public opinion are resulting in
a growing disgust sexually between sexes. When sexual science
is introduced into your schools, as assuredly as it will be,
sexual ills that now beset the young will vanish.

---000---
The disorganized condition of parties in the U.S., at the present time, affords a favorable opportunity for a review of the political situation and for comment on issues that are likely to come up for settlement in the Presidential election of 1872. As I happen to be the most prominent representative of the only unrepresentative class in the Republic, I request the favor of being permitted to address the public through the medium of the Herald. While others of my sex devoted themselves to a crusade against the clamps that shackle women of the country, I asserted my individual independence; while others prayed for the good time coming, I worked for it; while others argued the equality of woman with man, I proved it by successfully engaging in business; while others sought to know that there was no valid reason why women should be treated socially and politically as being inferior to man, I boldly entered the arena of politics and business and exercised the rights I already possessed. I therefore claim the right to speak for the unenfranchised women of this country, and believing as I do that the prejudices which still exist in the popular mind against women in public life will soon disappear I now announce myself as candidate for the Presidency.

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

The great government changes were to follow the enfranchisement of the negro I have long foreseen. While the curse of slavery covered the land, progress was enchained, but when it was swept away, the voice of justice was heard, and it became evident that the last weak barrier against complete political and social equality must soon go away. All that has been said and all that has been written, in support of equality for wo-
man has had its proper effect on the public mind just as the
anti-slavery speeches before secession were effective, but a
candidate and a policy are required to prove. Lincoln's elec-
tion showed the strength of feeling against the peculiar insti-
tution; my candidacy will, I am confident, develop the fact
that the principles of equal rights for all have taken deep
root. The advocates of political equality for women have,
besides a respectable strength (have) a current of unexpress-
ed power, which is only awaiting a fit opportunity to show
itself. By the general and decided test I propose, we shall
understand the woman question aright, or shall at least,
have done much toward presenting the issue involved in proper
shape. I claim to possess the strength and courage to be the
subject of that test, and look forward confidently, to a tri-
umphant issue of the canvass.

The present position of political parties is (analogous) anom-
alous. They are not inspired by any great principles of
policy or economy. Political preachers paw the air; there
is no live issue up. The only seemingly distinctive feature
upon which a complete and well-defined diversion exists is
on the dead issue of negro equality, and this to the polit-
ical leaders a harp of a thousand strings.

The minor questions of the hour do not affect the parties
as such and no well-defined division of sentiment exists.
A great national question is wanted, to prevent a descent
into pure sectionalism. That question exists in issue only
whether woman shall remain sunk below the right granted the
negro or be elevated to all political rights enjoyed by man.
The simple issue whether woman should not have this complete
equality with the negro is the only one to be tried, and none
more important is likely to arise before the Presidential
election. But necessarily included. The platform that is
to proceed in the coming election must enunciate the general
principles of enlightened justice and economy.

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

These important changes can only be expected to follow a com-
plete departure from the beaten tracks of political parties.
and their machinery; and this I believe my canvass of 1873 will effect.

That the people are sick of the present and the principles it professes to sustain, is a proposition, I think, that does not require argument; but as I have now taken a decided stand against such continuance for another term of four years, and offered myself as a candidate for the Presidential succession, a few preliminaries on the general management of our home and foreign policy will be out of place. The present administration has been a failure from the beginning; vacillating and deficient in moral courage, it commands neither the respect or admiration of foreign power nor receives the active support of its party. The general management of our foreign and domestic affairs does not seem to have arisen to the dignity of the policy, though it be allowed to have been constant in its various parts, it has been destitute of that decision in its various parts, decision and firmness which characterized the victorious soldier who is now president.

A decided Cuban policy would not only have settled at once the inevitable destiny of that island, but would also have given republican sentiment in Spain an impetus, strengthened the South American republics and exercised a healthy influence on Mexico and Canada. But instead of this we have to submit to the consequences of a policy of cowardice. American citizens abroad are murdered by Spanish cut-throats, our consuls are insulted, and our flag is disgraced. This is unworthy of the American nation, and the people will hold Grant responsible. A giant who never shows his strength is never feared nor respected. On the important question of taxation, the tariff, and the public debt, administration seems to have no policy. Taxation, whether for support of the government or the payment of debt, should in all cases be general and never special. No special interest, nor several interests should be singled out to sustain an extra proportion of taxation. And in regard to the tariff the same principle should be enforced. Whether the public debt be a blessing or a curse, it exists. Created to save the republic, it must be paid strictly according to both spirit and the letter of the law. But there is no immediate necessity for paying it off. By a proper policy its payment may extend through hundreds of years, for even beyond that time, will be benefitted its creation produced be felt and appreciated. In older countries the pressure of national debt becomes a heavier charge and a mightier burden every succeeding year, but with us this is reversed. The development of our magnificent resources will render the gradual payment of our indebtedness easier of accomplishment with each decade.

All other questions, whether of foreign or domestic nature, stand illustrated in the Cuban policy of the administration,
A bold, firm and withal consistent national policy, if not at all strictly within the conservative limits of international law, will always command the respect and admiration of the people.

With the view of spreading to the people ideas which hitherto have been placed before them, and which they may, by reflection, carefully amplify for their own benefits, I have written several papers on governmental questions of importance and will submit them in due order. For the present the foregoing must suffice. I anticipate criticism; but however unfavorable that comment I trust the sincerity will not be called in question. I have deliberately and of my own accord placed myself before the people as candidate for the Presidency of U.S., and having the means, courage, energy and strength necessary for the race, intend to contest it to the close.
From "The Origin, Tendencies and Principles of Government" pp. 41.
(as revised from the "New York Herald")

Preface: This address which the lady expects to be too busy
to deliver for some time to come, we publish it in extension.

As far back into the past as dim historic lights enable us to
see, and still much farther, even behind the appearance of man
upon the face of this planet, the existence of government can
be plainly traced. Wherever two or more of any species of an-
imals — not to descend lower and including man — are or have
been, something simulating to what is in our day denominated
government existed; and, whether it is or was over a greater
of less community, it is or was possessed of certain character-
izing elements, from and by which a clear insight into the
composition of the community can be obtained by those who will
analyze the elements somewhat philosophically; that is to say
governments are truthful reflections of the governed when
considered as a whole, and all changes or modifications that
occur therein, result from growth of the governed.

It is just or advantageous deductions from any subject or fact
which is worthy of a position in the world's history, and
which is capable of permanently maintaining such a position,
can be arrived at, except through a complete philosophical
analysis of all the elements entering into its composition.
All facts as well as all chemical compounds are made of ele-
mentary principles brought into intimate productive rela-
tions which they sustain to all other subjects and facts and
etc., also demonstrated, and thus a general law of relativity
is found which makes the whole round of creation one in pur-
pose and effect.

It is not proposed in the present article to prosecute an ex-
haustive analysis of government as it is or as it has been
evolved, and to endeavor to determine whether, link by link,
it does not form one harmonie whole, from the present aspect
of which its culmination may be caught sight of; and whe-
ther that culmination will not be found a complete circle,
containing within its immense area all that has conspired and
assisted in its completion and which will be entitled to posi-
tions in such a community of interests by virtue of having
thus conspired and assisted in its formation.

Neither is it proposed to extend the limits of this inquiry
beyond the consideration of human government, except in so
far as analogies may be sought to enforce the application of
general laws and to assist by such application in the solu-
tion of such questions as may be entirely apparent from the
evidences contained specifically within the said limits.

Philosophically considered, however, the objects sought could
as well be obtained from any other department of government;
for, while a general law underlies all forms of systems of
human government and controls all its modifications, the self-
same law underlies and controls all other forms and system of
government, from which human government sprung and upon which
it rests as a primary basis.

It is believed that there is sufficient mental development and
comprehension contained in the philosophic minds of this latter
part of the nineteenth century to gather into form the evidence
that has been and is being presented, in the evolution and
dissolution of government, to grasp its signification, so
that in its application to existing things, permanent instead
of political modifications in governmental affairs may be in-
saugurated. Governed by any other than such a broad standard,
changes and modifications in present systems and forms are
made simply to meet the exigencies of the times, and with
no view to place government upon a basis which should never
need modification, and which should meet all exigencies of
all times. The reasons why such government has not hitherto
been inaugurated or attempted, are, because in no country
has the general mind as yet become sufficiently broad and
comprehensive to discover that great general laws underlie
the universe and govern all its manifestations, applying to
each and every department thereof with perfect uniformity. It
is not my province to discuss what these great general laws
and principles are. I assume that they do exist, and it is
my office to predicate what the future of government must be
when it shall have its basis in such laws and principles are.
and to judge whether what has been, and what is, may be con-
sidered gradual approaches from the most simple and homogeneous
forms in which the interests of all were very indefinite,
either individually or collectively, toward that wherein the
interests of all while becoming more distinct individually,
and shall be merged in the general interests of the whole and
become identical therewith.

Mr. Maine says, in his *Ancient Law* (quotation omitted).

In speaking of ancient society, Mr. Fiske says: (quotation
omitted). And this he defines as a social aggregate of the
first order; and coalescence of families into civic communit-
ies an aggregate of the second order; the coalescence of civic
and tribunal communities into the nation an aggregate of the
third order. The coalescence of nations would then describe
an aggregate of the fourth order. Under these four orders all
the forms of government which can ever exist in the world
must be classified.

As low a form of government as can be conceived as existing
next above that of the family, worthy to be called human
government, still exists among the barbarians inhabiting
some portions of Central Africa, some of the East India Islands, and perhaps some of the South Sea Islands. These people unite in bands or tribes, and rove about seeking the means of subsistence and endeavoring to conquer other tribes, and rove. Some have central points of rendezvous, and where the rudest habitations are so constructed, in which the women and children remain during the absence of the men. The women almost universally are considered very much in the light of slaves by all these nomadic tribes, and as only fit to minister to their passions and to perform their drudgeries. Their language is as rude as their habits, consisting of little more than a comparatively few spasmodically uttered harsh sounds. Written language they have none, excepting perhaps some images or rude figures symbolizing some special event they in this way attempt to commemorate, and which may be considered as the foundation of it for the tribes using them as they were the primary foundation of all written language.

One notable feature is universally observable among all these representatives of primitive government — they all recognize the necessity of a leader under some of the many forms of control exercised by the one over the many, and is generally one who has exhibited some particular prowess in battle, and the capacity to perform which he is supposed to be endowed with some unknown power, and which renders him superior to all others, and best capable of ruling and protecting those who thus recognize him, and who obey him in every particular, even to sacrificing their lives. Such may be considered an outline of our conceptions of the most primitive form of government of the present day; and the fact that such still exists has a marked bearing upon the subject of general government, when it is remembered that the time was when no higher form existed on the face of the earth.

The law of evolution and that of dissolution being a universal deduction from the philosophic ultimatum that force persists, they apply to all things therein where force is exhibited; consequently human government must be the object result of the persistence of force exhibited among the people of the earth, and at the same time the subject of all modification and amalgamations, should be sought by the application of those laws to the objective points under consideration.

The question now naturally arises, Can human government, then be analyzed, and the facts presented to correspond to the deductions of philosophic law?

It has been remarked that the simplest combination of force among human beings, representing government which existed when none higher had been attained, was still represented on the earth by certain of its inhabitants. Beginning with this as the basis of the superstructure of human government, can there be traced by gradual scale of progress from it to the
government of this country, in which scale each nation, tribe
and tongue will find its appropriate place, which, unocoupled,
would render the scale imperfect, as a chain would be imper-
fect were one of its central links missing? And would be
an analysis of each of these governments develop the fact
that each successive one in the progressive scale would repre-
sent done new applications of the principle of liberty, some
more extended the idea of equality, or some better formula
of justice than the preceding had, which application, idea
or formula entitles it to rank superior thereto, and also
determines its position in the scale?

Of all systems and forms of government that came and passed
away during the long lapse of ages, from the time the most
primitive alone existed on the earth to the time wherein those
flourished that have left records of their existence, we can
know nothing except what may be gathered from philosophic de-
duction unsupported by any actual record of facts concerning
them. It is, however, philosophically certain they very
many such intermediate governments did exist, variously modi-
fied and advancing from the primitive forms. Possessing,
as we may justly infer, but little capability for duration,
their integration was rapidly succeeded by disintegration; be-
ing exposed to numerous and different external influences,
rapid and successive changes were inevitable because they were
possessed of but little individuality and consequently but
little capacity for resisting external influences. They
were bound together by none of the higher laws of association,
but were led by transient ephemeral contingencies, combining
at time together, to soon divide and subdivide only to again
form new and equally temporary amalgamations. Thus con-
stantly organizing and dissolving, the long interval alluded
to was occupied by primitive inhabitants in their march from
the purely homogeneous toward the individualized time wherein
civilization left records of itself.

While no special inquires into the correctness of the formulas
laid down at various times by various philosophers, which
seek to include and cover all the phenomena of the universe,
will be made, those the most eminent may with propriety be
stated; indeed, if it be attempted to show that history obeys
a fixed law of evolution, the law that it is presumed to
 obey must be given, that it may be seen whether the deduc-
tions arrived at are included within the limits of the formula.
If it should not turn out, then either the deductions must
be illegitimate, the formula imperfect or impossible, or the
facts made apparent, that, while all the other sciences, as
biology, physiology and their various divisions, are known
to conform to certain well determined laws of causation;
sociology, in which all history and government find their
basis, conforms to no law, but is the product of the merest
chance.
Until within the present century it was not claimed by any of the various philosophers who had flourished that there was such a science as sociology; or, if so claimed by any far-seeing mind, the attempt to demonstrate or formulate it was not made until the time of Comte, who, about the year 1830, did attempt it, and he may be justly styled the father of the present system. Though his system is now shown to contain many imperfections and omissions, it is nevertheless certain, that for it, the improvements since made would not have been possible to the present degree attained, though those who have made them may repudiate the idea, and sooner to acknowledge they have built upon Comte.

Gathering from his profuse writings upon this point his earlier and most continuous opinions, the following are the terms in which they can be the most simply expressed: Social progression is a gradual change from rudimentary, homogeneous and anthropomorphic conditions to civilisation; heterogeneity and to definite conceptions of the external world; and at the same time from nomadic characteristics, with aggressive purposes, to inhabitative propensities and individual industrial pursuits.

A number of philosophers, who have written since the days of Comte, have from time to time presented formulas which at best can only be considered as modifications of his, and it may confidently be asserted that no real addition was acquired until the Spencerian was made, which, while it included Comte's more general and comprehensive and at the same time more definite and special. This the law of evolution, and by having exhaustively demonstrated that all mental action — emotional as well as intellectual — was included in it. It is as follows: Evolution is an integration of matter and a concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a partial transformation. This general formula includes all evolution, organic and inorganic, and interprets not only the genesis of the sidereal and solar systems and of the earth, but also of life upon the earth, and has become the law of all social, and moral, and intellectual change.

He afterward found it necessary to make a supplement especially applicable to organic life, in such terms as should not include the inorganic. It was as follows: (quotation omitted).

Having now arrived at that point where history must furnish the facts upon which the subject rests, it may be well to comprehensively recapitulate a perhaps somewhat too long introduction. It was seen that all over the face of the earth, where human life was represented, government exists, and that this government was representative of one or another of the three orders of aggregates of individuals — the family, the tribal, or the nation, and that an aggregate of nations would
add the fourth order.

It was also seen that the evolution of government was the objective result of the persistence of force among its component parts. Fixing the basis of government in this philosophic fact, it was necessary to examine the history of government to see if in its evolution it had conformed to this law, according to present accepted formulas; and if so found to have done, to extend the same into the future, to ascertain if possible what the future would be. Thus by a present understanding of the law and its tendencies, all modifications and changes made in present system and forms might be made so in harmony therewith, and not with a simple view to meet the present exigencies, but with an understanding that would meet all exigencies of all time, which alone is perfect legislation.

It must begin to be apparent that the proposition is, that the evolution of government does not differ from that of simplest organic forms either in principle or in mode of operation. The same laws, that govern the growth and multiply it. The same laws that bring fruit to perfecting and dissolution to perfect and dissolve societies. The same laws that produce and control the units of society. The same laws that produce and control the units of the animal kingdom produces control of the units of society. The law that governs the ebbs and flows of the tides, that determines whether the components parts of water shall exist as water or as vapor, determines the movements of society and the conditions of its existence; and the same law that produces an earthquake here, a volcanic eruption there or a terrific hurricane elsewhere, produces the earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and the hurricanes that are ever modifying and changing society. Symbols of all the various processes society passes through in its growth and extension can be found in every other department of the universe; or, to assert the same fact differently, everywhere in the universe there is a constant effort to attain equilibrium — a continuous working to supply wants, an unceasing process of supply and demand, which are universal exemplifications of the law that motion is always in the direction of the least resistance or the greatest traction, or the resultant of the two operating forces jointly.

But what does history tell of the foundation and dissolution of governments, and what illustrations of the law of progress does it afford? As before stated, those who have most earnestly studied prehistoric time have found ample evidence that the time was when the head of the family was the highest sovereign power, and so absolute in its character that the individual was entirely submerged in it, and State supremacy was an impossibility. Nothing by anarchy and confusion could have attained such rule; constant rivalry, jealousy and contention must have kept up a continual strife between adjacent families, which could know no settlement except through subju-
of destruction of the weaker of the contending parties.

Of this order of governmental aggregations, it is questionable
if the earth at present furnishes any illustration, unless it
be in some part thereof to which the discoverer has not yet
penetrated. Of the next, or tribal, order of aggregates, it
does, however; and with this second order the real analysis
and comparison must begin though we have no objective means of
demonstrating the conditions stated as existing. When family
sovereignty was universal it can readily be seen that the
continued existence of such conditions would be impossible
for the continuous subjugation and amalgamations of families
would lead directly to tribal communities, at first in absolute
subjection to one tribe, which would grow into some power,
distributed among the several tribes. So also would the joining
together of several weak families to resist a more power-
ful neighbour lead directly to confederation.

The subjugation and reduction of families to bondage and
slavery was the beginning of that system of interdependence
now so broadly extended into commerce, exchange and mutual
dependence for almost the necessities of life. In the time
referred to every man was his own farmer, tailor, carpenter,
and cook, and this condition was only modified with individ-
uals of conquering families began to reply upon the conquered
for certain services they otherwise would have been obliged to
render themselves. All of these facts exemplify another phil-
osophic proposition -- that for anything in the universe to
remain in its homogeneous condition is impossible, which im-
possibility is the result of the fact that motion must pro-
duce change which constant motion is inevitable so long as
force persists and matter resists.

That eminent historian of the third decade of the eighteen-
century, Rollin, thus remarks of the earliest monuments which
are preserved, treating of the progress from simple to com-
plex forms of government: (quotation omitted).

But different motives gave rise to different laws. One man,
overjoyed at the birth of a first born son, resolved to dis-
tinguish from his future children by bestowing on him a more
considerable share of his possessions, and giving him greater
authority in his family. Another more attentive to the
interests of a beloved or darling daughter, when he
wanted to settle in the world, thought it incumbent on him to
secure her rights and increase her advantages. The solitary
and cheerless state of wife might be reduced to in a case
she should become a widow affected more intimately another man,
and made him provide beforehand for the subsistence and comfort
of a woman who formed his felicity. In proportion as every
family increased by the birth of children and their marrying
into other families, they extended their domain, and by ins-
sensible degrees formed towns and cities. From these different
views and others like an nature arose the different customs and
These societies growing in time very numerous, and the families dividing into different branches, each having its head, it was necessary to intrust on person with the whole in order to unite all these heads under one authority and to maintain the public good by a uniform administration. To heighten the lustre of this newly acquired dignity and to cause them to devote themselves entirely to the public good, the title of king was bestowed upon them and they were invested with full power to administer justice and punish crime.
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MRS. DE VERUX LILLIE BLAKE

COMMEMORATION OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE BATTLE OF LEXINGTON

April 19, 1874

The meeting was held in Union League Theater to protest against disfranchisement. The journals contained fair reports with the exception of The Tribune which closed its account of the many observances elsewhere by saying 'there was no celebration in New York City.' Several of the paper published Mrs. Blake's speech:

Just the first rays of dawn stole across our city this morning, the century was complete since the founder of this nation made their first great stand for liberty. The early April sunshine a hundred years ago saw a group of men and boys gathered together "a few rods north of the meeting-house," in the Massachusetts village of Lexington. Un-uniformed and undisciplined, standing in the chilly morning, that handful of patriots represented the great Republic which in that day was to spring from their martyrdom. The rebellious colonists had collected in the hamlets near Boston some military stores; these the British officers in command at Boston resolved should be seized and destroyed. Warned of their design Paul Revere made his famous ride to arouse the country to resistance, in the dead of night Adams and Hancock went out to summon their comrades to arms. As the last stars vanished before the dawn, the drum beat to summon the patriots to action, and in response a little band of about eighty men and boys assembled in the village green. Few as they were in numbers, they presented a brave front as the British regulars came up the quiet street, 200 strong. What followed was not a battle, but a butchery. The minute-men refused to surrender to Major Putnam's haughty demand, and a volley of musketry, close and deadly, was poured on this devoted band. In response only a few random shots were fired, which did absolutely no harm, and then, seeing the hopelessness of resistance, the commander of the minute-men ordered them to disperse. The British, elated with their easy victory, pushed on toward Concord, thinking that there another speedy success awaited them. In this they soon bitterly learned their error. Although they were reinforced on the way, when they reached that village they were met by such a resistance as drove them back, broken and disorganized, on the road they had so proudly followed in the morning. Concord nobly avenged the slaughter at Lexington.

So much for what men did on that day, and let us see what share the women had in its dangers and its sorrows. Jonathan Harris was shot in front of his own house, while his wife was watching him from a window, seeing him fall with such anguish as no poor words of mine can describe. He struggled to his feet, the blood gushing from a wound in his breast, staggered forward a few paces and fell again, and then crawled on...
his hands and knees to his threshold only to expire just as
his wife reached him. Did not this woman bear her portion of
the martyrdom? Isaac Davis, a man in the prime of life, went
forth from his home in the morning, and before the afternoon
sunlight had grown yellow, was brought back to it dead, and
was laid, pale and cold, in his wife's bed, only three hours
after he had left her with a solemn benediction of farewell.
Did not this woman also suffer? She was left a widow in the
very flower of her youth, and for seventy years she faithfully
mourned his taking off. Nor were these the only ones; for ev­
er man who fell that day, some woman's heart was wrung. There
were others who endured actual physical hardship and suffer­
ing. Hannah Adams lay in bed with an infant only a week old
when the British reached her house in their disorderly re­
treat to Boston; they forced her to leave her sick room and
crawl into an adjoining corn shed, while they burned her
house to ashes in her sight. Three companies of British troops
went to the house of Major Barrett and demanded food. Mrs.
Barrett served them well and ably, and when she was offered
compensation, refused it, saying gently, "We are commanded if
our enemy hunger to feed him." So, in toil or suffering or
anguish the women endured their share of the sorrows of that
day. Do they not deserve a share of its glories also? The
Battles of Lexington and Concord form an era in our country's
history. When, driven to desperation by a long course of op­
pression, the people first resolved to revolt against the mo­
ther country, Discontent, resentment, and indignation had
grown stronger month by month among the hardy settlers of the
land, until they culminated in the most splendid act of audi­
cacy that the world has ever seen. A few colonies, scattered
at long intervals along the Atlantic seaboard, dared to defy
the proudest nation in Europe, and few rustics, undisciplined,
and almost unarmed, actually ventured to encounter in battle
that army of oppressions drove these people to the mad attem­
pt? What unheard of atrocities had the rulers of the people
practiced, what unjust confiscations of property, what cruel
imprisonments and wicked murders? None of all these people
of this land were not starving or dying under the iron heel of
an Alva or a Robespierre, but their civil liberties had been
denied, their political freedom refused, and rather than en­
Sure the loss of these precious things, they were willing to
encounter danger and to brave death. The men and women who
suffered at Concord and at Lexington 100 years ago today, were
martyrs to the sacred cause of personal liberty! Looking over
the records of the past we find again and again repeated, the
burden of their complaints. Not that they were starving or
dying, but that they were taxed without their consent, and
that they were denied personal representation.

The congress which assembled at Philadelphia in 1774, declared
that "the foundation of liberty and of all free governments is
the right of the people to participate in this legislative
Council"; and the House of Burgesses, assembled in Virginia
in the same year, asserted "That a determined system is formed
and pressed for reducing us to slavery, by subjecting us to the payment of taxes imposed without our consent." Strong language this, as strong as any we women have ever employed in addressing the men of this nation. Our ancestors called the imposition of taxes without their consent, slavery and tyranny! Words which they tell us today are too strong for our use. We must find some mild and lady-like phrases in which to describe these oppressions. We must employ some safe and gentle terms to indicate the crimes which our forefathers denounced! My friends, what was truth a century ago is truth today! Other things may have changed, but justice has not changed in a hundred years!
Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee:

A recent writer in an English magazine, in speaking of the great advantages today, which flow to the laboring classes of the nation from having received right to suffrage, made the statement that disfranchised classes are oppressed because they are forgotten. We have year after year, and session after session, of our legislatures and of our Congress proved the correctness of that remark. While we have nothing to complain of in the courtesy which we receive in private life, still when we see masses of men assemble together for political action, whether it be of the state or nation, we find that women are completely forgotten.

In the limited time that is allotted to me I cannot go into any lengthy exposition upon this point. I will simply call your attention to the forgetfulness of the Congress of the United States upon this point. To the debt owed to women, who is broken down by her devotion to the nation in hospitals and upon the battlefield, she is met at the door of the Pension Bureau with this statement: "The government has made no appropriations for the services of women during the war." One of these women is an old nurse, whom some of you remember, Mother Bickerdyke, who went out to many battlefields, when she was in the prime of life, twenty years ago, and at the risk of her life, lifted men who were wounded in her arms, and carried them to a place of safety. She is an old woman now, and where is she? What reward has the nation bestowed on her for her services? The nation has a pension for every man that has served the nation, even now to the boy recruits who were out for three months; but Mother Bickerdyke, though her health has never been good since her services are earning her living at the wash-tub, a monument of ingratitude of a republic as great as was that when Belisarius begged in the streets in Rome.

I bring up this illustration alone out of innumerable others that are possible, to try to impress upon your minds that we are forgotten. It is not from unkindness on your part. Who would think for one moment, looking upon the kindness in the faces of this committee, that any man on it would do an injustice to women, especially if she were old and feeble, but because we have no right to vote, as I said, our interests are overlooked and forgotten.

It is often said that we have too many voters, that they aggre-
gate of vice and ignorance among us should not be increased by giving women the right to vote. I wish to remind you of the fact that in the enormous immigration that pours to our shores every year, numbering in the neighborhood of half a million, there comes twice as many men as women. The figures of last year were two hundred and twenty thousand men and one hundred and thirteen thousand women. What does this mean? It means a steady influx of foreign element; it means a constant preponderance of the masculine over the feminine. It means also a preponderance of the voting power of the foreign voter as over the native born. To those who fear that our American institutions are threatened by this gigantic inroad of foreigners I commend the reflection that the best safeguard against such preponderance of foreign nations or of foreign influence is to put the ballot in the hands of all women, so that if the foreign born man overbalances us in number, we shall always be in a preponderance on the side of liberty which is secured by our institutions.

It is because, as many of our predecessors have said, of the different elements represented by the two sexes, that we are asking for this liberty. When I was recently in the capitol of my own state of New York, I was reminded of the difference in temperament of the two sexes by seeing how children act when coming to the doors of the capitol which have been constructed so that it is nearly impossible to open them. I saw a number of little girls coming in through these doors — every child held the door for those to follow. A number of little boys followed just afterwards, and every boy rushed through the door and let the door shut in the face of the one who was coming behind him. That is a good example of the different qualities of sexes. Those boys were not unkind, they simply represented that onward push which is one of the grandest characteristics of your sex; and the girls on the other hand, represented that gentleness and thoughtfulness of other people which is eminently a characteristic of women.

That woman element is needed in every branch of government. Look at the wholesale destruction of forests throughout the nation, which has gone on until it brings dire destruction to the land on the lines of the great rivers of the West, and threatens us even in New York with destroying at once the beauty and the usefulness of our far-famed Hudson. If we women were in the government do you think they would protect the economic interest of the nation? They are the born and trained economists of the world, and when you call them to your aid for assistance, you will find an element that has not heretofore been felt with the weight that it deserves.

As we walk through the Capitol we are struck with the significance of the symbolism on every side; we view the adornments
in the beautiful room, and we find here everywhere emblematically woman's figure, here is woman representing even war; and there are women representing grace and loveliness and the fulness of the harvest; and above all, they are extending their protecting arms over little children. Gentlemen, I leave you under this symbolism, hoping that you will see in it the type of the coming day when we shall see women and men united together in the national councils in this great building.
The reverend gentlemen whose last discourse we propose to discuss tonight began his lecture on Friday evening by addressing his audience, two thirds of whom were women, as "dear brethren." Evidently his observations were intended to please men alone, and doubtless many of them enjoyed his denunciations of "the sins and follies" of our sex which followed. However, I am less surprised at the learned doctor's difficulty in understanding the facts of today, now that I have listened to some of his discourses and find how completely he lives in and with the past. Seated in Trinity Chapel one may easily imagine one's self in some mediaeval cathedral, listening to the choir of boy's voices and the service intoned by priests who utter the words so that it is difficult to tell whether they are Latin or English.

Influenced by these surroundings, leading an almost cloistered life, this man has no more sympathy with the rhythm and pulse of the great heartbeat of today than a stained-glass window. He is a theological Rip Van Winkle, who has slept, not twenty but two hundred years, and who looks across the wide fields of modern progress with eyes dazzled by the light of the nineteenth century. Are the stage-coaches all gone? Have women left off using the spinning wheel and taken to the study of Latin? And he endeavors to roll back the tape of life with a sermon case and time the march of modern thought to the toll of convent bells.

To show how little he comprehends the sentiment of the day, while speaking his last lecture of the evils of nihilism, he said, these people "have no respect for property of human life" (Lenten Lectures for 1883, pp. 113) putting property first, with the truly monarchical view that property is more valuable than the lives of the people. And again, he dwelt on the evils which come of education the children of "the humbler classes" to a social rank above their own." (Ibid, page 99) Who are these children of the "humbler classes"? "The mill-boy on the Slashes," who was afterwards America's greatest orator? "The rail-splitter who brought his clear brain and kind heart to the service of his country, and died a martyr to her cause? The canal boy, who grew to be the equal in culture of the most daintily-reared écholâtre in the land, and fell in his prime to be mourned by the world? Why, the glory of America is the children of the humbler classes who are educated above their rank.

However, in spite of Mr. Dix's old-world views, he has made some discoveries! He has found out that the position of wo-
man has changed, that she stands not where she once did, but
had advanced from the seclusion of the past. This fact, how-
ever he regards wholly with dismay, as he expressed the great-
est horror at the thought that women should come before the
public in any way. Some of them, he said, actually had their
names printed in the newspapers — their full names like men?

Which recalls a saying that was once held to be quite indis-
putable, that a woman's name should never appear in the news-
papers but twice, once when she was married and once when
she died. How pleasant it has been for men to monopolize all
the attention of the public in the past! No wonder they do
not like the idea of sharing their honors — or, possibly,
being outvilled.

"I abhor and detest the modern development," (Lenten Lectures
for 1883 pp95) the good doctors says frankly, and we can well
fancy that he disapproves violently of any system which will
permit his declarations on any point to be controverted, or
that any independence should arise in that sex which has so
long humbly accepted priestly dictation.

The eloquent divine devoted a considerable portion of his last
lecture to a graphic picture of the career of a fashionable
girl, who leaves school at eighteen, and achieves what is
called "success" in society. He is very much shocked at her
frivolity, her love of admiration, her fondness for gayety.
Why then does he not offer to the girls something better in
the way of employment than the round of idle amusements which
are now the only occupations offered to young ladies of a
certain social position? He denies to our young women all
higher education, closes to them all active careers, and
then blames a gifted girl for wishing to achieve success in
the only arena open to her.

"Note," he says, "the ambition to appear clever and brilliant,
the desire to say bright things and hear them said," and he
blames the poor girls for being able to "banter, jest, and
make repartee." What better use does he suggest for her po-
ers than the training them of effective display in society?

A young woman who has had all the advantages, even for a fash-
ionable education, must feel that what is offered by society
as occupation for her after school days are over, is miser-
ably frivulous and unsatisfactory, and the strictures of
Mr. Dix reminds me of the reply of a certain well-meaning
father to his daughter when she asked for advise. She had
returned to her home after graduating at a very good college
for young women, and finding, after a little, that the ab-
sence of daily tasks seemed to make life very unprofitable,
and she was drifting into habits of idleness and without an
aim in life, she appealed to her father suggesting that he
should point out to her some useful occupation for her train-
ed intellect and restless energy. The good gentleman was
easily puzzled at first, but brightened up as he told her that
he badly needed a new pair of slippers, and she might embrodi-
er them for him.

It is true that Dr. Dix highly approves of marriage for women,
and dwells so much on the importance of their training as
wives and mothers that he evidently thinks young ladies have
nothing to do after leaving school but walk into some conven-
ient church and be married to some good husband, who is regu-
larly provided for every woman as soon as she reaches a suit-
able age.

"It will be said," he admits, "that many women have no homes.
That is true; yet they are exceptions, and their unhappy cases
makes not against the general line of our argument."

This is, certainly, a very airy way of dismissal the facts
in the case, which are, that in this country today in all
our Eastern States women are in the majority 73,000 more
women than men in New York, 66,000 more women than men in
Massachusetts, and so on in the older States; and, coupled
with this, the other highly significant fact, that, for var-
ious reasons, principally owing to their own vice, and not
to woman's extravagance, as is sometimes claimed, many men
do not marry; so that there are in New York today 400,000 wo-
men over twenty-one and unmarried, either maidens, widows,
or divorced wives, which is about one third of the adult
female population. When you add to these the many women who
are obligated to support not only themselves but their hus-
bands, you have so large a number of women who cannot expect
to find homes or a support in marriage that only one who
stood in an "early English attitude" would think of consid-
ering woman's position today without having something to say
in regard to this constantly-increasing army of unmarried and
unsupported women.

But this is one of the peculiarities of the good doctor's at-
tempts to grapple with the "women question"—that he sees
nothing beyond Fifth Avenue and Murray Hill. He knows no
life but that of fashion, and has no eyes for the great
army of working girls who surge through our streets every
morning going to their labors and back again at night.

"Man's is the outer life, woman's the inner," he declares.
"It cannot be her duty to go down and strive in the streets;"
but ah! it is not only the duty but the necessity of many
women in every community to earn their living, by leaving
their homes, and striving to make for themselves a place in
the world; and at what fearful disadvantages are these wo-
men placed by the teachings of just such men and Mr. Dix?
Women are laboring in our schools at one half or one third as
such pay as men who do not do better work, toiling in our shops for a wretched pittance. (The average wages of women in this country are stated to be only $4 a week by Mr. Charles Wyllie Elliott, in his article on "Woman's Work and Wages," in the North American Review, August, 1862) and running sewing machines at starvation wages! The picture is terrible one in some of its aspects.

There are 50,000 women toiling in this city for pay that averages no more than thirty cents a day. (Annual Working Woman's Protective Union) Now what does such wretched remuneration as this mean? It means hunger, it means cold, it means misery, and too often it means degradation! for when a woman is starving and freezing she must have a heart of adamant to resist the tempter who comes to her and offers her comfort and luxury as the price of vice! (Woman is best paid to prostitute herself. -- N.Y. Medical Record, Aug. 30, 1879)

But for all these struggling souls Mr. Dix has not a word. The whole, sole, solitary training of a woman must be for the home, which, considering the facts of the case, is about as sensible as if all young men were to be educated for the ministry, with the absolute certainty that there would never be enough pulpits enough for them to preach from. And even when women are married, may it not be desirable for them to have some trade or profession, by which they may earn what will make their homes more complete and their lives happier?

Machinery has taken from women all their old avocations — spinning and weaving, knitting and sewing; the occupations that once filled up all women's time and made their services of industrial value have been taken from them by the inventions of the last century. Even the potting, and pickling and preserving, that were once done at home, are now done at factories, and unless a woman has an unusually large family of children she will have much leisure time, which might be profitably employed if only fair opportunities in life were open to all.

The sad story of one of my young companions strongly illustrates this fact. Pretty, brilliant and attractive, she early married a man of good social position in New York, and was introduced into fashionable life. Her husband was amiable and kind, but had no capacity for money making. They had two children, one of whom soon died, so that there but one little one to occupy the mother's time and thoughts, and this, a boy, who was soon at school. She was expected to take her place in society, to be well-dressed, and have a carriage, and all those expensive luxuries which fashionable life demands, and there was no money to supply all this. She was pretty, and I have said, and, in the midst of all the gay city, surrounded by constant temptation, she made a gallant struggle in that desperate effort to "keep up appearances," doing a large part of the work in her home, pra-
atizing the most rigid economy, but, of course, she refused all opportunities to earning anything.

She was remarkably quick at figures, and had exceptional executive ability, and, in discussing with me the present position of women, she more than once said, "If I only had some way of earning money! If I could only have gone into father's bank I know I could have done well, and been getting a good salary." But, of course, every one, including Mr. Dix, would have been shocked at such a suggestion. She would have met men there! And so she met men at parties and scenes of gayety, where the association was a thousandfold more harmful than any business companionship, and the end is too sad to relate — she lies in an alien grave, dead by her own hand.

Every day the necessity is becoming more apparent of giving women an education that shall fit them for their present position in life, their actual duties today, and not for some place they held in the past, or some position they may take in the future. A special training, done to keep women within doors, and fitting them for housekeeping only, tends to exaggerate the present weaknesses of the feminine character. Indeed, the sort of education which women receive today is often a positive injury rather than a benefit.

Mr. Buckle says, in his admirable work on the "Influence of Women in the Progress of Knowledge": (quotation omitted).

This is painfully true a consideration for the training of any fashionable girl will speedily prove. Only think what would be the effect on a set of young men who should be reared like girls, kept mostly in the house, forbidden to romp lest they should be "tom-boys," with their waists compressed by corsets, and their limbs hampered by skirts, their whole frames debilitated by their cruel dress and indoor lives, instructed only in the lighter accomplishments, forced to spend many hours of each day in playing on the piano and setting of minute stitches, and taught that beauty was their highest gift, and marriage the object of life. What sort of creatures would these young men be at twenty? I think we may really found a claim for woman's superiority on the fact that, in spite of this monstrous process of destruction our girls are as bright as they are. I fancy boys would hardly come out as well.

These young women, thus softly trained, and too often kept in ignorance of the evil of the world they must live in, are thrown into society with young men who have had a robust and varied education, and are well informed on the problems of life. No wonder these youths are likely to feel little respect for these gentle, and too often mentally feeble beings.
Mr. Dix, in his last lecture, drew a forcible picture of the want of deference now shown to women, the freedom with which a society man will treat the maidens he meets, and the disappearances of the old civility. It is quite true, the days of chivalry are over; women no longer command homage simply by reason of their sex; though, if you analyze that much-vaulted courtesy of the past, you will find it was paid to rank rather than womanhood; for formerly, as today, a gentleman who would relieve a lady of a basket or other burdens would hand it with indifference to her maid-servant.

Still it must be admitted that there is a great change in the freedom of intercourse among young people in society; and the ceremonious deference with which a gentleman of the last century asked a lady’s hand in the dance is in strong contrast with the careless manner of the waltzer today, who beckons to his chosen partner across the ball-room, with the light request, “Dance—take a turn!”

In these things there are signs of the times, plain as the handwriting on the wall, to show that the only hope for women and for morality is to place the hands of all women the power of self-protection. It is sometimes claimed that men are the “natural protectors” of women. Are they? Who is it that women fear on lonely roads at night, the members of their own sex or of that sex that claims to be their natural protectors? Any observer of the world knows, that while men may be very good protectors for the women of their own families, they are often very poor protectors for the women of other men’s families.

Ah, now a woman of today, who sees as much of life as she must, even from the most secluded home, must, for her own sake and for her daughters’ sake, be equipped with a good education, and such admitted social and political power as shall give her the ability to command the respect of the men she meets. Here is the only hope of society and the world, that women shall meet men as their intellectual equals and have the right to insist that men shall only associate with them as their moral equals.

Dr. Dix says of men today: “The sins of men are rank, their follies excessive and without number, their rebellion against God horrible and defiant; they are worse than women;” and again: “I believe that women are morally superior of men.”

And yet he would have all the laws, legal and social, made by the members of that sex which he holds to be least virtuous! How can women keep their homes pure if men permit themselves a wild license of indulgence that too often renders their wives wretched, and transmits even to their daughters the taint of unbridled passion! The misery which comes from
men's lawlessness surely cannot be charged on women, for the
different code of morality for the two sexes is an invention
certainly of men alone; and yet this wise doctor, like Adam
before him, blames the woman, and lays the culpability for
all social disorders on women alone.

"Generally this: that it is the faithlessness of woman to
his or her mission and her duty which emboldens the arch
conspirators upon her honor." {Lenten Lectures for 1835 p98}

It is really amazing, in reviewing these lectures from the
beginning, to see how throughout they are pervaded with the
idea that women ought to be silent and subordinate, and yet
may properly be held responsible for everything in active
life. And the other idea, that the world is absolutely
man's and woman is only allowed any place in it or any ad-
vantages at his good pleasure, and ought to be very great-
ful for any toleration show now enjoys. In his second lecture
Mr. Dix uses these remarkable words: (quotation omitted).

One is at once amused and indignant at reading this extra-
ordinary tirade. The cool way in which this pulpit dis-
tator assumes that the world is made for men, and that women
have no rights except what they choose to give them; the
calm assumption that he knows what work is "unsuited for
women;" and the dreadful penalties he fulminates against
one half of the human race, to be inflicted by another
half; - all these things show how utterly this commentator
on life fails to see the facts of the world as they are.

He would forbid women to enter certain occupations as "unsu-
ited for them" -- he himself, we presume, to be judge of
the suitability -- and does not see that the labor of any
individual should be limited only by the abilities which God
has given! His declaration that women should not enter pro-
fessions "already overstocked" makes one think of the re-
mark of a certain physician in England, when the question
was mooted whether women should enter the medical pro-
fession: "Do these women know that there is not work enough
for us men doctors now?" -- as if the world must of course
belong to men, and that only after they had filled all
desirable positions might women expect to be allowed to
take some humble place, and perhaps pick up a few crumbs
which fell from their well-spread table.

The learned rector of Trinity, then, well-schooled, doubt-
less, in the lore of the past, but absolutely ignorant of
the world as it is, after thus plainly stating how subord-
nate to man woman is, and ought to be, proceeds to blame
her for all the sins against the home today.

And really the worthy rector draws so dismal a picture of the
home he has seen that one is tempted to ask what sort of
society he has kept that can warrant such utterances as these.

"We see all about us the wrecks of homes, the shadows and ghosts of homes, the parodies of homes; slowly are dying out the home-life, the home-influence, the home-training and the home-religion."

How false to facts! What an insult to the thousands of happy homes in our land today! Ah, if this lecturer wishes to see really happy homes, let him visit really the homes of those women who are laboring for the elevation of their sex.

I know that it has been a favorite sneer to declare that "strong-minded" women neglected the duties to their families; but, on the face of the statement, it is likely to be false. If you find a woman full of energy as a writer, as a speaker, in her reform work, you may be sure she will carry that same energy into the administration of her household, and the hands that have been helpful to the world outside will not fall listless in the sacred realm of home.

I never shall I forget the visit it was once my happiness to pay to the home of Lucretia Mott. It was on an evening during the Centennial summer, while I was visiting in Philadelphia, and, leaving the hot and dusty city, went a short distance on the cars, in the cool of the evening, to the abode of that venerated woman -- a pretty cottage standing in the dewy country, with grand old trees shadowing its substantial proportions and wide piazzas. Within all was order and neatness, every room as perfect and scrupulous trim. Presently we were bidden to a well spread table, where admirably cooked food was daintily served, and later, on the piazza, we gathered about that noble woman, who, in the evening of her days, could look back to a life well spent in devotion to her family, and beyond that, to the welfare of humanity. She sat among us with the silvery moonlight falling on her lovely face and the pure white of her cap and kerchief; and her chair seemed transfigured to a throne grander than any throne on earth, for it was built up by the purity and beauty of life.

Ah, friends, the good, anxious rector of Trinity need not fear the destruction of the home, if he will only let women's voices be heard in the control of society. Home! Why it is the dearest sound to any true woman's heart, the one place we all dream of and we all love. My few brief absences from home have taught me how the thoughts and the affections cling with persistent tenderness to the spot where the loved ones are left, and how invisible threads seem to ever drawing the traveller back to the fireside and family.

Have we any of us forgotten our childhood? No! Its tender memories linger with us, though the stream of time is bearing us
rapidly away from the land of sunshine and of flowers. Still
as we are borne swiftly onward, we catch the faint echo of the
laughter and the song of that light-hearted time; and who was
the central figure of that picture of the past? The mother,
going with us hand in hand, sharing our pleasures, consoling
our sorrows, and training us in our obligations and our dut-
ies. Perchance the grass has waved deep and green over grave
for many long summers; but still the heart longs sometimes
for her counsel, or yearns with an ache that will never wholly
ease for one touch from that dear hand, one tone of that
beloved voice this is silent on earth forever.

It is this mother-influence that we would see powerful today,
the purifying, the ennobling, the moral qualities that make
the household happy, that should have their place in the
Government also; then, indeed, should we have happier homes
then we have today.

For we all know that there are homes wretched as any that
Mr. Dix describes yet not by woman's sins alone; for where one
home is ruined by woman's extravagance, a hundred are destr-
yed by man's vices; and if the wife is sometimes stupid
or negligent, or frivolous, how often is the husband the
master and the tyrant, or the drunkard and the brute?

There are homes where the wretched mother vainly strives to
obtain from her husband enough money from his earnings to
keep her children alive; homes where the wife, instead of
listening joyfully for the sound of her husband's home-com-
ing footsteps, hears his heavy tread with shivering terror.
Shall I read to you the stories of wife-murderers and wife-
beaters that blacken the pages of our journals day after day?
Why the night would be not long enough to relate the records
of even a few months. So common are such events that the
papers carelessly chronicle even the darkest of them, under
"Minor Items," or as "Another Wife Murder." Did any one ev-
er hear of "Another Husband Murderer"?

The wife-beater, surly brute! stalks abroad in our streets;
the faithless husband lounges on every street corner, and
then this dull-eyed observer charges women with being the
destroyers of home! In this city, during one quarter, 463
men deserted their families, and there were only 3 women
that desire to be rid of children, and asserts that the coming
of the child is often unwelcome to the mother, but never un-
welcome to the father?

I have known cases, and so have you, doubtless, where the
wife dared not tell her husband of the trembling hope that was
in her heart, lest he should receive the intelligence with
grumbling discontent; (This subject is too delicate to be
dealt with in a public discourse; but instances are by no
means rare in which the husband acted and spoke as if the
coming of a child was an invention on the part of the wife, which he had good reason to resent, and made her condition a reason for denying to her what few indulgences her life could have, on the ground that the closer economy must be practised, speaking always if the baby were an extravagance of her own; and yet this same man would have been very indignant at any denial of what he considered his martial rights. If women do practise any of the "vile arts," which Dr. Dix denounces, they are undoubtedly nine times out of ten persuaded or driven to them by their husbands; and if women are reluctant to assume the responsibility of children, men are far more reluctant to meet the expense.

Much is said by all the critics of women's position today with regard to their duty of their children. These duties cannot be too highly estimated, but women do not need to be preached on the subject. The divinest instinct of the heart is the mother's love for her child, and Dr. Dix would do well to spend some time in discoursing to men on their duties as fathers -- duties only second in importance to the mother's, and far more likely to be neglected. It is a curious and cruel feature of the present social condition that while women are so loudly talked to of these duties, they legally have no rights whatever to their children in a large number of states in this Union.

In New York, as in many other states, the law declares the father to be "the natural guardian of the child." One would be sure that no woman had any voice in framing that statute, when nature herself points beyond question to the mother as the only "natural guardian" of her offspring.

New York law goes farther than this, and gives the father absolute right to dispose of the child. It does not legally belong to the mother for a single moment of its existence! By an infamous law, passed in 1871, the father of a child, though he be a minor, may dispose of the custody and tuition of his child by deed, if he be living, and by will, even if he dies before he ever sees its face. You will tell me such a law matters little. Ah, yes, in the happy homes, of which we have so many, in spite of Dr. Dix, homes where husband and wife are happy equals in the care of their children; but laws are not needed to control good men, and we know that in every community are many bad ones, who will and do use this statute book to work infinite woe to women.

On this point, as on that of wife-beating, there is a long and terrible record drawn from our probate and police court stories of women made wretched by being robbed of their children. The law puts a positive premium on immorality, as the poor girl, whose child is born out of wedlock, owns it, while the respectable wife has no legal right to her child. In Michigan, where
there is a similar law, a woman, who was threatened with having her children taken from her, went into court and swore they were not her husband's, though every one knew her to be an honorable wife. Thus only could she keep her darlings with her. Let me tell you only one of these: Within two months, here in this city, a Chinaman, who had married a decent Irish wife. Thus took her baby from her when it was only three days old. (Case of "Ah Ying and His Baby"—New York Star, Nov. 30, 1888. It will be observed that even in this heading the baby is spoken of as "his" ignoring the mother.) The poor wretched mother appealed to the Society of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and the man was brought to court. When asked what he had done with the baby, he replied that he had given it to his brother to be taken away to China. Had the judge one word of censure for this? Not a syllable. His comment was:

"You did perfectly right; you are the natural guardian of the child; you had a right to dispose of it as you thought best;" and to the wretched woman standing there, sobbing and shivering in her poor clothes, he merely said: "Go home, be you not out in the storm." No reproof at this act, paralleled only in slave annals! Why a kind-hearted man would not treat his dog or his cat as this man treated his wife—taking her baby from her breast when it was only three days old! And yet good Dr. Dix cannot see that women have anything to complain about.

We ask better laws today for the sake of our children, because we love them. We can guard them now while they lie in our arms, we can protect them while they toddle at our feet, but when they pass beyond our portals, then what power have we to shield them? Men have opened on every side the doors of places that shall lead our sons—aye, and even our daughters—down to destruction, and we have no power to close them. It is because we love our children, because for their sake we would use our influence beyond the home to make the world purer and better, that we are asking for greater liberties today.

In a happy home and for the rearing of a virtuous family there are needed the two essential elements, a good man a good woman; the former as important a factor in the problem as the latter. Many such men there throughout our fortunate land, we all know, men who are true to their homes, to their wives to all the duties of life. It is because of this fact, that we have so many excellent men, whose kind hearts make laws for their action for more beneficent than any their ancestors have written, that you find so many a women who feel as if there were no need of any change. Their own lives are so sheltered that they cannot realize how others who are out in the story need better advantages and a purer moral code than exists today.

Ah, sisters because we have dear homes and good husbands, shall we not be able to see those others of our sex who are suffering? Even if we are happy, shall we not have pity on the unhappy once? A woman need not have endured any wrong herself to feel
the wrongs of the others. The good Wilberforce and the eloquent Charles Sumner had never themselves felt the lash of the whip, yet their hearts were full of compassion for the slave; and if some of us have husband, children, home, luxury, it the more behoves us out of our abundance to reach helping hands to women who are struggling or unfortunate.

The happy home, them, needs the union of both the masculine and feminine elements. A household of women alone is but a forlorn place, while a Western "ranch" where men dwell without women, is prone to become not merely forlorn but despicable. The sexes need the companionship of each other in all the departments of life, each modifying the special characteristics of the other, and united forming a harmonious whole.

And how much more likely are marriages to be well formed where there is the association of young people, not only in the ballroom where they are on their good behavior, but in the classroom also, where whatever is stupid, whatever is ill-tempered is prone to come to the surface.

By the way, it is quite amusing to hear Dr. Dix and others crying out in denunciation of co-education, as if it were something new, when many of our fathers and mothers and all our grandfathers and grandmothers were co-educated; when, in fact, as soon as you pass out of New York city, you will find all over the country "mixed schools" where both sexes are taught side by side.

Now often, if in the country in winter, we have seen a little one going to school with others. In the clear cold of some bright morning, when the snow has built airy castle on the fences, and the frost has fringed the roof with icicles the little group of young creatures has passed by with their rosy cheek aglow, their light breath circling in the crisp air, their shrill voices sounding clearly making with their scarlet caps and mufflers and mittens a patch of color across the snow. Some of the larger boys are very likely dragging some of the girls on their sleds as they go by, in happy unconsciousness that they are guilty of shocking impropriety of co-education.

The reminiscence of these early school friendships are very pleasant, and often last a lifetime. I remember how an old lady who sat with me one day reading the news of the death of a man older than herself, and laid down the paper with tears springing to her eyes as she said: "He was such a nice boy! Now often in the cold winter mornings he has drawn me to school on his sled."

And now let us consider for a moment the qualification which a woman should have to make her and the good wife and mother, and citizen also, doing her duty to the home and the world as well; and such a woman we find described in the chapter in Proverbs.
which I read to you before beginning my lecture. Now Dr. Dix himself in one of his earlier discourses, quoted from this same chapter, and yet with his masculine vision was quite unable to understand the meaning of the verses, plain as they are to any feminine eyesight.

We are told, in the first place, in verse 11, that "the heart of her husband doth safely trust in her;" showing that this perfect woman, described as a model for all time, was not a silly, dependent weakling, but a woman with all womanly grace and beauty doubtless, but also strong and self-reliant, so that husband and children could safely rely upon her in every emergency.

The succeeding verses tell how she excelled in all feminine arts, working in "wool and flax," rising early in the morning to attend to household cares, indicating that all these home duties were faithfully performed, although the next verse tells us that she went out into the world and transacted business:

"She considereth a field, and buyeth it: with the fruits of her hands she planteth a vineyard."

No mention is made of her asking her husband whether she should buy the property or not, or meekly signing her name to a paper after he had bought it without consulting her, and very likely with her money. The next verse again expatiates on her strength:

"She girdeth her loins with strength, and strengtheneth her arms."

It is evident that, as she was strong in body, she was strong in mind also, and this strength, instead of being denounced as unbecoming, is highly commended.

The next two verses again depict her household labors, and then in verse 20, we have record of her charities:

"She stretcheth out her hand to the poor; yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy."

A perfect woman indeed, foremost in all good words and work! Then follows a description of the clothing of her family, including her own, showing that she did not neglect her dress, but was attired "in silk and purple", as befitted her rank.

As now we come to verse 23, to which I desire especially to call your attention:

"Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land."
You will perceive that he is known as "her husband," pointed out doubtless as the husband of the important woman. Evidently he did not amount to very much himself, and was only known as her husband. A very good sort of man, doubtless, but quite inferior to her.

Even Dr. Dix could hardly describe this woman as "a clinging vine"—the way, what absurd simile that is! In the first place, every one knows what happens to a tree if a vine does not cling to it; it kills the tree. However, conceding that it may be very nice for the vine to have a tall and lofty oak to cling to, what are you going to do for those vines who have no oaks at all, or for those others whose oaks turn out to be constricting?

So return to the description of this perfect woman, who was no shrinking violet, seeking the shade, but rather a splendid magnolia, shedding and fragrance all about her.

The verse following again speaks of her public transactions in selling "girdles to the merchants," and then, as if the poet could never too much exalt in her glorious strength, there is added another verse commendation: "Strength and honor are her clothing; and she shall rejoice in time to come."

The next verse is very important as showing how perfectly is her character: "She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness."

Ah, sisters, what a lesson for us all in this sentence! This grand woman was no slanderer, no spreader of gossip; but with her noble intellect was joined a kind heart, and for those less fortunate, even the erring, she had words of tender charity. Will it might it be said of her as in the succeeding verse:

"Her children rise up, and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her."

The closing verses are all devoted to further praise of this most perfect woman, described as a model for her sex, and, one would think, for the utter discomfiture of Dr. Dix and others who would pretend to condemn women to restricted and dependent life, and find a warrant for their dictations in this good book.

The last verse of all is especially a wonderful contradiction to those who assert that it is of divine decree that woman shall lead lives of subordination and obscurity; it runs thus:

"Give of the fruit of her hands; and let her own works praise her in the gates."
Now this "praise in the gates" was the greatest publicity a person could have in those days when newspapers were unknown; we specially commend this verse to the consideration of this worthy divine, who was so shocked that a woman's name should be publicly known, and printed in full like a man's.

This noble woman, then, excellent in all the relations of life as wife, as mother, as housekeeper, and as friend, had also her distinct public duties, all admirably fulfilled, and yet remained kind, charitable, and loving. And this honored citizen received her due reward in the admiring respect of the world.

Well might it be said of the husband of such a woman, "She will do him good and not evil all the days of her life," and lofty indeed must be the qualities of the man who would be the fitting mate of this full-rounded and perfect creature.

In the dismal pictures of society of today which this modern Jeremiah has drawn, he hints that there is danger that love will disappear from the world. "It is averred now nobody falls in love, that the age of sentiment is in the past." How ignorant must this good man be of the facts of life. He discoursed eloquently the other evening on the novels of the day, showing an extensive acquaintance with them. Perhaps, as he spends so much time in the perusal of this light fiction, he has no leisure for reading the newspapers, which teem every day with tragedies which are the result of love, — sometimes, indeed ill-regulated and illicit love, but often the result of disappointed marriage hope and plainly proving that the day is yet far distant when "man will plod alone as best he may, misanthropical, hateful, and like one upon whose journey has descended the darkness of a night without a star."

Cruel and terrible as is ill-regulated passion, do we not all believe that love in its highest and purest form is the redeeming happiness of humanity? The foundation of every true home must be a harmonious and congenial marriage, a union begun and continued in love — that love which glorified and illumines life, which makes one man and one woman more than all the world to each other, which so enwraps them that, illumined by this wonderful light that never was on sea or land, they stand within a new creation, the Adam and Eve of a Garden of Eden, fair as all the dreams of myth or fable; a love that sets apart its ideal, crowned with a grace and beauty indescribable, and transfigures a very ordinary being to a transcendent loveliness. As the lover in Bulwer's poet says: “

[quotation omitted]

And later, when the couple thus divinely united go hand in hand to meet life's duties and life's cares, though the toils and trials of every day may destroy somewhat of the romance of passion, these remains in its place a tender affection, a
deep, abiding love, that is better in its calm sense of restful companionship than all the tumult of the first excitement.

So we not dally, know and see such unions as these, and meet couples who all their lives long are happiest when together, and who

"Love on through all ills, and love on till they die,
With hearts never changing, and brows never cold."

I well remember a venerable pair whom I reverenced in my childhood, always together, happy in each other's companionship after fifty years of marriage, with a complete content that no young love ever gave. Silver-haired and growing feeble as the time passed on, they were grew more slow, their frames more frail, until the gentle messenger came to bear them to their rest, and took first the tender wife. She died in the morning of a beautiful spring day, when all nature was re-enacting the miracle of the resurrection, and all day long the companion of so many years mourned beside the faded form that was all that was left in his heart's darling.

"I must go with Mary," he moaned; "I must go with Mary; she will be so lonely without me; I must go with Mary!"

And it was even so; as the last rays of the light faded the death-angel bore him away to be with Mary in the land where there is never any more parting. Hand in hand they had walked through life's path together in the sunshine and the storm; hand in hand they crossed the shadowy river and sought the golden shore.
The Unknown Quantity in Politics
Delivered to the National Woman's Suffrage Ass'n, 1864. From "Reports of the Forty-eighth Congress" pp. 27-32. Pub. by Charles C. Farrand, 103 Hoage St. Rochester, New York, 1884. (In Kane's Historical Library.)

When I was a child, I was first confronted with the study of algebra and I was really fascinated by that strange entity the unknown quantity. What was this mysterious integer whose very name had so pretentious a sound? As I advanced with my lessons I soon discovered that the unknown quantity was always a factor of so much importance that no problem could by any means be solved until its value was ascertained. I think it can be demonstrated that woman has always been the unknown quantity in civilization, in progress, and in politics, and that it has heretofore been impossible to calculate with certainty on the result of any great social reform or political revolution, because this mighty term, this x of the equation has been overlooked or forgotten.

Without direct power, and therefore entirely shut out of responsibility, woman has been a force whose potency it has been impossible to calculate, and therefore impossible either to counteract or to control. In ancient wars the influence of woman was like a minor chord in the barbarous clash of martial music, sometimes stimulating men to deeds of valor, like the Roman matrons who with pale, resolute lips bade their first-born sons meet death bravely for their country's sake; over by again their energizing seductions, destroying the valor of heroes as did the beauties of Capua who held the Carthaginian Warriors in silken fetters till their golden opportunity was past.

The same story has been repeated in all ages. Woman, sometimes the toy, sometimes the slave of man, never his equal, has held him back in the march of progress, weakened his "energisor" stimulated him to greatness according to her o-praise, always without responsibility, too often without intelligence, forever the unknown quantity in the social equation. That we have been the greatest sufferers is of course the inevitable result. The persecutions of all ages have number more women than men among their martyrs; during the absurd and cruel persecution for witchcraft, a hundred women suffered where one man died. And war has reserved its worst atrocities for the members of the tender sex, as the stories of the sieges prove, from Jerusalem to Jinkat.

With the advance of civilization a better day has come for women; yet how much we have gained is fittingly illustrated by the fact that leap year alone is ours, one year in four, a quarter of the time — the men have been the rest! And when we come to examine these so-called leap year advantages we find they do
not really exist, for, although men talk loudly of them, they
laugh at us if we attempt to claim them.

It is true that woman has now passed from the position of serf
to that of companion in all civilized nations, and her ability
for good and evil has consequently vastly increased, though
as yet, without direct responsibility. In politics her role
has been often prominent, though the measure of influence has
been impossible to ascertain. She has always been the mysteri­
ous x that eludes discovery. Who can say what part of the sal­
ces of paris have played in the history of France from the
days of the Duchess of Longueville to those of Julie Lambert?

In England woman's control has been less direct, although the
Countess of Waldegrave wielded more power than many a member
of Parliament, while in an election, who has forgotten the
fascinations and the daring Duchess of Devonshire? Charles
James Fox found her beauty to be an unknown quantity which,
plus his talents meant success.

In our country women have often influenced the elections,
though that influence has not always been publicly
exerted, and when it has been we have preferred other weapons
than either gold or kisses. In aiding the success of feasts
we have always been permitted an active part, like loyal
Republican ladies who buttered five hundred biscuits for a
mass meeting held to promote the election of Mrs. Hayes' husband. It does not say much for the gallantry of men,
however, to reflect that in most of those feasts women have
had no part in cooking them.

The enthusiasm that was awakened in the Clay campaign was
largely due the fact that women everywhere greatly admired the
dashing and the wit of the Kentucky statesman. Many of those
present must recollect the first great free soil canvass of
1856 when "Fremont and Jessie" was the rallying cry, and all
who will admit that the large vote rolled up by the struggling
young party was greatly a result of the efforts of the women.
Indeed, we do not think it too much to claim that the women of
New York are a factor of no inconsiderable power in any pol­
itical problem -- a mysterious x, if you please, but that may
mean exultation or execration, exaltation or exclusion, and
forgetfulness of which has brought many a man political ex­
communication.

Take, for example, the case of Lucius Robinson when, as Gov­
ernor of the State, he saw fit to veto the bill giving the wo­
men of New York the right to serve as school officials he de­
clared in a message that the God of nature never intended wo­
men for public office. When he asked for reelection, the wo­
men concluded that God of nature did not intend that Mr. Rob­
inson should occupy public office, and he was adorned a private
station once more and ever since.
A still more striking proof of our influence occurred last fall in the case of the attorney-general. In 1882, Mr. Leslie W. Russell, sitting safely in his office under the shadow of the Republican Governor, was ready, at the behest of a leading Democrat, to make himself the pliant tool of a minority of the Assembly, by declaring that the Woman Suffrage bill, then pending before that body, was unconstitutional. We had 78 votes pledged to the measure, many more than enough to secure, although in favor of our cause, were naturally influenced by one so high in authority, so that bill failed for lack of majority. Mr. Russell, no doubt, thought he was safe in dealing his blow. We were weak, helpless, apparently without power, and in fact we could abide our time and that time came last fall. Judge Russell was nominated by the Republican, Judge O'Brien by the Democrats, for the office of attorney-general. How I ask you to consider the situation. Russell had all the advantages of being in office, he had a wide personal popularity, and was sustained by the administration. On the other hand, his opponent, though an able man, was out of office, comparatively unknown, while his very name was against him with some persons. It is true that with a certain element of the Democratic party in this city Dennis O'Brien would be a name of charm yet there were thousand voters throughout the state to whom there would be grave ground of objection in these suggestively Greek syllables. But the women of New York labored against the man who had opposed them, with what successes you all know. Mr. Russell was defeated by a majority so small that it seems evident that would have been reelected but for the votes the women secured. If you admit that out of one million two hundred thousand votes in the State of New York the women control only two percent, you will be almost sufficient to turn the scales. You see he did not realize our power and the equality of the better sex. Russell plus office, plus power, minus equals defeat.

Ah, I can assure you that shrewd politicians are beginning to realize what women can do. Last fall the Young Republican club of Brooklyn got out an appeal to the ladies of that city to try to win their influence for their candidate. Outside of our own state also woman's power at the polls has been constantly demonstrated. In special election, as on prohibitory amendments, their energy has been the important in achieving a victory for the cause they espoused. Last fall, in Ohio, an enormous number of votes was rolled up by the party, "Betty and Baby". In Iowa the temperance amendment would have failed utterly if it had not been for the labors of the maidens and matrons of that state in behalf of their pet reform.

Let us now consider the presidency problem of the year. As this contest always occurs in leap year, it quite fitting that we women should offer our hands to the men to aid the party most friendly to us. And be assured that to us the question of man's view on our line of freedom is paramount to all others. We
dare little for party lines; Mr. Russell was a Democrat, Mr. Russell a Republican. But to return to the presidential campaign and illustrate it algebraically.

Here is an equation: A certain ranch man had a flock of goats and one sheep; there were 100 head in each flock on which he could depend; but there was a certain number fond of wandering, and when this number was subtracted from the sheep and added to the goats, that flock exceeded the other by two-fifths of the total. What was the number?

Now let us apply this equation to the presidential contest. Let Uncle Sam be the ranch man, the Republicans the sheep, the Democrats the goats. I suppose it is only fair to call them this, since they are in that outer darkness where is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. There are in the electoral college 401 votes; now supposing the Republicans can secure 150 and the Democrats 150 and let $x$ be the number controlled by the women — it is quite evident that whichever party can add this number to itself, will surely be the victor! Various candidates for the presidency are already in the field, for on every leap year, there are always plenty of statesmen ready to offer themselves to the nation, and more than one political go-cart has already chalked upon it "Barkis wis willin'.

Now we will consider some of these prominent gentlemen, and see how far they are likely to accept the peggatis of nation. There is first on the Republican side the Vermont lawyer, Senator Edmonds. No, he will not do! No woman of the nation will ever help to succeed the man who has spoken and voted against every suffrage measure that has been introduced into the Senate since he took office. As man who in one breath declares that disfranchisement is an infamous and degrading penalty and in the same moment proposes to disfranchise all the women of Utah, whether polygamous or not. No, we cannot accept Senator Edmonds. If you wonder, gentlemen, just for a moment try to think how you would feel in a similar position! Would you labor for the success of a candidate who would withhold from you the most sacred of human rights, that of liberty? What would have thought of Fredrick Douglas had he lifted his eloquent voice for the election of Jefferson Davis? No! Douglas had he uplifted his eloquent voice would be lost. No, decidedly, we cannot accept him, and should should the Republicans nominate him, we predict there will be $x$ number of votes against him. Then there is the Historian Kennebec. He has a better record against him. Then then is Mr. Blaine, who never openly championed our our reform, and we do not like luke warm lover. As for the smallward dictator, when he was in the Senate, he had for our demands nothing but a sneer; and as he in the days of his power did unto us, would we now do unto him. However, there is no probability of his acceptance by anybody, and there is no more chance for the Presidency of Roscoe Conklin.
Among the favorite sons of Democracy there is the giant from
pugby Delaware, an able man, and a brave one; but an old fogey
in his notions with regard to woman's position. Oh, no, this
modern Bayard will never do! Any man who rides a tilt against
equal rights had better be set aside among the fossils of the
National Museum. A better record has the Flower of the Empire
State. He stands committed to the cause of Woman Suffrage.
Should he be nominated? I think the women would smile on his
aspirations. But our own unequivocal and pronounced (women)
champion is the statesman of Indiana; over and over again has
he spoken and voted in favor of our bills. He was the one who first
moved a select committee in the Senate on Woman Suffrage.
Long ago, when our cause was less popular than it is today, he
fearlessly upheld it. There can be no doubt that the women
of the Nation owe a debt of gratitude to Joseph E. McDonald.

It may seem to you that the matter of a presidential candidate
for the campaign is of no great matter to the woman of the na-
tion; but in point of fact there is no class of persons in the
community to whom elections are really of so much consequence.
Various sets of men have various wrongs to complain of — we
have constantly the one overwhelming all-including wrong of
being forgotten or overlooked, and this forgetfulness leads
to the perpetration of all sorts of evil. If we were voters,
of course, our interests would be cared for. A distinguished
English writer, Mr. Alfred V. Dicey, in a recent political
essay pointed out how greatly the working men had been benefi-
ted by their admission to the franchise, and said, "Classes,
whose voices, cannot be heard, are neglected; not because they
are disliked, or because anyone wishes to oppress them, but
because their existence is forgotten." We have instances of
this every day. Take the case of the message of the Governor of
New York, Mr. Cleveland is a very amiable man, and I believe
favorably disposed to women's enfranchisement; but in writing
this document, as we are not voters, he simply and totally for-
got us. He talks of the soldier, the harbor masters, the emi-
grante, the pilots and even public buildings, the ships and the
trees — but has not a word to say of the women. He discourses
of the taxes, and has not a syllable on the injustice of "taxa-
tion without representation" to which women are subjected;
he has much advice about our schools, and nothing on the duty
of giving the male and female teachers equal pay for equal
work; he even has the temerity to declare that "The rights of
our citizens at primary elections have been protected by law,"
when he must be aware that no woman has any rights at election.
After all, there is a touch of absurdity in the peroration in
which he speaks of the State of New York as she. He says,
"The State of New York largely represents within her boundar-
ies the development of every interest which makes a nation
grant. Proud of her place in the community of States she fully
appreciates her intimate relations to the prosperity of the
country, etc." Rather amusing to talk of the commonwealth as
a woman, and ignore the women of the commonwealth. Take as an
illustration of Pension Bureau in regard to women’s services.
An enormous amount has been appropriated for soldiers — from
the veterans of two wars to the boy recruit who was out for only
three months — but not a dollar for the women who did duty in
the hospitals during that perilous time.

Forgotten, overlooked! the unknown quantity, and therefore
the unregarded! There are no rewards for us in life, no honors
for us after we are gone. Did a flag float at half mast in
this Nation for a woman however distinguished? If it had pleased
Providence to remove the late Wm. M. Tweed when at the height
of his power as a Comptroller of the City of New York, the flags
would have hung at half mast, for him all over the city; but
when Lucretia Mott died, Philadelphia had no banner to wave in
vee over her famous and noble daughter. The natural result of
this degradation of women is to be found in the different code
of morality for the two sexes, and the frightful tragedies that
grew out of it. In my own city there have been some most sad
events within the last few months. In one instance a young
woman, who had been outraged and deserted made her way to the
hotel where her destroyer was living with his young bride, and
shot herself at his feet. At the inquest there was no one to
defend the dead girl, every attempt was made to blacken her
character, and when the dastardly wretch, who had killed her,
was questioned at the inquest, he declared that she had thrust
herself at him, and “he had endeavored in a graceful and gentle-
manly manner to out her acquaintance! How does a man out a
woman’s acquaintance in a gentlemanly and graceful manner, when
he has broken her heart?

Another young woman, less patient and forgiving, put a bullet
through her lover before she killed herself. As in the former
case an attempt is made at once to blacken the dead girl’s fair
name and it is hinted that when she was sixteen, she was of
irregular life. This was held to be sufficient excuse for his
conduct. “Of course, he could not marry her”, men said; when
similar conduct on his part would not have been mentioned, for
men stand together well on these questions. In the Pennsylvania
legislature, last winter, when a resolution was introduced to
expel Mr. Duke, on account of his immorality, the members
said haste to vote it down. If such a rule were to be enforced,
what man would be safe in his seat?

The claim that men were natural protectors is every day disproved.
Recall the scene of the wreck of Columbus. Darkness and cold
and the wild waves uniting to destroy the ill-fated vessel, the
wretched passengers dashed away every moment to cruel death.
How were the women protected? There were on the doomed vessel
138 men and 35 women, more than five times the number of men,
and yet not a woman saved! The moon that looked whitely down
on the terror saw the captain and the crew and stout, strong
men protect their lives, while the women were left to die. Yet we would not be held for blame unreasonable; men cannot be expected to risk their existence in perhaps a fruitless attempt to preserve some strange person in whom they have no interest, simply because that person is a woman; in fact that is so shows that women should have the power to protect themselves and not be forever depending on some vague expectation that men will take care of them. It is better to have power of self-protection than to depend on any man, whether he be governor in his chair of state, or the any man, hunted outlaw wandering through the night, hungry, and cold, with murder in his heart. We are tired of the pretense that we are queens, and the fact that we are subject; of the symbolism that exalts our sex but is only a meaningless mockery! We demand that these shadows shall take substance!

The coat of arms of the state of New York represents liberty and justice supporting a child on which is seen the rising sun over the hills that guard the Hudson. How are justice and liberty depicted? As a police judge and an independent voter? Oh, no, as two noble and lovely women! We ask this symbolism shall assume reality for a redeemed and enfranchised womanhood will be the best safeguard of justice. The rising sun that sends its soft rays over the blue waters of the rippling river, may fitly typify the advancing glory of the Nation and the State. The sun of freedom, that as, it has risen higher and higher, has sent light and hope to the oppressed of all nations and melted the chains of the slave. It can only reach the zenith of all nations when all sons and daughters of the Republic are equal sharers in the effulgence of its beams.
Surely it is time that someone on this platform should say something for this half of humanity, which we really must confess after all is an important half. Ought we not admit that men have wrongs to complain of? Are they not constantly declaring themselves slaves? Is it not a well known fact, conceded even here, that women shine in all the tints of the rainbow, while men must wear only costumes of dull brown and sombre black? Nor is this because men do not like bright colors, for never a belle in all the sheen of satin and glimmer peals look half so happily proud as does a man when he has on a uniform, or struts in a political procession with a white hat on his head, a red ribbon in his buttonhole and a little cane in his hand.

Then, too, have not men, poor fellows had to do all the talking since the world began? Have we not heretofore been the silent sex? Even today a thousand men speak from pulpits and platforms when one woman uplifts her voice.

But let us pass to more important rights which are denied to men in the past. The first right that any man ought to be allowed — a right paramour to all others — is the right to have a wife. But look how in this matter he has been hardly dealt with. Has he had just standards set before him as to what a wife should be? No, he has been led to believe that the weak woman, the dependent woman, is to be desired.

Look again at the unhappy mess into which man all by himself has brought politics and public affairs. It is not too bad to leave him longer alone in his misery? Like the naughty boy who has broken and destroyed his toys, who needs mamma to help him mend them, and perhaps also to administer to him such violence as Solomon has advised — so does man need woman to come to his rescue. Look what politics is now. Who today can tell the difference between a Democrat and a Republican? Even a Mugwump is becoming a doubtful thing.

Do not these wrongs which men suffer appeal to our tenderest sympathies? Is it not evident that the poor fellows can't go on alone any longer, that it is high time we should take the boys in hand and show them a correct government can exist?

In behalf of the sons, the brothers, and the husband of these wage-earning women we ask for the political power which alone will assure equality to pay without regard to sex. For the sake...
of man's redemption and morality we demand that this injustice will cease, for it is not impossible for woman to be half-starved and man not dwarfed; for many women to be degraded and all men's lives pure; for woman to be fallen and the man not lost.

We all know that man himself has been most willing to grant to women every right, every opportunity. If he has hesitated it has been rather from love and admiration than from any tyrannical desire of oppression. He has said that women must vote because they cannot perform military duty. Can they not serve the nation as well as these men, who during the last war sent substitutes and to-day hold the highest places in the Government? But we ask one question: Which every year does most for the State, the soldier or the mother who risks her life; not to destroy life but to create it? Of the two it would be better to disfranchise the soldier and enfranchise the mothers. For much as the nation owes the soldier, she owes far more to the mothers who in endless martyrdom make a nation a possibility.

Man deserves that we should consider his present unhappy condition. In all ages he has proved his reverence for women by employing every virtue in female form, and has left none for himself. Truth and chastity, mercy and peace, charity and justice, all are represented as feminine, and lately as a proof of his devotion, he has erected at the entrance of our great metropolis a statue of liberty, and this too is represented as a woman. And so we hail the men, the liberty enlightening a world when woman and man shall be alike, shall be free.
MRS. LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE

The Hope of the Future

To the National American Convention 1899. From the "History of Woman Suffrage" Vol. IV pp. 335.

The lessons of the past year have brought home to us more forcibly than any other recent events the injustice and cruelty of denying to women their proper share in deciding questions for the public good. Why we have seen the reputation of the republic plunged into the war in which women have borne a heavy share of the burdens. It should be the rule of all nations that no contest of arms should be entered into without the consent of women.

Another significant object lesson grew out of the war. When the time of election approached, the governmental authorities because much exercised of the means for providing for the voting of the soldiers. It is astonishing how much men think of their right to vote. Extra sessions of the Legislatures were called to provide means of meeting this emergency. In this dilemma I ventured to write to the Governor of my State and suggested that he recommend the passing of a law empowering each soldier and sailor to send to some woman at home a proxy permitting her to vote for him. You can see how a simple plan this would be. Every man would have a beloved mother, a dear sister, or some adored damsel whom he would be proud to represent him at the polls, and the amount of money which this scheme would have saved to the state is enormous. The counting of the soldier's votes when at last they were sent to New York cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. In one instance the amount reached $100 per vote.
It is more than twenty years since my attention was first attracted to this subject. In 1870 I was appointed one of a committee of three to go and see the Superintendent of Police of New York, and try and get women appointed as police matrons. We were received very politely by him, but he insisted that there was no need whatever for such an innovation. We asked him if he had never known of an instance where it would have been better to have had a woman in charge of the station house? At last he did remember an occasion when a young woman was brought into the station by a police captain. She could not speak, and the case was entered in the blotter as "drunk and disorderly." She was consigned to a cell, and in the morning was found with a dead baby beside her.

It was not long after this, that one beautiful spring Sunday morning when I was on my way to church, my attention was attracted by screams, and, glancing in the direction from which they proceeded, I saw a sight that I shall never forget. A young woman was being dragged through the streets by two policemen; her dress was partly torn off, her bare white arms upstretched, each man holding her wrist, and thus she was pulled along, her body trailing on the pavement! As they thus forced her on she was crying out, "Have pity on me! Have pity on me! May God punish you for what you are doing!"

I thought of that young woman taken in that condition to the station-house. She was, no doubt under the influence of liquor; when she reached there, surrounded only by men with no woman to protect her, if need were, even from herself. I resolved then never to cease my efforts until we had secured the presence of police matrons in the station-houses of our great cities. It has been a long fight, and from the first the Police Department have opposed the innovation. I have no time to tell you all that has been done to break down this opposition, and build up public sentiment in favor of the reform. Mass-meetings have been held, articles have been written, addresses delivered, and finally every one of us with exception of the police. The board steadily refused to appoint matrons and we were driven to the Legislatures. In 1881 a bill was introduced, mandatory in its provisions. It passed the House and Senate with a unanimous vote, but the men of the State, and, the Police Department of New York being a large influential body of voters, he did not care to offend them.

In 1883 the same bill was again introduced, passed the Assembly, but failed in the Senate because of the determined opposition of the Police Department.
In 1866 a bill, prepared by the Women's Prison Association of New York, passed through both houses of Legislature and received the Governor's signature. It ran thus: "Whenever the Board of Apportionment shall appropriate money for the payment of salaries of police matrons, these matrons shall be appointed, etc."

It was a good bill, but, as you will perceive, not mandatory in its provisions. However, under this law police matrons have been appointed in Buffalo, Rochester, and other towns in New York. But from that day to this the Board of Apportionment of New York City has not appropriated the money for the salaries of matrons, and consequently none have been appointed.

Two years ago, when the law was first passed, I went down to see the mayor and Comptroller to urge this question upon them. They corresponded with me in a few days I received the following letter written to them by the police department: "The Board of Police has made no request for an appropriation for salaries of police matrons, in the opinion of the Department the appointment of such matrons is neither wise or expedient."

Last fall a bill was introduced by Senator George F. Rosech, a Tammany Democrat, which proves that some good thing can come from a Tammany Democrat, and it will probably receive the vote of the Democrats. As the other bills have received the support of Republicans, we have great reason to hope that this will be passed by both branches of the Legislature, and we think it will receive the signature of the Governor. Since he has lately been translated to the quiet of the United States Senate, he will not be a candidate for the party vote as Governor, and, we hope not as President. Therefore we think that, having no longer the fear of the police department of New York City, he will sign the bill.

We are just on the threshold of success, and here let me say that we do not mean to find any fault with the policemen; there are many noble and true hearts beating under their blue coats. We know that they are often as kind men as can be in cases of distress, but it is lonely seemly that the women who are in our station-house night after night should have the protection of women there.

These are of two classes, prisons and lodgers. Among the prisons there are many cases of young girls guilty of first offense, and, of course, from time to time some who are unjustly accused, and all these are in the charge of men, who must care for them if taken suddenly ill, and search them if charged with theft. Such things are a disgrace to our civilization. The lodgers represent the last pearls of our sex, those who in the hard struggles of life have sunk lower and lower till they are in the saddest of all conditions, homeless; and for these there is no woman to say a soothing word, to give hope of a better
bey life. There is also a third class of women who are some-
times detained in the station-house, to which you or I might
belong: I mean women accidentally hurt in the street or over-
some by sudden illness, perchance knocked down by a passing
vehicle or prostrated by the heat of the sun; and these are
carried to the nearest station-house to wait there until an
ambulance can be summoned. All these are in the hands of men,
and, however kind a man may be, you know it is not fitting.
The policeman embodies force, and side by side with him should
stand a woman embodying mercy.

(Since the delivery of the above address, the bill providing for
the appointment of police matrons has been passed by the New
York Legislature and received the signature of Governor Hill.
Under this provision police matrons are already in office in
all the cities of New York.)
In speaking of "Our Forgotten Foremothers" I shall begin with that great queen who, in some sort, may be considered not only as the mother of this nation, but of the whole New World — Isabella of Castile. Her clear intellect first grasped the thought that there might be a continent to be discovered, when her husband, her counselors and her courtiers all derided the claims of Columbus as mere idle dreams. Her steadfastness sustained him through all his vicissitudes, and at last her action gave him the money with which to fit out the expedition. Next after our debt to the intrepid navigator, this country owes its gratitude to the brave queen, and yet how completely she has been forgotten in all the celebrations and festivities of this commemorative year! Orators speak of the great enterprise of Columbus, poets rhymed in his honor, but Isabella, the woman who made his expedition possible, was scarcely mentioned.

When New York City was arranging for the celebration last fall, our City League wished to do honor to the queen by some decorations at the stand we occupied. We tried in vain to find a picture of her. The city was filled with so-called portraits of Columbus. He was depicted in every possible way, old and young, bearded and clean-shaven, smiling with amiable fatuity of expression, or frowning as if he hated all worlds, both old and new. But where could we find a picture of Isabella? High and low through the city and up and down the land, we searched in vain. A lithograph of Columbus could be purchased for two and a half-cents, but no presentment of the queen at any price, and we finally had one painted—enlarged from a small picture in a book. Thus was this great woman forgotten.

Last winter, in New York, we honored the memory of the Pilgrim mothers by giving a dinner on the anniversary of the landing on Plymouth Rock. This was the first time in the history of the country that these noble women had been remembered. Year after year, the Sons of the Pilgrims, in the great New England societies of New York and Brooklyn, have never failed to hold a feast in honor of the Pilgrim fathers, but never before had the mothers remembered. We wished to remind the world of their virtues, and of their daughters', whose ennobling women who have made New England what it is, who carried the piety, and the heroism, and the devotion of their ancestors to every part of our country. What fortitude, what self-sacrifice was required of those first women colonists? Many of them were nobly born and delicately nurtured, who, for conscience's sake, they left
home and friends and native land, to brave the dangers of a long voyage, the hardships of a hostile country in an inhospitable climate. We who are the heirs of their labors, and sacrifices should rejoice to render our tribute of honor to the Pilgrim mothers.

It may be asked why we chose to celebrate the landing of the Pilgrims on the 23d of December instead of the 23 was the day honored by the men. Simply because was it the 23 the actual date and day of the landing. You see men cannot even fix a date correctly without the aid of women. I carefully studied the journal of John Bradford, who was a young man on board the "Mayflower," afterwards the famous Governor of Massachusetts. He kept a careful record of the events of each day. On the 21st land having been sighted, a boat was sent to reconnoiter the shore. On the 22d the day being story, the ship lay off the coast, and the only event recorded is that a wife, her name is not given, descended into the valley of the shadow of death! On the 23d, the day we celebrated, there landed on Plymouth Rock thirty-two men and sixty-nine men and children. There was one advantage in holding our feast on the day after the feast given by the men, and that was it gave us the woman's privilege of the last word. I carefully looked over the speeches given at New England dinners, but as usual could find no mention whatsoever of anything the women had done. A noted educator spoke in New England as "she," which, considering how all things feminine were ignored, seems a piece of presumption. The most appropriate toast given was that of one honored gentleman whose theme was "Their Selfishness."

This forgetfulness of all that women have done for our country is only a piece with the usual proceedings at those masculine hearts. Year after year they have assembled to do honor to men alone. Some time ago the late James G. Blaine, in an address at a New England dinner, said: "Men settled and built up the country, men struggled and toiled; these good men were the progenitors of a great race." As if the men alone did everything — settled the country, founded the families and reared children.

On that bleak December day, two hundred and seventy-two years ago, one hundred and one persons came ashore on the cruel New England coast, of whom only forty-one were men, and yet, with the usual modesty of their sex, in talking of the deeds of these first settlers, their sons have followed the advice given last fall by the leader of one of the political parties and "claimed everything;" whereas, the real heroines and martyrs of those days were the women. What hardships confronted them in the awful winter that followed? Only try to fancy that they must have suffered! Living in a few huts — they could not be called houses — on that ice-bound coast. Think of the storms that howled about their frail habitation, and snows that swept over them, the bitter cold that froze them! How helpless they were!
On the one hand the inhospitable forest that encircled them, the lurking place of wild beasts and hostile Indians; on the other hands the wild ocean that stretched between them and their former homes. How chilly they must have been with only open fires fed with green wood, with no clothing fitted for the rigors of that climate, with not enough food for them and their children! That these women must have had to bear of hardship, misery and home-sickness! No wonder they died and their deaths were scarcely recorded. Bradford does not mention even the death of his own wife.

And then it must be remembered, as Fanny Fern long ago wittily said, "These women had not only to endure all that the Pilgrim fathers had to endure, but they had to endure the Pilgrim fathers also." And these worthy men must have been very trying, as all know, what a cold house and a poor dinner does not conduce to any man's amiability, and they were so conscientious. A later chronicle records with displeasure that a certain Mrs. Johnson was "given to unseemly pride of apparel," in that she wore whalebone in her sleeves. The Pilgrim fathers went a great deal further than their sons would like to go today, for they sat in solemn conclave to decide how many ribbons a woman might wear. Fancy the city fathers today holding sessions to discuss the width of a sash, and to decide whether or not certain styles of feminine apparel are consistent with "a godly walk and conversation."

But to return to the first winter. Despite the effort made then, as now, to suppress and suppress the "skirt brigade," some record has come to us of the deeds, the heroism and the noble self-sacrifice of the Pilgrim mothers. A woman's money fitted out the ships that discovered the New World, and a woman's money fitted out the "Mayflower." Mrs. Winston, a lady of position and influence, gave of her substance to equip the vessel. Mrs. Carver's steadfastness nerved her husband, the Rev. John Carver, to join the expedition. If it had not been for this grand woman, their "ghostly adviser" would have let the colonists sail without any ordained minister of the Gospel. Then there was Rose Stanish, the dainty beauty of the expedition, a lovely, gentle flower of a noble English home, too delicate to bear the hardships of the cruel life they led, and who failed and died the first winter. But above all others should be mentioned Ann Brewster, who was the very guardian angel of the colonists. A woman of mighty energy and of dauntless courage, whose hope and faith never failed, even in the darkest hours, whose sturdy health sustained her even through the most severe privations, who encouraged the well, nursed the sick and comforted the dying, a heroine who never lost her confidence and her cheerfulness, and also in her tireless regard for others, her patience with illness and her fortitude in the presence of death displayed heroism of a higher order than that of the men who faced only the activities of outdoor life.
Yet the sons and the grandsons of these women have forgotten to do them honor. Their deeds have been unchronicled, their names unrecorded, and men have calmly claimed all achievements and all enterprises as their own. The whole history of our country has been written from man’s standpoint, and women, however great, however noble, have been ignored. Abigail Adams, the wise and witty wife of John Adams, who urged him to action when he would have been indifferent, who have him the courage to stand by the struggling nation when he would have departed, whose more than suspicion of writing his speeches, is not mentioned. Mercy Otis Warren, the sister of James Otis and wife of General Warren, has no need of praise for her patriotic action in inspiring both brother and husband to do their duty. At a later period of the achievements of men in ridling the country of the curse of slavery are vaunted and sung, while Lydia Maria Child, Lucretia Mott and Harriet Beecher Stowe have not been so scanty praised. The heroes of the late war have monuments raised high in their honor; where are the tributes to the heroines? Dorothy Dix, Clara Barton and Mother Bickerdyke, the women who by their devotion sustained the army and nursed the soldiers — who remembers them?

Among those of other nations who have come to these shores to make the republic great, the stalwart German women, the thrifty French woman, the intrepid Spanish women, where are the records of their deeds? The men of these nationalities have perpetuated their memory by giving their names to mountains and rivers and cities. What are the names of the women whose virtues, whose devotion made them what they are or were? And we have become accustomed to this policy of silence that we are prone to submit to it, without even a protest, ourselves even forgetting to give honor where honor is due. We hear much of "self-made man," when often it we looked into the history of such persons we would find that they should more properly be called "wife-made man," for that they should be, many and many have owed his prosperity, his success in life largely to the energy and intellect of his wife, though she, like her foremother is forgotten.

Probably the culmination of the annihilation of the women of this country was reached in the declaration made by Judge Hoar, of Massachusetts, while presiding at the National Republican Convention in 1880, when he said, "The American people are gentlemen."

Today we will not say that the American people are ladies. That would be too a poor way of putting it, but we will ask who are these who are thus forgotten? Are they so unworthy that their brave deeds may not entitle them to recognition? Certainly not! We ask that honor be done, not to the foolish and undeserving, but to the mothers of the race.
But turning from the scenes of the past, let us look forward to the swiftly coming time of our emancipation. The forgetfulness of the past is rapidly giving way to the acknowledgments of the present. Already government has honored women by equality of position in the Great World's fair, and the time approaches rapidly when we shall have complete enfranchisement. To recall again the memory of the Pilgrim mothers, we find the contrast between woman's position today and hers two hundred and seventy-two years ago, as great as that between the comforts and luxuries we enjoy and the hardships that the pioneers endured. Where they had cold and darkness and wretched habitations, we have warmth and light and the palaces of our great cities. Where our ancestors had oppression and subordination, we have opportunity and almost equality. The end is nearly in sight, and the time will surely come when the deeds and the achievements of the foremothers will be applauded with those of the forefathers, and the daughters and the sons of the Pilgrims will sit side by side in their councils and at their feasts.
CLARA BARTON
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Talk to Soldiers


"Soldiers," she said in one of a hundred characteristic addresses — "a word with you. From the old armies of the Union — representatives of every section, and every battle field you have met here to-night to commemorate the fall of Richmond, and to celebrate the new salvation.

"While accompanying our armies I of course passed much more among the rank and file, than among the officers of any grade. And while I would not disparage the many hundreds of noble men deservedly I decorated with stars and eagles, my experience deepened a conviction, otherwise strong, that in peace or in war the fate of the Republic is mainly in the hands of the innumerable multitude of our citizens who wear no titles.

"What can be added to the glory of a Nation whose citizens are its soldiers? Those warriors, armed and mighty, — spring from its bosom in the hour of need, and peacefully retire when the need is over.

"A nation, which from its civil walks of life furnished to its armies, — captains, — colonels, — brigadier and major generals, — and more than all, the great Captain, — the sainted soul, that marshalled and sped our conquering hosts, till they wore the victor's crown, and he the martyr's — Abraham Lincoln.

"When the civil North rises in her might — the shadows of her warriors darken the land, and the bristling of her steel brightens the heavens. And when the ground shakes under the tread of her marching armies well my may rebellion and traitors tremble.

"How they came trooping from cottages and hearthstones, how they filed down your streets and crowded your cars and boats in their haste to meet the foe; — how the music of the fifes and drums rolled over your heads — have you forgotten these days?"

While Clara Barton hated war, she loved the warrior. "The history of a country is mainly a history of its wars," she stated to the soldiers of the Grand Army, "and you are the men of history — from the first call of the bugle till its closing note died away in the cadence of peace you were a part of that great struggle.

"You were with Fremont and Lyon in the early west — with Du Pont at Fort Royal — with Burnside at Roanoke and Fredericksburg — and with the gallant Ellisworth when he fell —
You were with the glorious but ill-fated Army of the Peninsula — at Cedar Mountain — with Hope at Manassas and with McLean when he hurled back Lee from Maryland.

You were with Grant at Vicksburg and Donaldson — your shouts mingled in the thunders of Shiloh — Chattanooga — Kenesaw and Atlanta — and your years and your feet kept time with the glorious music when Sherman, marched down to the sea.

You were with Butler at New Orleans — and with the old Sea Lion, Farragut, when he slowed his engines and shouted his orders in the iron hail of Fort Jackson and St. Phillip.

You were with the lion-hearted Thomas and Rosecrans in Cumberland — with Hooker at Chancellorsville, with McPherson and Howard and Logan in Tennessee — with me at Gettysburg — with the noble Berry at Fair Oaks and Fredericksburg — with Chamberlain at Five Forks and Spotsylvania — with Kearney at Chantilly — with the invincible Sheridan in the Valley, and with Kilpatrick everywhere.

You were with Gilmore at Charleston — and Olustee — with Foster at Newbern — with Butler and Terry at Bermuda Hundred — Petersburg and Fort Fisher — with Hancock in the charge — and with the immortal Sedgwick when he fell. With Grant at Cold Harbor — the Wilderness and Spotsylvania, and last of all you were with him in his death throttle upon Richmond.

The long dreary winter of ’64 passed as you lay out upon the snows of Virginia —

Four years of ceaseless warfare —

In the spring of 1865, the towering blaze of the Carolina pine streams out upon the swinging lines of Sherman’s marching legions — bearing northward.

Memorial Day after Memorial Day she stood with the "Boys in Blue" in the God’s care of the soldier. "Yes, Mr. President, airmen, soldiers! It is good to be here," she declared, on one of these occasions. "It is good that ye meet to build an altar, and deck it with your offerings — and throughout our whole vast land, from sea to sea, there rises not the question in any mind. To whom do ye build? — All the world knows to whom our Nation builds its altar on the 30th of May, and all approve. Truly when she set apart and made holy this day, she did well, and builted better than she knew. It is well, that not only the nation pay this great tribute of respect and gratitude once every year to those who fell in defence of its liberties, — but that those who struggled in the same noble cause, and survived, should meet, and in some manner, live over again the scence which made, the forever must make up, to them the most important era of their lives.
For there is no true loyal soldier today, who served his term of enlistment in the war of the rebellion, who, if asked for some portion of his past life to be taken out of his record and remembrance, but would say — 'Take whatever three or four years of my existence you will, but leave the old army life untouched, --I did in those days what you never did, and I can never do it again -- leave that to me.'

'But time rolls rapidly — and the events we most do receive, are already history.

Eighteen years ago, it was, — comrades! Can you realize it was so long, that the white blossoms of May fell on our young, untried armies, forming quickly to the call of 75,000 men?

'They fell unheeded, too, on the bowed heads, and tear dimmed eyes of the mothers, wives, and sisters, who gave up their bravest and their most best to that new strange call.

'Terrible days of misgiving were these, still, — all were coming back, all would live, and all come home the same, with the glory of a soldier added.

'It was only a separation, and for only three months! Ah! bright days, — bright uniforms — bright eyes — bright hopes and bright blossoms — and the May went bravely, and merrily on— and June! and July! — Ah! — that checked a little—

'Bull Run told us something we had not taken into our estimate — and the Peninsula — and the campaigns in the west; but the hopes grow and strengthened, under trials and adversity, and in answer to the second call, rolled back the mighty chorus, 'We're coming, Father Abraham, 300,000 more.'

'And the next May blossoms fell on uniforms less bright, but more soldierly and they fell, too, on the new-made graves, that by this time began to stud the distant lands. —

'We had learned they would not all come back!

'Shall we follow our marches another year, and find where they led by field, and river, and share and sea?

'Pittsburgh Landing — Shiloh — Fort Pillow — Corinth — Grim Ben Butler in New Orleans — Bold Farragut lashed to the riggin—

'And lay there, a wood to wall,
Then, scarce a cable's length from the fortress 'mid case shot
shot, shell and ball
bef the Hartford slowed her engines.'
Williamsburgh — Fair Oaks — seven days before Richmond —.

Malvern Hill with its spiteful fire — Cedar Mountain — 2nd Bull Run — Chantilly with its rain and darkness, its mingled artillery of Heaven and Earth — Webster and Kearney dead, South Mountain with its stubble hillside, burning September sun and its gallant Reno.

At another time, Miss Barton said, "Friends — had this our late contest been an ordinary war, by which we had merely acquired new territory, established a disputed boundary, settled a feud, retaliated an insult, or secured the uncertain claim of some aspiring ruler, tho' it had been waged at its own fearful cost, it were, perhaps, even now, before the graves are green, time to stop speaking of it, but the subject aside for a whistle so dearly bought — we could not afford to blow it — and to be forever laid away — as a memento of our inexperience and folly.

"But ours has been an ordinary war. We have no more territory, our boundaries are not changed. All insults and injuries avenged have been the outgrowth, rather than the dense of the war. And it is a great public question if the position of our chief ruler has been strengthened beyond that of his predecessor.

"Notwithstanding all this, and although it has cost three thousand millions of treasure and 300,000 noble lives, still we can afford not only to blow whistles, but to sound golden trumpets from the four corners of our free land, till their notes ring out against the blue dome of Heaven.

"Europe makes, war and deluged her land in blood, and but for the morning and evening Bulletin, and the rise of a few articles of import, we, a nation, should never know it.

“But our recent contest — tho' but the struggle of an infant, as compared with hers — rattled the moss grown stones of her old ivied towers. She has looked well to her household since, added new space to her chariot of liberty, and new speed to her car of progress.

"Still, it is not abroad, that the great work of our war was accomplished, but at home, among our own people, and it has been confined to no class, or condition, color, or sex. All have been touched and taught for it, and so far-reaching are its effects, so great must be the results, that as yet, it is scarcely possible to commence to estimate.

"Thus in speaking of the war, so far from regarding my subjects as old, I feel that its new, so crude, and undeveloped that I am unable to grasp, and clearly comprehend even its first page, much less to do it justice.

"As I reflect upon the mighty and endless changes which must grow out of its issues, the subject rises up before me like some far away mountain summit, towering peak above peak — rock above rock — that human foot has never trod, and enveloped in a hazy

mist, the eye has never penetrated.

A hazy subject you may suggest — my hazy indeed, and please bear in mind that I do not attempt to make it clear.

That, — time and the great breath of the Almighty, as he issues his mandates of power to coming generations — can alone accomplish.

I said that the result of our late contest has been confined to no class, or condition, color, or sex, — not only have all been touched and taught by it, but all have been strengthened and advanced.

In the whole work, there has been no step backward, and there is to be none.

We cannot always hold our great ship of state out of the storm and breakers. She must meet and buffet with them, her timbers must creak in the gale. The waves must wash over her decks; she must lie in the trough of the sea as she does today. But the stars and stripes are above her. She is freighted with the hopes of the world. God holds the helm; and she's coming into port.

The weak must fear, the timid tremble, but the brave and stout of heart will work and hope and trust.
"Women as a rule," she quoted, are not war-makers. For centuries the depravity of men have plunged the world in strife, spoiled the earth's surface with armies and enriched the soil with the best blood that ever flowed in human veins. It is only right that at length, in the cycle of ages, something should touch man's heart and set him humbly down to find out some way of mending as much of his mischief as he could. Perhaps he "builded better than he knew," for in that one effort, the creation of the Red Cross, he touched the spring that sooner or later will move it all. No grander or truer prophecy has ever been made than uttered in that first convention: "The Red Cross shall teach war to make war upon itself." It is the most practical and effective peace-making and civilizations in the known world. It reaches where nothing else can. If proof of this is wanting, study the action of Japan in its late war.

"But is man doing this work alone?" No — gladly, no! Scarcely had he made his first move, when the jeweled hands of royal women glistened beside them and right royally have they borne their part. Range the galaxy — the great leader and exemplar of all — Empress Augusta of Germany, her illustrious daughter, the Grand Duchess of Baden, Eugenie, Empress Frederick, Victoria and Princess Louise of England, Margherite of Italy, Natalie of Servia and the entire Court of Russia, and today the present Empress of Germany, the hard-working Empress of Japan with her faithful, weary court, even now busy in the hospitals of convalescing Chinese. The various auxiliary societies of women of all the principal Red Cross nations are a pride and glory to humanity."
Address to Congress

The following address was prepared to be read before a special meeting of members of Congress as early as the summer of 1886. The news of the death of General Sheridan prevented the meeting, and no other opportunity have ever presented, the remark have waited all the intervening years. What were the facts then are none the less true now, either for the Congress or the people, an. I adopt the usual custom in such cases, and ask "lame to print."

Gentlemen:—While proceeding to lay before you the various measure to which I have taken the liberty of inviting your honored attention, it may be well to refresh your memories regarding the subject of the principle of Red Cross; to recall how, under the treaty, it stands related to our government, and how, through the same feature, it relates us to other governments.

The code of ten articles, forming the international compact or treaty of Geneva, pledges each nation which unites with it to certain methods of neutral action and humanity never before formally admitted by nations at war, and it removes, to the greatest possible extent, all needless severities hitherto practiced under their usages.

This treaty, said to be the first compound treaty ever formed, came into existence at Geneva Switzerland, in 1864. It now includes some thirty governments. The first efforts towards our own adhesion were made with the Executive Department; but as it was thought that the test of the treaty called for some changes in the "Articles of War," it was submitted to Congress, by which body the adhesion was made in February, 1868.

It ever remains an undisputed fact that the medical department of an army never is nor can be found, or made adequate to the needs of the sick and wounded of its battles. Hence the inevitable suffering of men, and terrible anxiety and agony of friends at home, and the loss of countless lives.

The Red Cross creates an organized, neutral volunteer force, from the people, supplied by the people, but still subject to the regulations of the military in the field, recognized by and working in full accord with it, bringing all needed aid in the form of intelligent, disciplined assistants, and abundant supplies to the direct help and use of the medical department of an army, and with which department it works, as belonging to it.

It created, with great care an insignia to be known and recognized sign of neutrality in the relief of the sick and wounded of armies, and in the protection of the military hospital ser-
This insignia, which has given its name to the treaty has become universally known and respected. There is no other military hospital flag, and no other signs marks the relief designed for the succor the wounded soldier, now protects from capture or harm, either himself or the non-combatant who goes to administer. It is probably that no sign nor figure in the secular world is sacred to so many eyes as the Red Cross of Geneva.

This treaty takes its powers from the common consent of the united governments of the civilized world. Their rulers sign it. Its ratifications are officially made by the congress of Berne, Switzerland. It recognizes no other feature than the relief of the victims, and the mitigation of the horrors of war.

In its short life or twenty-five years it has assumed the conduct of the entire auxiliary relief work of the armies of the world. It has given rise to more valuable inventions, and under its humane principles, sanitary science has made rapid growth.

By common consent of the powers, at the formation of the treaty, the worthy body of Genevesian gentlemen, who called and conducted the convention, was formed into an International Committee, thought which only medium the various nations within the treaty communicate, and which holds the direction of all international relief in the time of war. Each nation, upon its accession to the treaty, is requested for form a national committee, which committee shall constitute the medium by which the other governments, through the International Committee, may communicate with its government.

These nation committees are usually presided over by officers very near the crown or high in authority; as, in instance, the national president of the Red Cross of Germany is Count Otto de Stolberg, who recently crown young Emperor William. Of France, Marshal McMahon; of England, Lord Lindsay; of Belgium, the King himself.

Their patrons are always of the crown or royal families, Empress Augusta of Germany, Victoria of England, Dagmar of Russia, Marguerite of Italy, and the Royal Grand Duchess of Baden.

Although the object of the organization is people's help for national necessities, its national branch receive strong governmental recognition, and encouragement. Every facility which can be afford to them, and the patronage of the crown of government is monarchical countries, unlike our own, means substantial aid, which is afforded in many ways.

Each nation is left free to form its national committee in ac-
gordance with the spirit and needs of its nationality. In the formation of our own, it was thought possible to include other relief than that of war, and as you already know, America organized for the relief, first of war then of other great national calamities, such as the government is liable to be called upon to aid through its public treasury.

We were accepted by the ratifying powers at Berne, with this depression, and although novel, it has won great approval and is known abroad as the "American amendment."

Under this civil feature the American Red Cross has aided in twelve great calamities; one forest fire, five floods, three cyclones, one earthquake, one famine and one pestilence. It has brought to the aid of the victims of these disasters, in money and material, many hundred thousands of dollars, acting as a systematized and organized medium of conveyance and distribution for the relief which the people desired to contribute. It has never yet solicited aid, it has scarcely suggested the raising of relief, but has endeavored to administer the relief which was raised wisely and faithfully.

Since our adhesion to the treaty two international conference have been held; the one at Geneva, by the International conference Committee, in 1884; the other at Carlsruhe, by the Grand Duke and Grand puchess of Baden, in 1887.

As president of the American National Red Cross the honor has been accorded me to present the government in each of these conferences. Some of the questions therein discussed being of both national and international importance, will be later be submitted for the consideration of your honorable legislative body.

For the foregoing explications made, I will, with your kind permission, gentlemen, venture to name to you some of the more personal features of our own national branch of the world-wide organization, touching its conditions, positions, relations and requirements, inviting your thoughtful consideration to the same. I must do this, not only as its chief executive officer, but as the person who has been wholly responsible for our every having had any connection with it. I along brought this subject before the government, as the official representative of the International Committee, asking its adoption as a treaty, if found desirable; and was shown the exceptional courtesy of a unanimous accord in a most unfamiliar subject, by the largest, and, as I hold, the highest legislative body in the world.

During the intervening seven years, I have done my best and my utmost to properly test the value of the obligation taken, and to learn, from actual and practical experience, if the results would warrant a continuance of effort on the part of the national committee, and to some extent the encouragement
and active cooperation of our government, without the objects of the treaty would be misapplied, and its results practically lost.

These efforts have been made in the face of the open world. No action has been covered, none exaggerated. On its own fair merits, the American branch of the Red Cross stands before the government and the people it has served for their judgment.

If it has been an idle body?
If a parasite, drawing sustenance from others?
If it has promised and not performed?
If its work has been actual, or merely appeared upon paper?
If it has found favor with the people it has gone to aid?
If it has gained or lost in public estimation?
If in any way it has disappointed expectations of the country or the people?
If it has given cause of the government to regret it admission?
If it has sustained its nation standing in good repute?
If it has been a costly adjunct to the government?

Like a gleaner it brings in its sheaves at the end of its seven years of faithful trial, and asks that its work be judged. If for any cause, the organization be looked upon as not meriting or justifying encouragement and the cooperation of the government, which its peculiar relations to it will be a simple and perhaps welcome thing to let go and rest. Unless one is actually going down hill with a load, it is always easier to stop than to go on. In this case vastly so.

It is now thirteen years ago, during the administration of President Hayes, that I first brought this matter to the attention of our government, believing it to be, perhaps, the work of a month. From that day to this, I have found time for nothing else. I learned that its broad humanities were the belt that spanned the world. Dependent, as it is, upon the cooperation of the government, being substantially a link between it and the people at large, I should not have been justified in proceeding to organize great bodies of persons under its regulations, until I was assured what position the government would take in regard to it. I could not ask this decision of the government until actual results had proven it, and to myself as well, that the position required was one worthy to be taken. Thus the trial has been made singlehanded. Not a penny of tax nor dues has ever been asked for the expenses of the National Red Cross.

The general impression prevails that it is actively a branch of the government and of course provided for it. This impression...
has, pecuniarily been heavily against us, as it enter no philanthropic mind to extend a generosity to the Red Cross, any more than to the War, or State, or Navy Departments, or any other branch of protected government service. No freight bill on shipments has even been remitted, nor agent ever passed free over a road up to this time; and no bequest has ever been made to it. Postage is not even paid.

The government is supposed to do all these things, and it is generally believed that its officers have large salaries. In one way this impression has been helpful. It has doubtless given prestige; but it is a costly luxury, and not to be forever afforded.

The actual expenses of the government since the first, have been as follows: an appropriation in 1883 of one thousand dollars, expended in government printing of a little pamphlet history of the Red Cross, written by me, at the request of the Senate Committee, for circulation after the adoption of the treaty — 3000 copies. As neither frank nor postage were provided for the mailing, the transmission of each copy cost some ten cents. The issue is exhausted. Appropriations of $1000 and $2000 respectively for expenses of governmental delegates to the International Conferences of 1884 and 1887, held at Geneva and Carlsruhe, the delegate giving their time and services, and meeting all cost, excepting those actually incurred on route, and provable by vouchers. Thus making an aggregate of six thousand dollars in eight years expended in its own behalf with as much in value, in each in value, in each instance, added by the committee, otherwise as appropriated. These are the only demands ever made upon the government. This balances our accounts to date.

We are now reaching a point where I may name some directions in which the government might properly extend it protecting it with its helpful hand. The International Committee of Geneva makes the National Committee of America the recognized medium of communication with our government. It sends its official communication to the president of the American National Red Cross, with directions that this officer present the same to our government, and duly transact the required business. But unfortunately, there is opened to legalized medium through which the Red Cross is expected to confer with the government, through either its executive or its legislative branches. "What is everybody's business is nobody's business." The entire system has each time to be explained to busy men, precedents to be found, and, however willing and anxious, no one can be quite certain if he is right. The naming of two or three gentlemen from your own honorable body to act permanently as a committee on the affairs of the Red Cross would remedy all this, and render simple and efficient what is it now awkward and complicated. It would then be somebody's business. The subject would be understood, the needs comprehended, suitable advantages taken, mis-
takes avoided, time saved, prestige given both at home and abroad, and the unavoidable communications between the committee and government officials come to be regarded as legitimate business, and not as favor personally sought and graciously listened to.

I regard the appointment of this committee as a most important step, if any steps are taken -- perhaps indispensable, in view of certain measures which must come officially before Congress.

At the last two International Conferences resolutions were passed requesting that each government within the treaty take firm measures for the protection of the international insignia of the Red Cross, from misuse and abuse by unauthorized persons and parties, as methods of popular advertising for speculation and gain. The patent office is besieged by applicants demanding the Red Cross for trademarks.

It becomes our duty on behalf of these conferences to present these resolutions to the government, together with the statement of the avaricious countries through their delegates, and to ask its consideration, and its official action, in common with that of all other nations. Our duty to the government demands this as well.

The great query which confronts us, and often with a tinge of seeming reproach, is: "Why is so little known of your organization? Why is it not written up, and circulated among the people for general information? Even the army knows nothing of it. Where shall we find something published about it?" And these inquiries come from the officers of the Regular army, the National Guard, and the本次 Army, and the medical fraternity in general, not to mention the people at large.

There is probably no one in the land who would more gladly see these questions favorably met, and the information go out, than the parties supposed to be responsible for this dereliction. It has sometimes occurred to me that a little "dangerous surplus" might be safely disposed of in that way without compromising any leading issues.

Governmental bureaus, with full powers have been commenced requiring less of actual labor, method, skill, clerical ability, and official expense than are expected and provided yearly at the private headquarters of the American National Red Cross, and with less of general demand for them, and the smaller visible results.

Fortunately its president has been always able to furnish space for the Red Cross headquarters in her home, and as it was her child, she has naturally and willingly provided for it. But, gentlemen, children grow! In no other country does the organization of the Red Cross as an ordinary benevolent society. In all others its relation to the government is defined, pronounced, and its prestige assured. This wise and just, and only this can make it
of greatest service to the government and to the people.

It is a peculiar institution, without nationality, race, creed or sect, embracing the entire world in its humanizing bond, of brotherhood, with arbitrary laws or rules, and yet stronger than armies, higher than thrones.

I desire to have it better comprehended and more fittingly appointed in our great advancing country. I would like to for it a headquarters which, in point of activity, would be a national honor to us. The Red Cross of America should successfully undertake some difficult problems. Hospital and emergency work naturally fall to it. It has come to be the first thought of by any community suddenly overtaken by disaster.

With all our misguided, criminal and incendiary immigration, which nothing seems to hinder, with our dangerous foreign leaders and teachers, our strikes, mobs and dynamite, can foresee the moment when the United States flag shall be called to make peace and hold it? And where that symbol goes, the Red Cross must follow, and only one step in the rear. The first man who falls must see it on the arm that raises him, and the last must know it has not left him. The National Red Cross of America is not without possibilities for occupation, and these neither theoretical nor sentimental.

Gentlemen, there are some points in reference to which I desire to guard against misapprehension on your part. If all things, I would not have you get the impression that I desire to foist the Red Cross upon the government for support. That, because I say is liable to equal a government bureau in point of work and care, I desire to have it made a government bureau. Nothing is more impossible. I would not have you feel that we have carried it into a certain extent, and now want the government to take it over. These things could not be; it would at once defeat the very objects of the organization, which means people's help for national needs, not national help for people's necessities. Still, there is a certain fitting and customary connection between the two, which it still proper to recognize. Certain protection of the rights and welfare of the organization, which it is suitable and for the interest of the government to maintain, as, for instance, the protection of the insignia. Its acts of incorporation — some aid in the circulation of information respecting it, its charters, etc., through its official printing bureaus, and some direct channels of communication, and advice in other countries, and without which I think we cannot reasonably hope to stand upon a respectable basis in their estimation.

If Germany can place Count Stolberg, one of its highest official dignitaries and officers, at the active head of its Red Cross, we can scarcely do less than permit a small advisory committee.
of our legislature to at least confer with ours.

These are all very small and inexpensive demands upon a govern-
ment like ours, and from there apparent unimportance, likely to
remain unconsidered. Still, they are important to the work that
seeks them. With these assured, the national Committee can safe-
ly permit the people to take their place the work, and if the
times never comes when the country has need of the help for which
they organize, it will be only a too fortunate land.

The part which I have thus far been privileged to take in this
work has but one merit. It has been faithful, and I believe,
unselfish, with better judgment, greater strength, wealth, and
power and prestige, or ready help of those who had, I might have
accomplished more. I have nothing to gain from it, and never
have had. I have no ambitions to serve, and certainly no pur-
pose. I regret only the years which have gone by in feeble,
unaided effort, which, I feel, with stronger help, might have
been more serviceable.

All I am worth to it today is the experience I have gained. I
have no more time for trials, nor proof, and of these no more
are needed of the government, before it can go on, and I ask your
kind consideration of the same.
The Red Cross at
International Council of Women—1888
Washington, D.C.


Preface: Miss Barton will now speak. The flag of the Red Cross at the back of the platform will introduce her to you.

Miss Barton: — The organization of the Red Cross is the result of an international treaty known among nations as the "Treaty of Geneva" and has, for its object the amelioration of the condition of that class of persons who, in accordance with the customs of mankind from the earliest of history to the present, have been called to maintain the boundaries of nations and even national existence itself, by human warfare.

Whether well or ill, needful or needless, that nations and boundaries, is not a question for me to decide here. That they have been, and mainly are so preserved, that no better method is yet consummated, and that, in the progress of humanity, the existing countries of the civilized world have been fit to enter into an International Treaty for the betterment of conditions of those subjects or citizens, who, by their laws, are called to the performance of this duty, are facts which I am here to state. This International Treaty of 1864 commences with the neutralizing of all parties in their efforts to relief. It brings to the aid of the medical and hospital department of armies, the direct, organized and protected help of the people. It goes through the entire category of military medical regime, as practised up to its date; makes war upon and plucks out its old-time barbarities, its needless restrictions and cruelties, and finally, in effect, ends by teaching war to make war upon itself.

By its international code all military hospitals under its flag become neutral, and can better be neither attacked nor captured. All sick and wounded within them remain unmolested. Surgeons, nurses, chaplains, attendants and all non-combatants at a field, wearing accredited insignia of the Red Cross are protected from capture. Badly wounded prisoners, lying upon a captured field are delivered up to their own army, if desired. All supplies designed for the use of the Red Cross are protected held sacred to their use. All convoys of wounded prisoners or prisoners in exchange are safely protected in transit, and, if attacked from ambush or otherwise harmed, an international treaty is violated. All persons residing in the vicinity of battle about to take place shall be notified by the generals commanding both armies, and full protection, with a guard, assured each house which shall open its doors to the care of the wounded from either army; thus each house becomes a furnished field hospital and its intimates nurses.
Each nation upon its accession to the treaty establishes a national society or committee, through which it will act internationally in its various relations. This body corporate adopts a constitution, in the formation of which it seeks the best methods for serving humanity in general, together with the interests of its own people, in direction of its legitimate efforts.

With the exception of our own, no national constitution has covered more than the direct ground of battle or treaty, viz., the prevention and relief of sufferance from war. The framers of the National Constitution of the Red Cross of America foresaw that the great woes of its people would not be confined to human warfare alone; that the elements raging, unchained, would wage us wars and face us in battles; that as our vast territory became populated, the people, in the face of prairies and forests, should live in their tracks, these natural agents might prove scarcely less destructive and more relentless than human enemies; that fire, flood, famine, pestilence, drought, earthquake and tornado would call for prompt service of the people no less than war, and while organizing for the latter they included the former. The ratifying congress at Berne accepted us with that digression from the original purport of the treaty, and what we term the civil branch of the Red Cross is known abroad as the American Amendment.

With these explanations it remains only to name some of the things accomplished and the changes which have taken place in consequence of this treaty during its life of a short quarter of a century. Previous to the war of the Crimea, civil help for military purposes was unknown. Florence Nightingale trod a pathless field. In the wars which followed till 1866, even this example was not heeded, and the wars of Napoleon III., in North Italy, were types of military cruelty, medical insufficiency, the needless suffering which shocked the world. Out of the smoldering ashes of these memories rose the clear steady flame of the Red Cross; so bright and beautiful that it drew the gaze of mankind; so broad that it reached the farthest bound of the horizon; so peaceful, wise, harmless and fraternal that all nations and sects, the Christian and Jew, Protestant and Catholic, the soldier and the philanthropist, the war-maker and peace-maker, could meet in its softened rays, and by its calm holy light, reveal to each other their difficulties, compare their views, study methods of humanity, and from time to time, learn from and teach to each other things better than they had known.

Our own terrible war, which freed 4,000,000 slaves, had no fraternal light. The great commissions rose and performed a work of relief highly unknown hitherto, but from the lack of military recognition their best efforts comparatively failed and from the lack of permanent organization their future possibilities were lost to the world.

With the Franco-German war of 1870-71 commenced the opportunities for the practical application of the principles of the treaty.
Both nations were in the compact. There was perfect accord between the military and the Red Cross Relief. There was neither medical nor hospital work save through and under the treaty of Geneva. The Red Cross brassard flashed on the arm of every agent of relief, from the medical director at the headquarters of the king to the little boy carrying water on the field to his wounded lieutenant; from the noble Empress Augusta and her Court, and poor Eugenie, while she had one, to the patient, tired nurse in the lowest hospital or tent by the roadside.

No record of needless humanity or cruelty to wounded or sick stains the annals of that war. I walked its hospitals day and night. I served in its camps and matched with its men, and know wherof I speak. The German, the Frenchman, the Italian, the Arab, the Turco, and the Zouave were gathered tenderly alike, and lay side by side, in the Red Cross palace hospitals of Germany. The royal women, who today mourn their own dead, mourned then the dead or friend and foe.

Since that day no war between nations within the treaty has taken place in which the Red Cross did not stand at its post at the field, and the generous gifts of neutral nations have filled its hands.

The treaty has brought the war-making powers to know each other. Four times it has called the heads of thirty to forty nations, to meet through appointed delegates, and confer upon national neutrality and relief in war. It has created and established the military hospital flag for all nations. It has given to the people the recognized right to reach and succor their wounded at the field, it has rendered impossible an insufficiency of supplies, either medical or nutritive, for wounded or prisoners at any point which human sympathy and power can reach. It has given the best inventions known to science for the handling of mutilated persons, whether soldiers or civilians. The most approved portable hospitable in the world are those of the Red Cross. It has frowned upon old-time methods of cruelty in destructive warfare; poisoned and explosive bullets are no longer popular. Antiseptic dressing and electric lights on the battle-field are established facts and the ambulance and stretcher-bearers move in the rear ranks of every army. These isolated facts are only the mountain peaks which I point out to you. The great Alpine range of humanity and activity below cannot be shown in fifteen minutes.

So much for human warfare and the legitimate dispensation of the treaty.

Touching our "American Amendment* the wars of the elements have not left us quiet or at leisure. Under the constitution are formed "Associate Societies* which aid directly in providing the relief which is dispensed. It being the rule to aid only the
souls of the public, our societies are less frequently called to act. They are expected to have reserved funds or material gathered and held for the purpose of supplying relief upon call from the National Association.

The public, in general, to a large extent, is coming to the use of the Red Cross as a medium of conveyance and distribution. The National Association with its headquarters in that city, has a field agent, who visits, in person, every scene where aid is rendered. Commencing with the forest fires of Michigan in 1881, there has fallen to its hands a share of the relief work in the overflow of the Mississippi River in 1883; of the Ohio in 1883; of Louisiana cyclone that same year; the overflow on both the Ohio in 1884 and the Mississippi; the representation of the U.S. Government at the International Conference at Zehra, Switzerland, in 1884; the exhibition of woman's work in the Red Cross both foreign and American, at the Exposition at New Orleans 1885; the drought in Texas in 1885; the Charleston earthquake in 1886; the representation of the U.S. Government again at the court of their Royal Highness, the Grand Duke of Baden, at Karlsruhe, Germany, in 1887, and the relief of the sufferers from the Miss. Vermont cyclone from which the travel dust is still on our garments and our trunks not yet unpacked.

In the overflow of the rivers in 1884 the Government appropriated $150,000 for distribution through our department, and magnificently and faithfully was that distribution made — an honor to any nation.

The Red Cross, with no appropriation and no treasury received from its societies and the public, and personally distributed in space of four months, money and material at a moderately estimated value of $175,000 — an honor to any nation.

It will, I trust, be borne in mind that this branch of relief work is not recognised by the treaty — that it is our own. The first publication of which embodying principles of the present constitution for the relief of the national calamities was issued in pamphlet form entitled "The Red Cross — What it means to Help to the Congress of 1878", with the valued assistance of its first secretary Mrs. H. M. Shaphard, of this city.

But, says one, what has the war movement, this Red Cross treaty to do with real progress and bringing about universal peace toward which our eyes and hearts and hopes are turned, and for which we have so long organized, labored, and prayed? It has, my friends, the same effect, to do with those that suffrage would have to with woman's position and advancement; the same that prohibition would have to do with temperance. Wars are largely the result of unbridled passions. That universal treaty, binding every war-making power to wholesome restraints, pledging it
to humanity, and holding it responsible to the entire world, is
the bit in the mouth, the curb on the neck of the war horse, and
while it holds out the measure of oats on the one hand it carries
the bridle in the other. It constitutes a peace society which
cannot be ignored in counsel, nor ignored in war. It is one of
the thresholds of the temple of peace, but even ourselves may
be farther from the entrance than we are wont to fondly dream.
Mobs are organized mobs, they tell us. We are, with put that
seed in our fair land today.

But again, what has Red Cross to do with woman's work and why
does Miss Anthony give it a place here? Because her judgment is
sound, her vision clear, and strong and she sees far. Miss
Anthony was the first woman to lay her hand beside mine in the
formation of the Red Cross Society in her native city of Roch-
ester, and that society has stood like a rock through trouble and
disaster, responsive to every call. Because there are more wo-
men than men in the Red Cross of Europe today. Empresses and
queens lead its societies and its relief work in war, and while
each queenly wife stands with her Red Cross hand on the epaulet-
leted shoulder of her meditating husband, he will consider well
before he declares. This has been and will be again the case.
Women have much to do with it, and the great millennial day, when
peace has conquered war, and its standards float over from the
shining battlements, both women and the Red Cross shall be
there.
What is the Significance of the Red Cross in its Relation to Philanthropy?


I am asked to say something upon the "Significance of the Red Cross in its Relation to Philanthropy." I am not sure that I understand precisely what is desired.

If a morning paper should announce that three or four of the greatest political bosses or greatest railroad kings in the country had quietly met somewhere, and sat with closed doors till long after midnight, and then silently departed, people would ask, "What is the significance of that? What mischief have they been devising in secret?" In that sense of the word, significance — which is a very common one — the Red Cross has none that I ever heard of. It has no rich offices to bestow, no favorites to reward, no enemies to punish. It has no secrets to keep, no mystic word or sign. Its proceedings would, and do, make a valuable library, accessible to all men and all women from Norway to New Zealand.

I will not say that it is so simple and common in character that he who runs may read, but surely she who desires information can sit down, and read and obtain it. The Red Cross has been quietly doing its work for thirty years and is now established in forty independent nations. No other institution on earth, not even Christianity, has a public recognition so nearly universal. None has ever adhered more closely to its one single purpose of alleviating human suffering. Has that any significance or any connection with philanthropy? Let us see.

I will not say that it is so simple and common in character that he who runs may read. An institution or reform movement that is not selfish, must originate in the recognition of some evil that is adding to the sum of human suffering, or diminishing the sum of happiness. I suppose it is a philanthropic movement to try to reverse the process. Christianity, temperance and sanitary regulations are in general good examples. Great evils die hard, and all that has yet been done is to keep them within as narrow limits as possible. Of these great evils, war is one. War is in its nature cruel — the very embodiment of cruelty in its effects — not necessarily in the hearts of the combatants, Baron Macaulay thought it not a mitigation but an aggravation of the evil, that men of tender culture and humane feelings, with no ill will, would stand up and kill each other. But men do not go so way to save life. They might save life by keeping peace and staying at home. They go solely with intent to inflict so much
pain, loss and disaster on the enemy that he will yield to their terms. All their powers to hurt are focused upon him.

In a moving army the elements of destruction, armed men and munitions of war, have the right of way; and the means of preserving and sustaining even their own lives are left to bring up the rear as they best can. Hence, when the shock and crash of battle is over, and troops are advancing or retreating and all roads are blocked, and the medical staff trying to force its way through with supplies, prompt and adequate relief can scarcely ever reach the wounded. The darkness of night comes down upon them like a funeral pall, as they lie in their blood, tortured with thirst and traumatic fever. The memory of such scenes set a kindly Swiss gentleman to thinking of ways and means for alleviating their horrors. In time, and by efforts whose history must be familiar to many of you, there resulted the Geneva Convention for the relief of the sick and wounded of armies. I shall not trace its history, as it seems to be more to the present purpose to explain briefly what it proposed to do, and how it proceeded to do it.

The convention found two prime evils to consider. First the existence of war itself; second, the vast amount of needless cruelty in which it inflicted its victims. For the first of these, with the world full of standing armies, every boundary line of nations fixed and held by the sword, and the traditions of four thousand years behind its customs, the framers of the convention, however earnest and devoted, could scarcely hope to find an immediate, if indeed a perceptible mitigation. Only time, prolonged effort, national economics, universal progress and the pressure of public opinion could ever hope to grapple with this monster evil of the ages.

But the second — if it were not possible to dispense with the needless cruelties heretofore inflicted upon the victims of war, thus relieving human misery to that extent, seemed to the framers of the convention a reasonable question to be considered. This is what it proposed to do. A few sentences will explain how it proceeded to do it.

A convention was called at Geneva, Switzerland, for the fourth of August, 1864, to be composed of delegates accredited by the heads of the governments of the world, who should discuss the practices of war and ascertain to what extent the restraints of the established military code in its dealing with the sick and wounded of armies were needful for the benefit of the service; and to what extent they were needless, of benefit to no one, causing only suffering, of no strength to the service, and might be done away with; and to what extent war-making powers could agree to enter into a legal compact to that end. The consideration, discussion and concessions of two weeks produced a proposed agreement which took the form of a compound treaty, viz:
A treaty of one government with many governments — the first ever made — a compact known as the Treaty of Geneva, for the relief of the sick and wounded in war.

Its basis was neutrality. It was made neutral all sick, wounded, or disabled soldiers at a field; all persons, as surgeons, nurses and attendants, who cared for them; all supplies of medicaments or food for their use; all field and military hospitals with their equipment; all gifts from neutral nations for the use of the sick and wounded of any army; all houses near a battlefield that could receive and nurse wounded men: none of these should be subject to capture. It provided for the sending of wounded men to their homes, rather than to prison; than that friend and foe should be nursed together and alike in all military hospitals; and, most of all, that the people who had always been forcibly restrained from approaching any field of action for purposes of relief, however needed (with the single exception of our Sanitary Commission, and that under great difficulties and often under protest) should not only be allowed this privilege, but should (and) arm and equip themselves with relief of all kinds, with the right to enter the lines for the helpless; thus relieving not alone the wounded and dying, but the armies of their care.

It provided a universal sign by which all this relief, both of persons and material, should be designated and known. A red cross on a field of white should tell any soldier of any country within the treaty that the wearer was his friend and could be trusted; and to any officer of any army that he was legitimately there and not subject to capture.

Some forty nations are in that treaty, and from every military hospital in every one of these nations floats the same flag; and every active soldier in all their armies knows that he can neither capture nor harm the shelter beneath it, though it be but a little "A" tent in the enemy's lines, and every disabled man knows it is his rescue and his home.

It may be interesting to know the formula of this compact. It recognizes one head, the International Committee of Geneva, Switzerland, through which all communications are made. One national head in each country which receives such communications, transmitting them to its government. The ratifying power of the treaty is the Congress of Berne. The organization in each nation receives from its government its high moral sanction and recognition, but is in no way supported or materially aided by it. The Red Cross means not national aid for the needs of the people, but the people's aid for the needs of the nation. The awakening patriotism of the last few years should, I think, make this feature more readily apprehended.

As the foreign nations furnish the only illustrations of the value and material aid of the Red Cross in war, let us glance at what it has accomplished.
The first important war after the birth of the Treaty of Geneva was between Germany, Italy, and Austria: Austria had not, at that time, entered the treaty, and yet its objects were understood and its spirit found a responsive chord in the hearts of the people. Over $400,000 beside a great amount of material were collected by that country, and made use of for the relief of the combatants. Italy was fairly well organized and rendered excellent service, furnishing much substantial assistance. Germany, which was the vanguard of the treaty nations, was thoroughly organized and equipped. She was the first to demonstrate the true idea of the Red Cross — people's aid for national, for military, necessity. Great storehouses had been provided at central points, where vast supplies were collected. In an incredibly short time between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 were raised for relief purposes, and large numbers of volunteers came to help the already organized corps of workers. Great trains of supplies were sent to the front. The wounded enemy was tenderly cared for, and everything was accomplished so well and so systematically that it proved the insalubrable value of organized, authorized, civil aid. French and Swiss Red Cross workers also render great assistance, this being the first instance of neutrals taking active part.

In the Franco-Prussian War the German Red Cross performed even better service, it having learned many valuable lessons in the German-Austrian conflict, and through their efforts an infinite amount of good was accomplished and great suffering averted. Not only were the wounded and sick soldiers tenderly cared for, but the unprovided families of soldiers were also provided for. The French Red Cross at the breaking out of the war was poorly organized and penniless. Within one month, however, hospitals had been established, ambulances and a large amount of field supplies were at the front, with a considerable relief force to care for the sick and wounded. The French Association, not including the branches in the provinces, spent over $3,000,000 and assisted 110,000 wounded. Many neutral Red Cross nations assisted rendering aid and relief in this great war. England alone sent a million and a half dollars and over $1,200,000 and assisted 500,000 wounded. The French Association, not including the branches in the provinces, spent over $3,000,000 and assisted 110,000 wounded. Many neutral Red Cross nations assisted rendering aid and relief in this great war. England alone spent a million and a half dollars, beside twelve hundred cases of stores. Eighty-five thousand were cared for by the Central Committee at Berne. The International Committee at Geneva, in one instance, asked for and obtained 2500 seriously wounded French soldiers, supplied their wants, and sent them to their own country.

In the great Russo-Turkish War, the Red Cross of Russia, splendidly equipped, with ample means and royal patronage, was, at the beginning of hostilities, greatly hampered by the jealousy of the military. The relief organizations were assigned places well in the rear, but after many months had passed, the military surgeons gladly accepted the Red Cross aid, and colossal work did it perform. Over $12,000,000 were raised, and all that was necessary spent in supplying relief. The neutral Red Cross countries furnished valuable assistance in this war also.
In the recent war between Japan and China, you undoubtedly read of the wonderful work performed by the Japanese Red Cross. This society followed the precedent of Germany, in tenderly caring for the wounded enemy, even though fighting against a nation not in the treaty. Japan had a cruel, merciless enemy to fight, and yet her soldiers were instructed to have respect even for a dead enemy.

It is needless to give further illustrations; history records the wonderful achievements of these greatest of relief organizations, though it cannot record the untold suffering which has been averted by it.

Is the Red Cross a humanitarian organization? What is the significance of the Red Cross? I leave these two questions to you to answer.

But war, although the most tragic, is not the only evil that assails humanity. War has occurred in the United States four times in one hundred and twenty years. Four times its men have armed and marched, and its women waited and wept. That is on an average of one war every thirty years. It is now a little over thirty years since the last hostile gun was fired; we fondly hope it may be many years before there is another. A machine, even a human machine called into active service only once in thirty years is liable to get out of working order; hence to keep in condition for use, no less than for the possible good it might do, the American Society of the Red Cross asked to have included in its charter and such the privilege of rendering such aid as it could in great public calamities, as fires, floods, cyclones, famines and pestilence.

Naturally it required not only diplomacy but arguments to obtain a privilege never before officially considered in the unbroken customs of an international treaty. They must be submitted to a foreign Congress. The same argument pertained fifteen years ago that pertains together today, namely, that in all our vast territory, as subject to incalculable disasters, with all our charitable, humane and benevolent associations, there was not one which had for its object and duty to hold itself in preparing and training to meet and relieve the woes of these overwhelming disasters. All would gladly aid, but there was none to lead. Everybody's business was nobody's business, and the stricken victims perished.

He asked that under the Red Cross Constitution of the United States its national organization should be permitted to act in the capacity of Red Cross relief agents, treating a national disaster like a field of battle, proceed to it at once with experienced help, equipped with all the needed supplies and means to commence relief, overlook and learn the needs of the field, make immediate statements of the true condition and the wants of the people of the country, who, knowing the presence of
the Red Cross there, could, if desirable, make it the medium of their contributions for relief either in money or material, to relieve the necessities in every way possible, keep the people at large in possession of reliable information, hold the field until relief has been given, and return when all needed aid has been rendered. This privilege was graciously granted by the ratifying Congress at Berne, and is known as the "American Amendment" of the Red Cross. Nations since that date, on becoming signatory to the treaty, have included that amendment in their charters.

This the principle upon which we have acted. The affording of relief to the victims of great disasters anywhere in the United States, is what the National Red Cross has proceeded to do, and it has confined itself strictly to its privileges, acting only in disasters so great as to be national. It never asks aid; never makes an appeal; it simply makes statements of the real condition of the sufferers, leaving the people free to exercise their own humanity through any medium they may prefer.

In the thirteen years of relief work by the Red Cross in the United States, every dollar and every pittance that has been received and distributed by it, has been the free-will offering of the people, given for humanity without solicitation, and dispensed without reward. It has received nothing from the government. No fund has been created for it. No contributions have been made except those to be distributed as relief at its fields. Its officers serve without pay. There is not, nor was ever, a salaried officer in it, and even its headquarters meets its own costs. Among the various appropriations made by Congress for relief of calamities in the past years, as in great river floods, not a dollar so appropriated has ever been applied through the Red Cross, although working on the same field. I name these facts, not by any way of complaint, or even comment, but to correct popular errors of belief, which I know you would prefer to have corrected. True to its method, this is simply a statement of the real condition of things, and left to the choice of the people -- the Red Cross itself is theirs, created for them, and it is peculiarly their privilege to deal with it as they will.

The following list of calamities with the approximate value of material furnished, as well as money, will go to give you some appreciation of the services rendered in the cause of humanity by the American National Red Cross. Limit of time and space forbid even an attempt at description of its various fields, I can only name the most important, with estimated values distributed on each:

In each of these emergencies something has been added to the sum of human happiness, somehow something subtracted from the sum of human woe; the naked have been clothed, the hungry fed, new homes have been springing up from the desolated ruins, crops reviv-
and activities and business relations resumed. In a neighboring state and its adjacent islands scarcely two hundred miles distant from this, could today be found several thousand human beings, living in their homes, enjoying their family lives, following their ordinary avocations, cultivating the ground, who, if asked, would unhesitatingly tell you that but for the help of the Red Cross, they would two years ago have been under the ground they now cultivate.

If the alleviation of human miseries, the saving of life, and the bringing of helplessness and dependence back to methods of self-sustainance and independence are counted among the philanthropic movements of the day, then to us, who have been so much and worked so long and so hard among it, it would seem that the Red Cross movement has some "significance" in connection with philanthropy.

There remains but one question more. To whom is this movement due? Who instituted it? In what minds did it originate? I wish I could say it was all woman's work; but the truth compels the fact that this great, humane idea originated with men; the movement instituted by them. They thought of it, and they wrought it out, and it was only right and proper that they should, for the terrible evil that made it necessary was they as well. Women as a rule are not war-makers. For centuries the cuprises of men have plunged the world in strife, covered the earth's surface with armies, and enriched its soil with the best blood that ever flowed in human veins. It is only right that at length, in the cycle of ages, something should touch man's heart and set him humbly down to find out some way of mending as much of the mischief as he could. Perhaps he "builted better than he knew," for in that one effort he touched the spring that sooner or later will mend it all. No grander or truer prophecy has ever been made than uttered in that first convention: "The Red Cross shall teach war to make war upon itself." It is most practical and effective peace-maker and civilizer in the known world. It reaches where not 'he else can. If proof of this be wanting, study the action of Japan in its late war.

But is man doing his work alone? No - gladly, no! Scarcely had he made his first move, when the jeweled hands of royal women glistered beside him, and right royally have borne their part. Fanes at the galaxy -- the great leaders and exemplar of them all, Empress Augusta of Germany, her illustrious daughter, the Grand Duchess of Baden, Eugenia, Empress Frederick, Victoria and Princess Louise of England, Margherita of Italy, Natalia of Servia and the entire coud of Russia, and today the present Empress of Germany, and the hard working Empress of Japan, with her faithful, weary court, even now busy in the hospitals of convalescing Chinese. The various auxiliary societies of women of all the principal Red Cross nations are a pride and glory to humanity.
These nations have all two important features in their movements, which, thus far, have not been accorded to us. Their governments have instituted laws protecting the insignia and the name of the Red Cross from misuse and abuse as trademarks by unscrupulous vendors, and appropriation by false societies for dishonest purposes. This lack, and this alone, has thus far rendered general organization in the United States impracticable and unsafe. For seven years the most strenuous efforts at protection have failed; the loss has been to the people in general.

The second advantage of other nations is that citizens, the men of wealth in those countries, have created a Red Cross fund for its use, varying in amounts from an hundred thousand to several millions of dollars. Russia, I believe, has a fund of some three millions. It seems never to have occurred to our wealth-burdened men that possibly a little satisfaction might be gained, some good accomplished, and some credit done the nation by a step in that direction. It will dawn upon them some day, not, perhaps, in time, but in some of yours, but then ladies you can well join your hands with them, and discern more clearly than now the "significance of the Red Cross as related to philanthropy."
GLARA BARTON

To the President, Congress and People of the U.S.

From "The Red Cross" by Clara Barton, pp. 688-673 - - 1898

A brief statement of how I became acquainted with the Red Cross may serve to explain at once its principles and methods, as well as the present attitude of our government in regard to it.

The practical beneficence of the sanitary and Christian commissions of the United States attracted the attention of the civilized world. I had borne some part in the operations of field hospitals in actual service in the battles of the Rebellion, and some public notice had been taken to that work. But, broken in health, I was directed by my physicians to go to Europe prepared to remain three years.

In September, 1869, I arrived at Geneva, Switzerland. In October I was visited by the president and members of the International Committee for the relief of the wounded in war. They wished to learn if possible why the U. S. had declined to sign the treaty. Our position was incomprehensible to them. If the treaty had originated with a monarchical government they could see some grounds for hesitancy, but it originated in a Republic older than our own. To what did America object, and how could these objections be obviated? They had twice formally presented it to the government at Washington, once in 1864, through our Minister plenipotentiary at Bern, who was present at the convention; again in 1866, through Rev. Dr. Henry W. Hallowes, the great head of war relief in America. They had failed in both instances. No satisfactory nor adequate reason has been given by the nation for the course pursued. They had thought the people of America, with their grand sanitary record, would be the first to appreciate and accept it. I listened in silent wonder to all this recital, and when I did reply it was to say that I had never in American heard of the Convention of Geneva nor of the treaty, and was sure that as a country American did not know she had declined; that she would be the last to withhold recognition of a humane movement; that it had doubtless been referred to and declined by some one department of the government, or some one official, and had never been submitted to the people; and as its literature was in languages foreign to our English speaking population, it had no way of reaching us.

You will naturally infer that I examined it. I became all the time more deeply impressed with the wisdom of its principles, the good practical sense of its details, and its extreme usefulness in practice. Human intelligence had devised its provisions and peculiarly adapted to it to win popular favor. The absurdity of our own position in relation to it was simply mar-
valorous. As I counted up its roll of twenty-two nations — not a civilized people in the world but ourselves missing, and say Greece, Spain and Turkey there, I began to fear that in the eyes of the rest of mankind we would be far from barbarians. This reflection did not furnish a stimulating food for national pride. I grew more and more ashamed. But the winter wore on as winters do with invalids abroad. The summer found me at Berne in quest of strength among its mountain views and baths.

On the fifteenth of July, 1870, France declared war against Prussia. Within three days a band of agents from the "International Committee of Geneva", headed by Dr. Louis Appia (one of the prime movers of the convention) equipped for the work en route for the seat of war, stood at the door of my villa inviting me to go with them and take such part as I had taken in our own war. I had not strength to trust for that, and declined with thanks, promising to follow in my own time and way, and I followed within a week. No shot had then been fired — no man had fallen — yet this organised, powerful commission was on its way, with its skilled agents, ready to receive, direct and dispense the charities and accumulations which the generous sympathies of twenty-two nations, if applied to, might place at its disposal. These men had treaty power to go directly to any field, and work unmolested in full co-operation with the military and commanders-in-chief; their supplies held sacred and their efforts recognised and seconded in every direction by either belligerent army. Not a man could lie uncared for nor unfed. I thought of the Peninsula in McClellan's campaign — of Pittsburg Landing, Cedar Mountain and second Bull Run, Antietam, Old Fredericksburg with 2 acres of snow covered and gun-covered glades, and its fourth-day flag of truce; of its dead, and starving wounded, frozen to the ground, and our commissions and their supplies in Washington, with no effective organisation to go beyond; of the Petersburg mine, with its four thousand dead and wounded and no flag to truce, the wounded broiling in a July sun — died and rotted and no truce so they fell. I remember our prisons, crowded with starving men whom all the powers and pitiless of the world could not reach even with a bit of bread. I thought of the widows' weeds still fresh and dark through all the land, north and south, from the pine to the palm; the shadows of the hearths and hearts all over all my country. Sore, broken hearts, ruined, desolate homes! Was this people to decline a humanity in war? Was this a country to reject treaty for the help of wounded soldiers? Were these the women and men to stand aloof and consider? I believed if these people knew that to me the last cloud of war had forever passed from their horizon, the tender, painful, deathlike memories of what had been, would bring them in with a force no powers could resist. They needed only to know.

As I journeyed on and saw the work of these Red Cross societies in the field, accomplishing in four months under their systematic organization what we failed to accomplish in four years with
cut it --- no mistakes, no needless suffering, no starving, no
lack of care, no waste, no confusion, but order, plenty,
cleanliness and comfort wherever the little flag made its way ---
a whole continent marshaled under the banner of the Red Cross ---
as I saw all this, and joined and worked in it, you will not
wonder that I said to myself "If I live to return to my country
I will try to make my people understand the Red Cross and that
treaty." But I did more than resolve, I promised other nations
I would do it, and other reasons pressed me to remember my
promise. The Franco-Prussian war and the war of the Communes were
both enormous in the extent of their operations and in the suf-
fering of individuals. This great modern international impulse
of charity went out everywhere to meet and alleviate its miseries.
The small, poor countries gave of their poverty and the
rich nations poured out abundantly of their vast resources. The
contributions of those under the Red Cross went quietly, prompt-
ly through international responsible channels, were thoughtfully
and carefully distributed through well-known agents, returns,
accurate to a franc, were made and duly published to the credit
of the contributing nations, and the object aimed at was accom-
plished.

America, filled with German and French people, with people humane
and universal in their instincts of citizenship and brotherhood,
freighted ships with supplies and contributions in money and
prodigal and vast. They all lived in Europe, but they were not
under the treaty regulations. No sign of the Red Cross authori-
sed any one to receive and distribute them. The poor baffled
agents, hopes, well meaning and indefatigable, did all that in-
dividuals without system or organization would do. But for the
most part the magnificent charity of America was misapplied
and went as unystematized charity always tends to go, to ruin
and to utter waste. The object aimed at was not complete.

At the end of the report of the international organization of
the Red Cross occurred something like this: "It is said that
the United States of America also contributed something for
the sick and wounded, but what, or how much, or to whom, or
when or where, it is impossible to tell."
alone upon department, but one man, who had been the assistant secretary of state in 1864 and also in 1866, when the treaty had been on the two previous occasions presented to our government. It was a settled thing. There was nothing to hope for from that administration. The matter had been officially referred and would be decided accordingly. It would be declined because it had been declined. If I pressed it to a decision, it would only weight it down with a third refusal. I waited. My next thought was to refer it to Congress. That step would be irregular, and discourteous to the administration. I did not like to take, still I attempted it, but could not get it considered, for it promised neither political influence, patronage, nor votes.

The next year I returned to Washington to try Congress again. I published a little pamphlet of two leaves addressed to the members of the senators, to be laid upon their desks in the hope they would take the trouble to read so little as that, and be by so much the better prepared to consider and act upon a bill if I could get one before them. My strength failed before I could get that bill presented and I went home again in midwinter. There then remained but a portion of the term of the administration, and I determined, if possible, to outlive it, hoping another would be more hospitable. Meanwhile I wrote, talked and did whatever I could to spread the idea among the people, and March, 1861, when the administration of President Garfield came in, I went again to Washington. The subject was very cordially received by the president and carefully referred to Secretary Blaine, who considered it himself, conferred fully with me, and finally laid it before the President and the cabinet. Perhaps the most satisfactory account of that transaction will be found in the letter of Mr. Blaine addressed to me, which gives the assurance that President Garfield would recommend the adoption of the treaty in his message to Congress.

What were the provisions of that treaty which had been so conspicuously and persistently neglected and apparently rejected by this whole government, whose people are as humane as any people in the world, and as ready to adopt plain and common sense provisions against evils sure to come upon themselves and those who they hold most dear? It was merely the proposed adoption of a treaty by this government with other nations for the purpose of ameliorating the conditions incident to warfare, humanizing its regulation, softening its barbarities, and so far as possible, lessening the suffering of the wounded and sick who fall by it. This treaty consists of a code of ten articles, formed and adopted by the international Convention in Geneva, Switzerland, held August 22, 1864, which convention was composed of delegates, to or more from each of the civilized nations of the world, and was called at the instance of the members of the Society of Public Utility of Switzerland.

The sitting of the convention occupied four days, and resulted, as before stated, in a code of ten articles, to be taken by the delegates there present, backing to the governments of their
respective countries for ratification. Four months were allowed for the consideration and decision by the governments, and all succeeding within that time were held as having signed at the convention. At the close of this period, it was found that twelve nations had endorsed the terms of the treaty and signed its articles. The protocol was left open for such as should follow. The articles of this treaty provides as its first and most important feature, for the entire and stricken neutrality of all material and supplies contributed by any nation for the use of the sick and wounded of war; also that persons engaged in distribution of them, shall not be subject to capture; that all hospitals, general or field, shall be neutral, respected, and protected by all belligerent; that all persons comprising the medical service, surgeons, chaplains, superintendents shall be neutral, continuing their work after the occupation of a field or past the same as before, when no longer needed by the free to retire; that they may send a representative to their own headquarters if needful; that field hospitals shall retain their own equipments; that inhabitants of a country who entertain and care for the wounded of either side, in their houses, shall be protected; that the generals of an army of so shall inform the people; that the generals of an army shall have the power to deliver immediately to the outposts of the enemy soldiers who have been wounded in an engagement, both parties consenting to the same; that the wounded, incapable of serving, shall be returned when healed; that all transports of wounded and all evacuations of posts or towns shall be protected by absolutely neutrality. That the sick and wounded shall be entertained regardless of nationality; and that commanders-in-chief shall act in accordance with the instructions of their respective governments, and in conformity to the treaty. In order that all may be understood, and no mistake be possible, it also provides that one uniform international flag shall mark hospitals, all posts of sick and wounded, and one uniform pledge or sign shall mark all hospital material, and be worn by all persons properly engaged in the hospital service, of any nation included within the treaty; that this international flag and sign shall be a red cross on a white ground, and that the nations within the compact shall not cease their endeavors until every other nation capable of making way shall have signed this treaty, and thus added to the general principles of humanity in warfare recognized by other peoples.

Thirty one governments have already signed this treaty, thirty-one nations are in this humane compact. The U.S. of America is not in it, and the work to which your attention is called, and which has occupied me for the last several years, is to induce her to pass herself there.

This is what the Red Cross means, not an order of knighthood, not a commandery, not a secret society, not a society all by itself, but the powerful, peaceful sign and reducing of practical usefulness of one of the broadest and most needed humanites the world has ever known.
These articles it will be observed, constitute at once a treaty governing our relations with foreign nations, and additional articles of war governing its conduct of our military forces in the field. As a treaty under the constitution, the President of the U. S. and the Senate are competent to deal with them; as additional articles of war, Congress must sanction and adopt them before they can become effective and binding upon the government and the people. For this reason I have appealed to Congress as well as to the Executive departments.

On the breaking up of the original convention at Geneva, the practical work of organizing its principles into form and making them understood and adopted by the people, devolved upon seven men, mainly those who had been instrumental in calling it. These men were peculiarly fitted for this work by special training, enlarged views, and a comprehensive charity, no less than by a practical insight, knowledge of the facts and needs of the situation, and a brave trust in the humane instincts of human nature. They are known today the world over as "The International Committee of Geneva for the relief of the sick and wounded in war." This committee is national, and is the one medium through which all nations within the treaty transact business and carry on correspondence.

The first act of each nation subsequent to the treaty has been to establish a central society of its own, which, of course, is national, and which has general charge and direction of the work of its own country. Under these come the establishment of local societies. It will be perceived that their system, aside from its international feature is very nearly what our own war relief societies would have been, had they retained permanent organizations. Indeed it is believed that we furnish for their admirable system some very valuable ideas. The success of the Red Cross associations consists in their knowledge in making their societies permanent, holding their organizations intact, guarding their supplies, saving their property from waste, destruction and pillage, and making the persons in charge of the gifts of the people as strictly responsible for straightforward conduct and honest returns, as they would be for the personal property of an individual, a business firm, or a band.

In attempting to present to the people of this country the plan of the Red Cross societies, is it proper to explain that originally and as operating in other countries they recognize only the disasters arising from war. Their humanities, although immense, are confined to this war center. The treaty does not cover more than this, but the resolutions for the establishment of societies under the treaty, permit them to organize in accordance with the spirit and needs of their nationalities. By our geographical position we are far less liable to the disturbances of war than the nations of Europe, which are so frequently called upon that they do well to keep in readiness for the exigencies.
of war alone. But no country is more liable than our own to
great over-mastering calamities, various, widespread and terrible.
Feldon a year passes that the nation from sea to sea is not,
by the shock of some sudden, unforeseen disaster, brought to
utter consternation, and stasis shivering like a ship in a gale,
powerless, horrified and despairing. Plagues, cholera, fires,
flood, famine, all bear upon us with terrible force. Like war
these events are entirely out of the common course of woes and
necessities. Like death they are sure to come in some form and
at some time, and like it no mortal knows where, how or when.

What have we in readiness to meet these emergencies safe a good
heart of our people and their impulsive, generous gifts? Certainly
to organised system for collection, reception nor distribution;
no agents, nurses nor material, and , worse of all, no funds;
nowhere are resources in reserve for the use in such an hour of
peril an national vie; every movement crude, confused and unsys-
tematised, everything as unprepared as if we had never known a
salami before and had no reason to expect one again.

Meanwhile the suffering victims wait! True, in the shock we
bestow more generously, lavishly ever. Men "On Charge" plunged
their hands into their pockets and threw their gold to stran-
gers, who may have neither preparation nor fitness for the work
they undertake, and often no guarantee for honesty. Women, in
the terror and excitement of the moment and in their eagerness
to aid, beg in the streets and rush into fairs, working day
and night, to the neglect of other duties in the present, and
at the peril of all health in the future — often an enormous
outlay for very meagre returns. Thus our gifts fall far short
do their best being hastily bestowed, irresponsibly received and
wastefully applied. We should not, even if to some degree
might, depend upon our ordinary charitable and churches to
meet these great catastrophes; they are always overtaxed. Our
communities abound in charitable societies, but each has its
specific object to which its resources are and must be applied;
consequently they can be relied upon for prompt and abundant
aid in a great and sudden emergency. This must necessarily be
the case with all societies which organise to work for a specif
charity. And this is as it should be; it is enough that they
do constantly, bestow.

The sooner the world learns that the halo of glory which sur-
rounds a field of battle and its tortured, thirsting, starving,
pain-racked, dying victims exists only in imagination; that it
is all sentiment, delusion, falsehood, given for effect; that
the soldiers do not die painless deaths; that the sum of all hu-
man agony finds its equivalent on the battlefield, in the hos-
pitals, by the weary wayside and in the prison; that, deck it as
you will, it is agony; that sooner and more thoroughly the people
of the earth are brought to realize and appreciate these facts,
the more slow and considerate they will be about rushing into
hasty and needless wars, and the less popular war will become.
Death by the bullet painless! What did this nation do during eighty agonizing and memorable days but to watch the effects of one bullet wound? Was it painless? Painless either to the nation or the victim? Though canopy by a fortitude, patience, faith and courage scarce exceeded in the annals of history, still was it agony. And when in his delirious dreams the dying President murmured, "The great heart of the nation will not let the soldier die," I prayed for hasten the time when every wounded soldier would be sustained by this sweet assurance; that in the combined sympathies, wisdom, enlightenment and power of the nations, he should indeed feel that the great heart of the people would not let the soldier die. Friends, was it accident, or was it providence which made it one of the last acts of James A. Garfield in health pledge himself to urge upon the representatives of his people in Congress assembled, this great national step for the relief and care of wounded men? Living or dying it was his act and his wish, and no member in that honored considerate and humane body but will feel himself in some manner bound to carry it out.
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Farmer's Alliance Speech 1890

From Anna M. Carlson's "The Heritage of the Bluestem" Ch. XXVI pp. 183-7.

Preface: One the eve of the election, Mary E. Lease, Prophetess of the People, as she was hailed by the new party, spoke to a crowd that filled Pilgrim Valley town hall to overflowing. Hundreds could not get in.

Painting a lurid picture of Wall Street reaching out its tentacles of gold to strangle farmers, the speaker, by the sheer magnetism of her personality, worked the audience into a frenzy.

"Wall Street is ruling this country," she shrieked. "This is no longer a government of the people, by the people and for the people. It is a government of Wall Street, and by Wall Street and for Wall Street.

"We fought England for liberty and in turn put chain on four million Blacks. The Puritans, fleeing from oppression became in turn oppressors. We wiped out slavery and by our tariff laws and national banks began a system of white slavery worse than the first. It is long not a government of the people. The great common people of our country are slaves and monopoly is the master. The West and the South are bound, prostrated before the manufacturing East. Our laws are the output of a system which clothes rascals in robes and honesty in rags. Politicians tell us we suffer from overproduction, when ten thousand little children — as statistics tell us — starve to death every year in the United States and one hundred thousand shop girls in New York are forced to sell their virtue for the bread their masters deny them. The common people are robbed to enrich their masters.

"The cause of our troubles dates back to the time when the financial system was inaugurated which gave rise to two classes of citizens in this country — millionaires and producers.

"It is time that the producing classes rebel at the unwarranted advantage that has been taken of them by the big financial interests. It is time that the Kansas farmers awaken to their rights and join the movement of the masses against organized and privileged wealth. It is time that they demand laws that will enable them to market their products at a reasonable profit.

"Corn is selling for ten and fifteen cents a bushel, while speculators receive forty-five and fifty cents for it. It has cost you farmers at least twenty-one cents a bushel to produce the grain piled on the ground along railroad tracks awaiting shipment. The people are burning corn, instead of coal — it is
cheaper than mined fuel. Coal miners are out of work and are going hungry because they can not get the corn. The merchant's shelves are loaded with merchandise they can not sell, and the manufacturers and their workmen who made the clothing are starving because there is no demand for the products of their toil.

In western Kansas, horses and cattle stagger around and stumble on the barren pastures and feed lots. The horses are too weak to pull a plow. "Why," you ask. Because they are starving. That is why ... and corn is piled along the railroad tracks in another part of the state because there is no market ... what little grain they have in that barren district the women grind in coffee mills and bake for the children to keep alive. Their children never know what it is to leave the table with their hunger appeased. You ask: "Why not send some of this surplus grain to the stricken area?" I ask you, who will pay the exorbitant freight rates?

"Your farms are burdened with mortgages ... foreclosures are threatened ... your creditors are pressing. What will you do?"

"The Populist party is your only hope."

"It stand for the abolition of the national banking system. As a substitute it asks power to make loans direct from the government. It stand for a national legal tender currency, safe, sound, and flexible, issued by the government without the use of banks. Direct distribution to the people at a tax not to exceed two percent per annum. Increase in the circulating medium to fifty dollars per capita ... A graduated income tax ... Postal savings banks ... Government control of railroads and communication lines ... Prohibition of alien ownership of land ... Limitation of state and national revenues to the necessary extent of government honestly administered ... Lands held by railroads and other corporations in excess to needs to be reclaimed by the government and held for settlement. We will stand by our homes and our friends by force, if necessary!

"We want the accursed foreclosure system wiped out. The blood hounds of money that have dogged us thus far, beware! My advice to you farmers is to raise less corn and more Hell!"

The crowd went wild. Men leaped upon the seats and waved their arms. They were shouting, singing; women laughed hysterically, or wept.

Paul Michaelson left the hall, deeply stirred. What had come over the people? Was this wild shouting crowd the quiet unemotional farmers of Pilgrim Valley, who rarely were moved out of the even tenor of their ways?
MARY ELIZABETH LEASE

I

Kansas Speech to Farmers


She made her first public speech in 1888. She became a popular speaker. In 1890 she made 160 speeches during the summer and fell to large audiences.

This is an example of her speaking:

"This is a nation of inconsistencies. The Puritans fleeing from oppression became in turn oppressors. We fought England for our liberty and put chains on four millions of blacks. We wiped out slavery and by our tariff laws and national banks began a system of white wage slavery worse than the first. Wall Street owns the country. It is no longer a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, but a government of Wall Street, by Wall Street and for Wall Street. The great common people of this country are slaves, and monopoly is the master. The West and South are bound and prostrate before the manufacturing East. Money rules, and our Vice President is a London banker. Our laws are the output of a system which clothes rascals in robes and honesty in rage. The parties lie to us and the political speakers mislead us. We were told two years ago to go to work and raise a big crop, that was all we needed. We went to work and plowed and planted; the rains fell, the sun shone, nature smiled, and we raised the big crop that they told us to; and what came of it? Eight-cent corn, ten-cent oats, two-cent beef and no price at all for butter and eggs — that's what came of it. Then the politicians said we suffered from overproduction. Over production, when 10,000 little children, so statistics tell us, starve to death each year in the United States, and over 100,000 shop girls in New York are forced to sell their virtue for the bread their niggardly wages deny them. Tariff is not the paramount question. The main question is the money question. John J. Ingalls never smelled gunpowder in all his cowardly life. His war record is confined to the court martialing a chicken their. Kansas suffers from two great robbers, the Santa Fe Railroad and the loan companies. The common people are robbed to enrich their masters. There are 30,000 millionaires in the United States. So home and figure out how many paupers you must have to make one millionaire with the circulation only $10 per capita. There are thirty men in the United States whose aggregate wealth is over one and one-half billion dollars. There are half a million men looking for work. There are 60,000 soldiers of the Union in poor houses but no bondholder. It would have been better if Congress had voted pensions to those 60,000 paupers who wore the blue and
dyed it red with their blood in the country's defense than to have voted to make the banker's bonds non-taxable, and payable interest and principal, in gold. We want money, land and transportation. We want the abolition of the National Banks, and we want the power to make loans direct from the Government. We want the accursed foreclosure system wiped out. Land equal to a tract thirty miles wide and ninety miles long has been foreclosed and bought in by loan companies of Kansas in a year. We will stand by our hopes and stay by our fireside by force if necessary, and we will not pay our debts to the loan-shark companies until the Government pays its debts to us. The people are at bay, let the bloodhounds of money who have dogged us thus far beware.
Madam President, Friends and Fellow Citizens, I use that term with somewhat pardonable pride when I remember that the Alliance League of Kansas has given to the women of my sunflower, humanity loving, temperance-loving State of Kansas the right of political suffrage.

The subject assigned to me today, Women in the Farmers' Alliance, cannot be intelligently discussed nor fully understood until the necessity for the formation of the Farmers' Alliance is first shown, and its aims and purposes briefly stated. It must be evident to every intelligent man and woman today that there is something radically wrong in the affairs of this Nation. It must be evident to every thinking man and woman that we have reached a crisis of the affairs of this Nation which is of more importance, more fraught and mighty of consequence for the weal or woe of the American people, than was even the crisis that engaged the attention of the people of this Nation in the dark and bleeding years of civil strife. We are confronted today by a crisis in which every instinct of common duty, of justice, and of patriotism demands prompt and decisive action.

Twelve years ago one of our distinguished statesmen who has retired to private life, in a speech in the United States Senate said, "There is no use in any longer trying to disguise the truth. We are on the verge of an impending revolution. Old issues are dead, and the people are arraying themselves on one side or the other of a portentous conflict. On one side is labor demanding employment, labor starving and sullen in the cities, resolutely determined to endure no longer a system that gives to Vanderbilt a Vanderbilt possession of wealth beyond even the dreams of avarice and condemns the poor to a poverty from which there is no refuge but starvation and the grave.

These were the words that were uttered in the Senate of the United States twelve years ago, and during the time that has intervened, during twelve years of poverty that has been heaped upon the people because of class legislation we are today on the verge of an impending revolution. "Old issues are dead, and the people are arraying themselves on the one side or the other of a portentous conflict."

What means it that Senator Tower stood in the Senate a few days ago and bade this Nation beware of further ignoring the will of the people and prophesied dark disastrous days to come if the will of the people be longer defied? What means it that the grand old governor of Iowa stood before the Republican Club of New York and prophesied that a storm would break over
this country that would bring ruin, devastation, and bloodshed? That means it that John J. Ingalls, whom the women of Kansas had the pleasure of defeating, what means it that in his death-bed speech a few days ago he bade the House, and Senate, and the Executive beware of further ignoring and defying the will of the people, and told us most emphatically and plainly that there were two great dangers that menaced the safety of, threatened the very existence of the Republic today, a corrupt ballot and tyranny of combined, incorporated, conscienceless capital? You know John was always great on adjectives.

Senator Stewart tells us, in a recent speech made before the Convention that every act of legislation since the close of the war has been in pursuance of the policy of the combined bondholders to enslave the American people and contract the currency of this nation, and Garfield and Logan unite in telling us that whoever controls the money of the Nation controls the commerce, the industrial interest of that Nation.

My friends, the lash of the slave-driver's whip is no longer heard in this country, but the lash of necessity is driving the thousands of unrequited toil. Conscienceless capital is robbing manhood of its prime, mothers of their motherhood and sorrowful children of sunshine and joy! Look around you! What do you behold today. A land which less than Four hundred years ago we received fresh from the hands of God, a continent of unparalleled fertility, magnificent in golden for all humanity, a land where we have all diversity of soil and climate, a land where the bounteous hand of Nature has given a wonderful heritage to each and every one of her children; and yet, in this land of plenty and unlimited resources, the cry of humanity is going up from every corner of this Nation. The complaint of motherhood, the moans of starving children! Capital buys and sells today the very heart-beats of humanity.

Senator Stewart said, for twenty years the market value of labor was going down, and the market value of the dollar has gone up, until today the American toiler in his bitterness and wrath asks us, which is the worst, the black slavery that has gone or the white slavery that has come? Has the American laborer nothing to show for twenty years of toil? Oh, yes; he can point to the rivers bridged, to the transcontinental railway connecting ocean with ocean, to wonderful churches and cathedrals; he can point to the most wonderful system of agriculture that ever brought joy to a hungry world; he can jostle his rags against the silken garments his toil has secured; he can walk shelterless and sad by the side of the home he has helped to build; he can wipe the sweat from his weary face, and reflect that the twenty thousand of American millionaires who own one billion five hundred million dollars, gather from the toils and tears of sixty-four million people, have it in their power to name their Governors and our legislators and representatives and Congressmen, --
and they do name them, and they have named them for the last quarter of a century, and they have it in their power to fix the price of labor, fix the price of every ton of coal.

For one hundred years the speculators, the land-robbers, and pirates and gamblers of this Nation have knocked unceasingly at the doors of Congress, and Congress has in every ease acceded to their demands. They have gotten money out of the public treasury amounting to tens of millions a dollars. They were permitted to tap the veins of trade and commerce and withdrew from the body politic the circulating medium which is the life-blood of the Nation, and our law-makers terms these acts constitutional, and when for the first time in one hundred years the farmers come timidly knocking at the doors of Congress asking for relief, a howl went up from our Boodle--(the bell sounded time)

I have given only the prelude. I have not said a word about the women of the Farmers' Alliance. Tomorrow morning they say I may finish my address. I want to say to you as representatives of the Alliance from Kansas from the West, that we number a half a million in the Alliance who are loyal White-Ribboners. The majority of them are, and I say it with pride, and I return grateful thanks to Almighty God that our Alliance representatives are the only men in the council of this Nation today who have not been elected on a liquor platform.
The Alliance League

"Swing outward, O gates of the morning,
Sing inward, ye doors of the past;
A giant is rousing from slumber,
The people are waking at last."

Madam President, Friends, and Fellow Citizens, If God were to
give me my choice to live in any age of the world which has
flown, or in any age of the world yet to come, I would say,
"O God, let me live here and now, in this day and age of the
world's history." We are living in a grand and wonderful time;
we are living in a day when old ideas, old traditions, and old
customs have broken loose from their moorings, and are hope­
lessly adrift on the shoreless, boundless sea of human thought;
we are living in a time when the gray old world begins to dimly
comprehend that there is no difference between the brain of
an intelligent woman and the brain of an intelligent man; that
there is no difference between the soul-power and the brain­
power that served the arm of Charlotte Corday to deeds of hero­
cism, and that which swayed old John Brown behind his barri­
cade at Osawatomie; we are living in a day and age when the
women of industrial societies and the Alliance women have be­
come a mighty factor in the politics of this nation; when the
mighty dynamite of thought is stirring the hearts of men of this
world from centre of its circumference, and this thought is
crystallising into action.

Organization is becoming the key-note among the farmers of this
nation; The farmers, slow to think and slow to act, are today
thinking for themselves; they have been compelled to think.
They have been awakened by the load of oppressive taxation,
unjust tariffs, and they find themselves standing today on the
very brink of their own despair. In all the years which have
flown, the farmers, in their unswerving loyalty and patriotism
to party, have been too mentally lazy to do their own thinking.
They have been allowing the unprincipled demagogues of both
the old political parties to do their thinking for them, and
they have voted poverty and degradation not only upon them­
selves but upon their wives and their children.

But today these farmers, thank God, are thinking, and also
their mothers, wives, daughter, "their sister, their cousains,
and their aunts." We find, as a result of this mighty thought
in the hearts of the people, a movement of the great common
people of this nation, and that is the protest of the patient
burden-bearers of the world against political superstition, a
movement which is an echo of the life of Jesus of Nazareth,
a movement that means resolution, not a revolution of brains
and ballots that shall shake this continent and move humanity
everywhere. The voice which Lincoln heard blending with the
guns at Fort Sumter. It is breaking into a clarion cry which will be heard around the world, and thrones shall fall and crowns will crumble, and the divine right of kings and capital will fade away like the mists of the morning when the angel of liberty shall kindle the fires of justice in the hearts of men.

An injury to one is the concern of all. Founded upon the eternal principles of truth, with special privileges to none, the farmer's movement could not well exclude the patient burden-bearers of the home. And so we find them opening wide the doors of this new and mighty movement, the Farmers' Alliance, admitting women in the ranks of the organization, actually recognizing the fact that they are human beings, and treating them as such, with full privileges of membership and promotion. And the women who have borne the heat of the burden of the day are not slow to accept the newly-offered privileges, undeterred by the fact that the new organization was political, though non-partisan, and they gladly accept the privileges extended to them, until we find today upwards of half a million women in the Farmers' Alliance, who have taken up the study of social and political problems and are studying and investigating the great issues of the day, fully cognizant of the fact that in the political arena alone can these great problems be satisfactorily settled.

You will wonder, perhaps, why the women for the West are interested so much in this great uprising of the common people, the mightiest uprising in the world has seen since Peter the Great led the armies of the East to rescue the tomb of the Savior from the grasp of the infidel. I will tell you friends; if you refer to your old school-maps, you will find that portions of our country now the valuable, teeming, fruitful West, was twenty-five or thirty years ago marked as the "GREAT AMERICAN DESERT, the treacle plain". About that time the women of the East turned their faces towards the boundless, billowing prairies of the West. They accompanied their husbands, sons, and brothers; they came with the roses of health on their cheeks; they left their homes and friends, school and church and all which makes life dear to you and me, and turned their faces toward the untried West, willing to brave the dangers of pioneer life upon the lonely prairies with all its privations; their children were born there, and there upon the prairies our little babes lie buried. And after all our years of sorrow, loneliness, and privation, we are being robbed of our farms, of our homes, at the rate of five hundred a week, and turned out homeless paupers, outcasts and wanderers, robbed of the best years of our life and our toil. Do you wonder that women are joining the Farmers' Alliance and the Knights of Labor? Let no one of this audience for one moment suppose that this Alliance movement is but an episode of a brief career. We have come to stay,
for we are advocating the principles of truth, right and justice. Our demands are founded upon the Sermon on the Mount, and that other command, that ye love one another. We seek to put into practical operation the teachings of Christ, who was sent to bring about a better day. Then there shall be no more coal kings, but a better day when there shall be no more millionaires, no more paupers, and no more waifs in our streets.
Mr. Chairman, honorable opponent, ladies and gentlemen: The question which we are called upon to debate or speak upon, today, is as old as the civilization of the world as old as mankind itself. The struggle that we are engaged in, is a struggle between the laborer, the corn, wheat, of the nation and its bondholder and its gold. It is a struggle between the debtor and the creditor class. And now, my friends, to begin with, I have been accused of misrepresentation — I have been accused of making startling statements, startling assertions, which I could not prove. Today, as I have the honor of debating with an honorable Republican I am going to put honorable Republican witnesses in the stand to prove everything that I have said.

In 1878 Brother Ingalls said in a speech in the Senate: (Quotation omitted).

We will assume then, taking Senator Ingalls as our authority that the struggle which we are today engaged in, is a struggle between the wealth producers on the one hand, and the corn, the wheat, the cotton of the country against the bondholder and its gold. In all the history of the world, my friends, there have been two factors — two great agents that have combined to rob and control the hives of labor. These two great agents of factory have been despotism and the money power. Under despotism the laborer and his labor were the chattels of a money aristocracy. The labor had no rights which the titled aristocracy or money power felt bound to respect. But Despotism received its death blow during the reign of XIV of France. The death knell of despotism was rung when the streets of Paris ran red with blood in 1879.

There is not today an absolute despotism on the face of the earth. But in the place of despotism we find the money power, more absolute, more gigantic, more far reaching in its mighty results for the well or the woe of the American people than was ever the despotism in the zenith of its power. The money power that in all history in this gray old world, has ever endeavored to enslave the people, to crush the people, to absorb the benefits of civilization and to rob the toiler, rob the many for the benefit of the few.

Look out with me over those old nations of the past and you will see what the money power has done for other nations. When Greece went down, two percent of her population owned ninety percent of her wealth. When Persia went down, two
percent of her population owned ninety percent of her wealth. When Rome, proud imperial Rome, went down, eighteen hundred men owned all the known world. Egypt is today paying interest on the bonds to the money power that has enslaved her. Egypt perished from among the nations of the world, the toil of her sons has been absorbed, the benefits of her civilization has been drained away from her, and her children starve in the midst of plenty. The same thing abounds in India, India, rich with every fertility of soil and climate, centralization of wealth, the curse of the money power, the incumbrance of bonds was loaded on India, and India went down as Persia, and Spain, and Greece and Rome, as Turkey, and Ireland went down, from the uncumbre of bonds, the curse of our money power.

The fetters of the chains by which the money power enslaves nations, enslaves people and has laid waste to all those old nations of the past and they perished from among the powers of the earth; and this same money power, this some gigantic octopus that crushed the life out of these nations of the past, has taken firm upon the same prosperous and once prosperous, and contented the once happy American people. How did this come about friends. When was it that bonds, that fetter to the money power, were placed on the American people? When did the money power get such a control of the American people that Senator Ingalls tells us in his last death bed speech made in the Senate: "Not only the safety but the very existence of this nation is today threatened by the tyranny of the combined concentrated, incorporated conscienceless capital." When did capital get such a gigantic grasp upon this people and this nation that today a eminent Republican tells us that the very existence of the nation is in danger. Ah, my friends, go back to the trying period in our forefather's history — go back to that time when the firing of a gun that forced on Fort Sumter was heard around the world — go back to the time, to those bleeding years of civil strife, and in that trying hour of the nation's danger, you will find a time when the nation needed men and needed money. But my friends, our treasury was depleted. We didn't have a dollar to carry on the war that was inevitable. We didn't have a dollar to furnish arms ammunition and clothing to the soldiers that were hastening forward to the call of arms, to lay their lives at sacrifice on the altar of our country. What was to be done, my friends? You know it has been stated that in this trying hour of the nation's danger the bankers came to the rescue of the nation and loaned their gold to the government to carry on the war. And again, I put Senator Ingalls on the stand and the Senator tells us that the gold of New York and London, in our great civil war -- the gold of London and New York did not work us greater injury than the powder and the lead and the iron of the revels. It was the most memorable day — the gold, the bankers, the rich man of the nation were the most invincible enemies of the public. Gold paid no soldier or sailor. It refused the nation's obligation. It was worth the most when
our fortunes were the lowest. Every defeat gave it increased value. It was the open ally of our enemies the world over and all the influences of the money power of the nation were our destruction. In that trying hour of our nation's danger, men rushed forward to the rescue to save the nation, but the bankers offered to loan their gold, and this and supplicate on bended knees for every dollar they loaned on bended knees but they loaned their credit. Just think of it Mr. Brumbaugh, the wealth — (lost in applause) I have said it before and I say it again and I am prepared to prove it, that in this trying hour of the national danger, if when the government took from us our fathers, brothers, sons, and husbands and placed them in the foremost of the nation's battle for the nation if the same strong hand of the nation's government had reached out and taken from some Shylock his gold it would have enable them to have carried on the expenses of the war, and every dollar of the bonded indebtedness of this union might have been averted. I come before you with facts and figures to prove my opinion that every dollar of the bonded indebtedness of this nation was unneeded and unnecessary. Put it down Mr. Brumbaugh.

The government issued money enough to have paid all the expenses of the war. This you will find by looking over the records and the figures which I will produce here today. Yet, my friends, notwithstanding the government issued enough money to carry on the war, the bankers and bondholders of this nation fastened a great debt upon the people; and notwithstanding we have paid two billions and some odd millions of dollars interest and upward of one billion in principle. The war debt today is greater today than it was at the close of the war. ah, that is an assertion that Mr. Brumbaugh will hardly believe unless I put a Republican witness on the stand to prove it.

Honorable Thomas W. Fitch, Republican representative says, (Quotation omitted)

One has been vainly endeavoring, this Republican states vainly endeavoring to increase the number of dollars and the other has been successfully increasing the amount of toil he receives for his dollar. For sixteen years, he says the market value of the dollars has been going up and the market value of the man has gone down until freemen in their bitterness ask us "Is white slavery worse than black?" He says, (quotation omitted).

As another instance of how Republican witnesses agree, whether they agree with Mr Brumbaugh or not I do not know, but as in an instance of how they agree, I will simply quote you again from Representative Fitch: (quotation omitted).
After questions and interruptions Mrs. Lease continued:

Now listen to the way Senator Stewart, an eminent republican described the banking system. (quotation omitted).

Now Mr. Brumbaugh, I want to ask you upon whose credit did the greenbacks rest?

The credit of the United States, whose credit too do the bonds rest upon? The credit of the U. the credit of the government. But the greenbacks were non-interest bearing. The bonds were made interest bearing and were fastened upon the people, as Senator Stewart tells us, to make the non-producing classes, living in wealth and affluence, beyond even the dreams of Aladdin upon the toils of the laborers of this nation.

Then we will find that according to Senator Stewart, the destruction of the people's money, the burning of more than one billions of greenbacks -- the contraction of currency where by the circulating medium was reduced from two billions to less than a hundred millions. The wise man admits the demonetization of silver. The refunding act, were all in the interest of the bondholders or bankers to contract the volume of the nation's money, and thereby enslave the American people to the bondholder, until our own Congressman Ryan said, "It is proposed to forever enslave the American people to bondholders."

When the contraction of currency by means of the retirement of the treasury notes in circulation was first agitated by John Sherman, who was then an honest man, that was before he commenced to receive boodle -- says, "it is impossible to except the capitalist our debt or a salaried officer or an annuitant, it is a period of loss, danger, lassitude of trade, fall of wages, suspension of interest, enterprise, bankruptcy, and disasters. It means ruin to all business men whose debts are twice their business capital though one third less than actual property." Yet Sherman wrote the bill and permitted its passage through Congress. He voted for it.

Senator John A. Logan, in speaking upon the same question contraction of currency, a bill brought about by the national banks and by the bankers, a bill that was brought about to enslave the laborer said: (quotation omitted).

Now an instance of this legislation which Senators Stewart, Logan and Sherman, when they were honest men - at least Sherman was an honest man - I will speak of that infamous and black chapter in the nation's history, the Credit Strengthening Act passed under and by a republican administration, made the bonds payable to coin, non-taxable and interest bearing. It doubled the burdens of the tax payer of this nation and as a
corresponding result it has doubled the profits of the bondholders and bankers of the nation. Our government had pledged itself to pay the debt of the nation in coin, but it deliberately violated its pledge to the soldier and it paid them in depreciated greenbacks that had not been worth thirty five cents on the dollar; and from that time to this it has never paid the soldiers the difference between the depreciated greenbacks and gold, but it has paid the bondholders, the moneyed men who skulk at home — it has permitted them to reap a harvest of gold there from the blood of the nation's soldiers and the widows and orphans and of this nation. It has taxed the paupers of this nation to pay double price to the bondholder who did nothing, and it has taken the taxes from the rich and bloated bondholder and placed it doubly upon the wealth producers of the nation. This is the kind of legislation which has been in the interest of the bondholders and in pursuance of their cherished policy to control the currency and enslave the people of this nation. Ah, you say as have some other Republicans to me, this thing about the Hazard Circular is all a hoax, but no such a circular was sent. Let me read to you from an eminent Republican, friends (Aside to Mr. Brumbaugh Press this is a Stand authority, a national work, and whose records and figures are the national figures and facts, the same as the circular, and of which a marked copy was sent to all great bankers, (quotation omitted).

Now old Don Cameron of Pennsylvania a staunch old Republican in speaking of this Hazard Circular says, (quotation omitted).

Senator Cameron, again said in the senate in reply to Mr. West who referred to what Senator Brown said. He said that what Mr. Brown says in somuch is entirely correct as to the depreciation in the value of the panda and keeping pace with the demonetization of silver 1873. (Quotation omitted). And Ingalls tells us that when Congress demonetized silver in 1874, they hypnotized the Congressmen by the bondholders, and "hypnotize" is to place a person so completely under your control that they will obey your will without knowing it, and Ingalls tell us that Wall Street has hypnotized Congress when silver was demonetized, and judging by the legislation that they have given us up to the present time, they have been completely hypnotized by the money power. All this has been in the interests of the corporations, and bankers, the great syndicates of this nation against the wealth producing class. Senator Cameron says, (Quotation omitted). Now, my friends, a partial investigation by an intelligent person will surely convince the most prejudiced, the most staid or partisan-minded person, that the acts of legislation as Senator Stewart tells us have been in pursuance of the treasured policy of the money, the volume of the nation's money; enslave the laborer, enslave the commerce, enslave the industry of the nation. We have reached a period in the history of this nation when even national banks are no longer safe. Our comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Lacey, who was one of the stockholders of
the Philadelphia's bank that recently went down, owing tens of thousands of dollars to its depositors. He will eventually corroborate that fact as he is in great trouble over the downfall and the trouble of this Philadelphia bank known as the national bank. Senator Stewart tells us that by the very laws that brought these banks into existence, they must perish.

I just found the speech of H.B. Kelly of Wellershon. We have all heard of that great Republican man, H.B. Kelly. You will accept him. Won't you Mr. Brumbaugh? He says, (quotation omitted). That is one reason why we are in favor of the sub-treasury plan, or the government loaning money on non-perishable products, or grain, and real estate, and wealth of the country because Kelly tells us that we cannot hold our products for better prices because this money blight that burdens the industrial interest of the nation.

Senator Stewart says of the supply of one-half out of all of our money changed from a contract payable in gold and silver at the option of the debtor to a contract payable in gold alone. In other words as Senator Plumb tells us in a speech made on the banking question March 27th, (quotation omitted).

In other words a prominent Republican statesman tells us that no relief can come from the government because the Treasury officials are inactive partnership with the national banks, and that the national banks, in other words, have the control only of the volume of the nation's money, but control of the best and highest interest of the country and the agricultural interests of this nation. They refuse, as Senator Plumb tells us for twenty years to adopt any other means.

Then my friends you will not wonder, taking the statements of these eminent Republicans into consideration, that the American people are today rising in their might and their majesty and demanding the abolition of the national banks. They are demanding a loan to the people based upon real estate security, based as it is today on our poverty and indebtedness. Oh, our Republican brothers tell us that would be unconstitutional.

That, the government loan money to farmers! Why not loan it to the farmers on the Sub-treasury plan, upon the corn and wheat and oats of the country as well as to loan it to the bonded whiskey men of the nation upon whiskey? Surely if the government can loan money to bonded whiskey men upon corn juice, it ought to be willing to loan it upon corn.

Now in our demand for more circulation medium, more per capita circulation and the abolition of the national banks that have outlived their usefulness, we are simply asking for justice and we accept nothing less. Those banks have outlived their usefulness, (quotation omitted). Yet our present secretary, Mr. Foster, has devised a scheme to meet a deficit in the treasury.
caused by our billion dollar Congress, and he proposed to meet this contingency by refunding or permitting a continuance of the four and a half per cent bonds that fall due on the first of the month at two per cent interest and fifteen per cent premium, and the Republican papers exult over the low rate of interest, but they don't say a word about the premium.

(to Mr. Brumbaugh — there won't be any water left for you).

I have been repeatedly contradicted for stating as I stated to you here today that the government loaned money to the bankers. I have here the Congressional Record March 1, 1868, in which that grand old watch dog of the treasury, General Weaver, stated on the floor that the law on page 360 of Loans and Currency was passed June 1864 during the struggle for the preservation of the union when the government had to disburse large sums of money in various parts of the country. There was no design in the passage of the law to make national banks depositaries for government funds for their convenience and benefit. It was the convenience of the government that was uppermost and when necessity ceased, the deposit of money in national banks should have ceased. There are fifty or more banks in this country that have been literally stuffed with government money for the past quarter of a century — money levied from the people by unjust and personal taxation and stuffed into the banks by them, loaned back to the poor workers from whom it came. Fifty-nine millions of dollars scattered over the country without regard to the convenience of the government, utterly in defiance of sound policy and solely with reference to the convenience and at the behest of the banks. He says, (quotation omitted),

Now there is a long list of banks and government loans here in the banks, but I want to read now from the report of the Treasury, and we find that the money due from the state of Kansas owed to the national banks to be over $35,000. The people of Kansas owe to these banks $35,000 paying all the way from ten to seventy per cent interest. A per capita alone to the national banks of $17.00 per capita for every man, woman and child in the state of Kansas. Kansas people, do you want this colossal failure, the national bank fastened upon you any longer at from ten to seventy per cent, or do you want a government loan to the people at the same rates of interest that the banks are getting it?

Mrs. Lease's Closing Speech

Mr. Brumbaugh I wish to congratulate you. You made an able talk. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I came here today prepared to prove every assertion I might make by an array of Republican witnesses. I put such men on the stand as Ingalls, Garfield Logan, Fitch, H.B. Kelly, of McPherson, the millionaire iron man from Pennsylvania, old Don Cameron of Pennsylvania, Stewart, and other prominent and eminent Republicans. Yet when the gentleman who represents the Republican party of Cloud County took the rostrum, he said, who is Kelly, who is Stewart? Why Kelly and Stewart are demagogues and Ingalls is a fool. And what authority did he bring up? Why I were to pay the Cloud
County bank I would bring just the authority he did, a few items written on a piece of paper. Likely they are from a Concordia bank whose purse will be lighter today than it was yesterday.

H.B. Kelly, Stewart, Cameron, Logan, Garfield, all eminent men who have hearted in legislative halls for years, these men are demagogues and fools, and our Concordia banker is authority. My friends, there was a time when I was radical Republican. I triumphed in its victories. I exulted in the heroism of its glorious martyrs. There was a time when I wouldn't permit anyone to speak against the record of that grand old party, but with J.K. Judson of Topeka Capital, that day is past. It has become the lying place of thieves and the refuge of salary grabbers and robbers, but looking back to that day, looking back to those opening days of civil strife, I remember the tradition of the past, remembering its victories and triumphs, remembering its victories of the glorious men who have composed this party, I blush for shame that the Cloud County Republicans could not get a better representation for their party than a banker through this man Brumbaugh. He has practically admitted everything I have stated. He has admitted that Republicans have gone over by wholesale into the People's Party in this County, and then he goes on to tell what robberies they perpetrated in the junitorship and in the printing bill. Would you expect them, Brother Brumbaugh, to be converted all at once? While defending the national banks and evidently in the pay of bankers, he says none has suffered more than he has from the excessive rates of interest, now what is this but a practical acknowledgment? Now friends, I will concede the man is honest. He looks like an honest man but I am honest enough to believe that he is ignorant. I have here — I could not if I would talk this morning to-morrow morning correct all the mistakes that man in his ignorance has made. He said that he quoted from the national law books. I have here a book which tells me in unmistakable language, and the gentleman may refer to it if he wishes, I offered to loan him my books — which we find an item in regard to the national banking act: (quotation omitted).

He says that they are actually suffering because they do not make any profit. He must be just, he says, he must be just but for the sake of justice let us not wrong these national banks. Why no Mr. Brumbaugh, for the sake of justice, we will just put a bank on the stand and have justice here.

The First National Bank of Concordia is in proportion to its capital the richest institution of its kind in the state. It has a capital over $150,000 and on the second day of October its surplus fund and undivided profits amounted to over $87,000.

Since its incorporation the bank has never paid less than ten per cent of dividend and often more. If the bank closed up today it would have a regular surplus of $150,000 to divide among its stockholders. This was in 1873. This bank at the start had
150,000 capital. It has always paid no less than ten per-cent dividend. It has now $100,000 surplus, just two thirds of its original stock. Why have the stockholders of this bank been able to make ten per cent on their capital and at the same time double their fortune?

W.H. English, President of the First National Bank of Indianapolis, for fourteen years resigned and in his retiring address said, (quotation omitted). Now from a republican standpoint from Congressman Marshall of Illinois, I want to read a summarization up of the national banking act, (quotes Marshall) I want to say to you brothers that I will address you tonight on the Railroad question. This is an extract from Congressman Marshall's speech in 1788 in U.S. Senate, yet the gentleman takes up the time talking about local affairs.

Well, my friends, and especially my Republican friends, don't you think your representative is badly out of fact when he takes up his time talking about Senator Pfeiffer's beard? Why I expected to hear about Senator Simpson's feet before he got through. I leave it to this intelligent audience to our laborers and even to our Republican friends here if I have made any calamity here in speech today. I started out to talk on money power, to talk of the grasp it had on the people, and to show you how through the banks and the national banking system the money power had obtained a clutch and grasp upon the American people. But my friends, there is no need of making a calamity speech. On last fourth of July, John J. Ingalls, made a speech up here in Nebraska and he tells us that there are 10,000 people who have accumulated over $1,000,000,000 in wealth, enough to give every man, woman and child under the flag a competence. Enough to secure every household a competence, enough to educate every family and keep the wolf from the door and yet Senator Ingalls says, "there are 10,000,000 people in this country that never get enough to eat from end of the year to another."

Why friends, I object to that. I said something like that three years ago. I object to Senator Ingalls stealing my speech I made a statement like that three years ago and I modestly put the number of 5,000,000. But here comes Ingalls, who only last fall was a god of the Republican party who tells us this in his fourth of July speech. He says in this Fourth of July speech that there are over 10,000,000 in this country who do not know what it is enough to have enough to eat from one end of the year to another. Mr. Ingalls says this but Mr. Brumbaugh says Ingalls is a fool and that settles it. I agree with him. We won't have any dispute on that point. I want to put another eminent Republican on the stand, Wm. B. Kelly of Pennsylvania. No doubt, if the gentleman were permitted to speak again he would say, "Why is Wm. B. Kelly?" Speaking of the prosperity that the American people enjoyed before the contracted system began, he says, (quotation omitted). Time was called and Mrs. Lease said turn out tonight and Mr. Brumbaugh will give you more on beards.
Synopsis of 'Peace'

In the shadowy morning of the world's childhood, when man dwelt in caves clad in skins of animals, and feasted upon blood-reeking flesh, might made right, but force prevailed; and he whose sinewy arm could best direct the murderous aim of spear or arrow, he who from the chase bore the greatest number of bleeding trophies as evidence of his barbarous prowess was acclaimed a mighty warrior. And as the world grew, the struggle for supremacy was transferred from butchery of beasts to the butchery of men. And he who participated in the bloodiest of wars, who bore the brunt of battle while slaughtering his fellow-men, he whose soldier's wreath was deepest dyed and darkest stained with human blood, had attained the standard of human greatness and was made ruler or crowned king by an applauding people.

Under the benign influence of the teachings of the Nazarene, the "Man of Peace," the standard of the world's greatness no longer accords to blood-stained men the greatest laurels, but to him who seeks to uplift and rescue suffering humanity, to him who practices as well as preaches that new command, to the life and soul of every religion, "Love ye one another," the benediction falls.

Two great faiths have for centuries contended for supremacy; Caesarism, the doctrine of hate, and the religion of Jesus Christ; the doctrine of love. We have professed Christianity, filled God's blue sky full of church spires and preached the doctrine of love while practicing the doctrine of hate. Te Deums are chanted in our churches and thanks returned to a God of peace for battles won and murderous men triumphant. The horrible inconsistency between religion belief and action is dawning upon the hearts of the race, and they declare that the real sin against the Holy One is to strike at God through His image, man; that we have been living a gigantic lie, and that unless we practice what we preach to believe we had best stop building churches and supporting ministers and take down our signs of Christianity and go out of the business. An honest Pagan is exemplary compared with a lying, hypocritical Christian.

The Hatred implanted in the minds of unborn children by the mothers of the North and South thirty years ago is today struggling to give expression in force. The world is ready for another baptism of blood. The "dragon's teeth" sown in that fratricidal war are springing up "armed men." A dark cloud, surcharged with the electricity of the coming storm, is suspended above the nation. The rumblings of discontent and mutterings of war are heard coming up from every side. The women of this nation can alone avert the conflict. Let them come into their
kingdom, claim their own, assert their power and bid the murderous passions of men cease, as Christ stilled the stormy waves of Galilee. Peace! be still.

The mothers of this nation, the mothers of the world, shall no longer rear their sons to be slain, or give their loved ones to be butchered. If men can not get along without the shedding of blood and putting the knife to the throat of brother, let them no longer set themselves up as guides and rulers, but confess their self-evident inefficiency and turn the management of affairs over to the mothers, who will temper their justice with love and enthrone mercy on the highways. Then shall the peace that surpasseth human understanding, the peace of our Lord Jesus Christ, abide among men and redeem the world. Their mission to bring about that time when the Golden Rule shall be incarnated in human affairs and govern the world; theirs the mission to usher in that time of which Isaiah sang and the prophets have so long foretold — that time, the hope of which has lingered in the hearts of men, and mingled with their hopes and yearnings, since the "morning stars first sang together when the earth was young!"

We are nearing the dawn of the Sabbatical period — the dawn of the glorious twentieth century — of which that inspired champion of human rights, Victor Hugo, makes prophecy.

"In the twentieth century war will be dead, famine will be dead, royalty will be dead, but the people will live." A fuller and holier comprehension of the Lord's prayer is filling the hearts of the people. "Our Father, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven," will usher in that era when "the swords shall be beat into plow-shares, and the spears into pruning hooks; when nation shall not go to war against nations, neither shall they learn war any more."
MART ELISABETH LEASE

Great Quadrangular Debate
Republican: Sen. J. C. Caldwell
Populist: Mary E. Lease
Democratic: Hon. David Overmyer
Prohibition: Ex-Governor J. St. John

Given at Salina, Kansas, December 18, 1893. Published by The Open Church, Salina, Kansas, 1894. (Pamphlet in Kansas Historical Library, Topeka, Kansas.)

Question: Which of the political parties is the best qualified to solve the social problem of the day?

Mrs. Lease was greeted with enthusiastic cheers as she came forward, and delivered the following address:

One of the greatest thinkers of antiquity, Aristotle, divides the whole human race into two classes, freemen and slaves, and declares that this division is a social necessity, and the indispensable material foundation of state and society. "For," he argues, "if free citizens were obliged to do the work required for their maintenance, how could they have time and wish to cultivate intelligence and direct the affairs of the state?" And then Aristotle makes this remarkable observation: "If, he says, "an animate object could render the service of a slave, if an instrument can perform its functions with or without command, if the looms could weave, the looms could weave, the looms could weave, the looms could weave, the torce of harmony spontaneously, there we could conceive of a society without slaves where all men might be free."

Without the help or intervention of the gods, the miracle which the wise old Greek deemed impossible, has been wrought in our day. Steam and electricity daily perform miracles which out-rival the statue of Deucalion and surpass the table of Hephatesus, which of its own accord entered the halls of discoveries, perfected and wrought by the subtle brain of genius, the achievements of Fulton, Morse and Edison have immeasurably increased the individual and national wealth of the country and multiplied the comforts and benefits of civilization. Labor saving machinery works daily miracles. We have reached dizzy heights of wealth and material progress. We have accumulated in thirty years forty billions of dollars. Machinery accomplishes in one hour the equivalent work of twenty men in one day. And yet, the prophecy is not fulfilled. The burden of toil is not lightened, the hovel molders in the shadow of the palace, and within its fetid shelter and gaunt misery waits for death. Unemployed labor glutts the market and swarms the land. Men are denied the right to obey that divine injunction to "earn their bread in the sweat of their brow," and the skeleton in our national closet is an army of idle men.

There is a disappointment.
The cotton-gin and sewing machine work wonders, yet the highways are filled with humanity's outcasts, and Hood's "Song of the Shirt," is as applicable today as when written.

The sweating dens of our great cities swelter with unpaid toil garbed in unwomanly rags.

There is social injustice.

The laborer, given permission to toil earns thirteen dollars per day and receives less than one. The world is beginning to recognize not only the phenomena of wrong but the principle underlying the phenomena. If the laborer does not receive every farthing he earns he is robbed.

There is widespread discontent.

Capital (that should be the servant of labor, because labor produces every dollar of capital) has become a tyrannical and avaricious monster. The burdens of the nation are placed upon the brawny shoulders of toil. He sows unceasingly, yet yea he reaps no harvest. He builds stately mansions, yet lives in dens and hovels until for human habitation. Pure silks and costly velvets are the products of his toil, yet his own gaunt form is hung with rags and his naked little ones hide from curious gaze.

The cry of the shelterless goes up to God.

The demon of rent and usury has taken the homes of the people.

The old world vampire "Land Monopoly," fattens upon the blood of the people. More evictions in the city of New York in one week than in landlord-cursed Ireland in one year. According to reliable statistics gleaned from the eleventh census report, seven eighths of our city populations are liable to be turned out of work at the end of the week. Two thirds of the farmers of America are now tenant farmers, such as have existed for centuries in the old world. The land, which is the heritage of the people and the source of all wealth, has passed into the hands of a few who toil not, neither do they spin, and the rough-handed, kingly-hearted sons of toil, - chieftains fit to guard the ark and covenant of liberty - are compelled to compromise with the silk-hatted dude and the soft-handed son of idleness, for permission to exist. The pallid mother and her wretchedness of babe die for bread while within a stone's throw at their unspeakable agony, a daughter of wealth, a notary of fashion and no doubt a pious church member, gives a birthday party to her poodle dog and spreads a royal feast of game pie, sliced chicken ice cream and cake to a select invited company of canines.

- - -The land has produced more than enough for every man woman and child within our broad domain. Yet three million able
bodied men are denied food and work. Starvation gaunt and terrible stalks through the midst of plenty. Ten thousand little children, according to the statistics of the board of health, die annually of starvation in New York City alone. And every child that dies of hunger is evidence of murder done for money. Men from very wantonness of affluence feed on melted pearls and brains of peacocks, as in the days of Cleopatra and Helogabalus. The wealth created by the common toil of the people has been transferred by legislation into the hands of a few, less than two per cent of the people owning forty-five per cent of the wealth of all. "Wealth beyond the dreams of avarice on the one hand, and on the other, poverty from which there is no refuge from starvation but death."

We need no anointed of the Most High to impress upon our minds that punishment follows wrong doing. The law of Retribution enters into the lives of individuals as into the history of nations. By a process of moral evaporation our guilt has been ascending till we stand today beneath a dark cloud of suspended in the heavens, surcharged with the electricity of the coming storm.

The tendencies of the time are revolutionary. We are in the midst of the pitchy darkness that precedes that dawn. The mighty waves of discontent are beating and surging around the ship of State, and red flag of anarchy has been flaunted in the streets of our great cities. And the hoarse cry of "Bread or Blood" has been flung against the gates of God. The fires of unrest are puffing up from the chimneys of Homestead, the mines of Cour D'Aleme and the convict camps of Tennessee.

A tidal wave of discontent is sweeping across our land. Labor, land, money and transportation are the paramount issues before the people. The evolution of society has brought us face to face with grave and mighty problems that require solution and demanding the attention of the American people, and these problems are the natural result of laws and infringement upon the rights of man, and give to one man, or set of men, opportunities not accorded to every other, regardless of wealth, color or sex. The appalling social condition that today confronts us is the result of legislation that gives to the few all the soil, all the money, or all the muscle that waging avarice can control. The constitution of our fathers has been set aside, its provisions trampled under foot, justice has been ignored and the "Book of Books is covered with the rubbish of the Temple." Th retrograde influence of monopolies, self-seeking officials, party prejudices and general political corruption has poisoned the whole social fabric, and a deep seated disease, the result of class legislation, fraud, and treason, fastened upon the country during and since the war, pollutes the physical organism. Far-seeing statesmen predict that the disease will end in social dissolution, national extinction and the chaos of civilization. Such prophets ignore or forget the fundamental princi-
pies of life and law, the one lesson gleaned from the history of right and wrong since the world began, that however much wrong may triumph for a time, right, in the end, prevails. There are two great controlling forces of nature, unceasingly active and equally potential, which we call centripetal and centrifugal forces working in opposite directions, attracting and repelling, and, in the confliction of their internal forces, they combine in production of an absolute balance or equilibrium. These two forces, typified in our nineteenth century civilizations, are found in the doctrines of hate and love. The doctrine of hate, personified and exemplified in monopolistic greed, corporate tyranny and legislative robbery, has filled our land with sorrow, turned homes into hovels, workers into tramps and sends up from every part of our land the wail of mentally and physically dwarfed children and the despairing cry of the Proletaire. Our social conditions belong to the old civilization, where the standard of might was evolved from a condition based upon a universal sense of the right of brute force. We are living a gigantic lie. We proclaim all power is in the people, while laws are in force that take it away from them. We profess Christianity, yet fail to practice. For thirty years two great political parties have alternately struggled for supremacy, differing chiefly upon one issue, and marshalling their forces upon one line of battle—"high or low tariff." As political shepherds, they have been of ever one thought in common for their flock (the people), not how they might best to them be tended, but how they might oftentimes be closely shorn. Hegel tells us, "History is the judgment bar of nations." Bring the democratic and republican parties before this tribunal and the verdict will be incapacity and unwillingness to meet and solve the questions of the living present. They were organized in the past to deal with the problems of the past; they can progress no farther, because reacting influences are becoming dominant; evolution is impossible, because evolution stands for the sum total of forces that produce growth and development. A society or organization cannot evolve beyond its standard of right, and that standard reached, evolution ceases and dissolution begins. The centripetal, or attracting force, or attracting force, the doctrine of love, is the standard of right which Christ brought to the world, and through Him our civilization is permeated with a consciousness of right and wrong. Whether saint or sinner, whether Christian or infidel, whether orthodox or outside the pale of the church, the teachings of Jesus appeal to every heart, move with every sentiment, with every estimate we form, every judgment we render, and have produced a social force, unknown to the ancients, that bids us live up to our ideals, gives us a fuller comprehension of the words of "Our Father," and binds us, without regard to the barriers of race or boundaries of nations, with the mystic, holy ties of brotherhood. Under the influence of this higher standard of right, our civilization has grown up, and, though dwarfed and stunted, though cruelly scarred and defaced, though menaced by utter disregard for human right, a reacting force consistent with the teaching of the Nazarene, has sprung into existence that civilization may continue its evolution to-
ward the limit of that standard of right which no man shall define, and that we may fulfill that destiny appointed for us by the Creator. The change is working unseen and undirected by human agency. The signs of the times are portentous of a struggle that will convulse the world. There is a uniformity of opinion as regards the near approach of some great upheaval, some radical social change. A wide and generally felt unrest and insecurity prevades the social fabric; there are wordy protests, curses, loud and deep, suppressed mutterings, and everywhere agitation, and all are but the tumults of the coming storm. It is not a question of a few more pennies a day, or less hours work, of what shall our money be made, or who shall issue it, nor sighted politicians, who see in the political war clouds of the present, but a question of wages and profits, but a question of high or low tariff, or the struggles of a political party for supremacy, known nothing of the real struggle. Humanity is gathering its resistless forces for another upward step in the march of civilization. The way is being prepared for an era of industrial democracy and social justice, the fulfillment of the teachings of the Nazarene — "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." The voice that blended with the guns of Fort Sumter and the Wilderness, that sang the chorus of "Union and Liberty" which Lincoln heard in 1861, is sounding forth day to day from the mystic chords of the American heart, bidding them to return to the constitution of the fathers and sign the emancipation which will free the toiler and uplift oppressed humanity the world over. The moral conscience has been quickened, the heart "with malice toward none and charity for all," which of the political parties can best solve the problem of the day? And the teaching of Christ and in harmony with that safe-guard of human liberty, that constitution of the United States. Political parties no longer exist for the benefit of the people, but as a means of obtaining place and power, and the republican and democratic parties, that have pretended for thirty years to be as widely separated as heaven and hell, have clasped hands in fraternal love to further their schemes and trample the will and wishes of the people under foot. We behold the amazing spectacle of John Cleveland and Grover Sherman, the two great money changers of our national policy, conspiring to demonetize silver and make gold the ultimate payment. To obtain gold we must borrow it; to borrow it, a bond issue is unavoidable, and in all the history of the world the money power has been used as a bonded debt to enslave the people.

Amid the smoke and clamor of partisan political strife, the mad race for power, the allied forces of laborers in city and country, the oppressed burden-bearers of the nation, representing the anti-gold forces, known as populists, independents, nationalists, or socialists, or whatever be the name inscribed upon their banners, turn to the Declaration of Independence as their impenetrable rock of defense, and clinging to it, as the shipwrecked mariner clings to his last plank, when storm and tempest sweep about him. They are asking whether the eternal principles of truth were
intended by our inspired and heroic father as obligatory upon their
descendants, under all conditions of society, or were these utter-
ances intended only as temporary expedients or were they applica-
tive to certain peculiar conditions of the American people.

The subject is worthy of investigation. The words uttered more
than a century ago ring in our ears as strong and true as though
but uttered yesterday. Nay, they take on a new meaning, and are
fraught with fuller and deeper significance, higher and holier
import. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men
are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain in-
alienable rights." That among these rights are, "life, liberty
and the pursuit of happiness." The Declaration further asserts,
that to secure these inalienable rights, "governments are in-
stituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent
of the governed." And we are further told that if a government
"fails to secure these rights," "fails to establish justice," "to
insure domestic tranquility," "promote the general welfare," and
"secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our children," it is the right, nay, it is the duty of the people to
overthrow that government. There is no uncertain note, no
quibbling with terms, or liability of misconception. The De-
claration is clear and unaltering, and as forcible as the com-
mands of Jehovah hurled from Mount Sinai's lightning-drowned
summit. The most beautiful summary of human rights and recip-
rocal duties are contained in this Declaration, based as they
are on the fundamental principles of Christianity, and the Ser-
mon on the Mount. That part of it which relates to the natural
rights of man and the rightful functions of government, is the
Golden Rule, incarnated and made manifest in human affairs. It
is the touchstone by which all our laws and the whole growth
of our institutions are to be tested. It is the solvent by which
all the dangerous accretions and deposits in the body politics
are to be dissolved and thrown off. The American people must
cling to it with tenacity. It is their first, as it must
necessarily be their last harbor, of protection, for earth
yields no more than "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The framers of this incomparable instrument could not live for-
ever to personally assist in moulding and administering the gov-
ernment which they founded. But they left this imperishable
scroll as an ever living witness of just what they intended to
accomplish when they threw off the yoke of British rule, and
established an independent Republic. The Declaration was pre-
eminently the product of the Jeffersonian school of philosophy.
Through force of public sentiment, it was reluctantly accepted
by a part of the aristocratic school, while openly resisted by
the other. When we view the history of a government from the
standpoint of its laws we are enabled to comprehend better
than in any other way the tremendous power which baleful influ-
ences have of projecting themselves far out through centuries
of national life. Once planted, they feed and grow upon our
very life, until the people are compelled to rise and cut them
to pieces by the drawn sword of revolution. It is unnecessary
to recall the melancholy chapters in modern history which verify
this statement. The aristocratic or plutocratic element was
strongly represented in the federal convention which framed our
theories of government, which are so at variance with popular
rights at this day, as to seriously mar the harmony of our polit-
ical system. Being too weak to force directly upon the conven-
tion their aristocratic theories, they addressed themselves to
the method of selecting the senate and judiciary, two of the
most important arms of federal power. A century of experience
has demonstrated the gravity of these mistakes. Few will deny
that the United States Senate, and federal courts by reason of
the methods of their selection, and the life tenure of their
judicial office, are now the main-stay and reliance of pluto-
cracy and confederated monopoly, as they were the bulwark of
slavery in ante-bellum days. It has remained for the closing
hours of the nineteenth century to witness the transformation of
the senate of the United States into a cringing and servile tool
for carrying out the behests of the gold power as championed and
advocated by a Wall Street lawyer. The capitalistic press re-
joices in the power of Grover Cleveland, the American agent of
Jewish bankers and British gold. Yet pondering upon the eternal
truths enunciated by our fathers, he is a menace to the Republic
more dangerous than any foreign foe, a barrier between the people
and prosperity. Our system of government, as framed by the fa-
thers, never intended that one man should attain such eminence
as to trample the constitution under foot, and prostitute patriot-
ism to patronage. Those who obeyed the dictation of Cleveland,
one hundred and three democrats, aided by one hundred and
ten republicans, who struck down the money of the constitution,
and made the Golden Rule subservient to the Golden Calf, have
written the doom of their parties upon the hearts of the people.

The appalling condition that confronts us, the concentration of
wealth, pauperization of the masses, the division of the people
into debtor and creditor classes, the conflict between labor
and capital, the devastation of contract and the gold and whole-
sale plundering of the American people by the gold kings is the
result of legislation, fraud, and treason, fastened upon the coun-
try since the war, and this legislation, fraud, and treason, the
republican and democratic parties are directly responsible for.
These charges are proven by the history of the parties, the re-
cords of their own members. And before these facts, the stal-
wart champions of old partyism, sweet singers whose siren notes are purchased by the money power, must shrink
away abashed, or cuttle-fish like, darken the air about them
with falsehood.

Political affinity and party ties were never more loosely held
than at the present time. The scales are falling from the eyes
of the people. They have seen prominent republicans elected to
office through the power of corporate money and influence, and
they have seen this same corporate money and influence used to
select a democrat; hence it is conclusive that there is no pledge
or test of party membership, and that organized capital has no
interest in the principles advocated by either party, and that
its real object is to maintain a conflict of opinion among the
people that capital may take advantage of political prejudice
and rob both.

The only obstacle between the complete and harmonious union of
the old parties is the strife for office. They have united on
everything from finance to whiskey. A republican president names
a Bourbon democrat from the south for the supreme bench, while
a democratic president offers the first office in his cabinet
to a life-long democrat or republican. On the most prominent
question of later developments in American politics, that of
restoring silver to its original proportional value with gold,
which it had maintained from the foundation of the government
until it was degraded at the dictation of foreign money dealers,
the old parties went to their respective national conventions
pledged exactly the same policy. Let it be recorded that they
voted alike in the upper and lower houses to fasten England’s gold
system upon this country and enslave American to a bonded debt,
which they can never pay. Such a spectacle was never before
presented in history; five-sixths of the republicans in congress
falling down in unseemly haste to do homage to, and lick the
crumbs of patronage from the hands of the bourbon democratic
president. The day will come when they will call upon the moun-
tains to fall upon them, and hide them from the indignation of
the people whom they have betrayed and robbed. There is no
longer a democratic or republican party, save in name, but from
amid the wrecks and dust of universal decay, a new power is be-
ing fashioned out and adapted to the new time destinies.

The populists are in line with the constitution. Their movements
are a vigorous plan, a determined demand for its enforcement.
The great evils which are cursing American society and under-
mining the foundation of this republic, flow not from the leg-
itimate operation of the great humane government which our fa-
thers gave us, but they come from the tramping its plain pro-
visions under foot, and denying to the people the safeguards and
privileges of that blood-bought instrument.

Upon this point they challenge the world to meet them.

The constitution provides that congress shall make all needful
rules and regulations respecting our territory. This means,
among other things, to hold, preserve, and carefully guard
the lands for the benefit of the homeless and unborn genera-
tions, that all may have a home to keep. But the democratic
and republican parties allowed the public domain to be seized
by home and foreign speculators and gave away empires in area
to corporations.

The constitution clothes congress with exclusive power to coin
money and regulate its value. The gold gamblers of Europe and America defy congress, manipulate both parties, and they say we shall not have silver money at all unless its bullion value to be made equal to its coin value, and that this must be regulated in the London market. They have ignored the right of contract, discriminated against the debtor class in interest of the creditor class, violated the provisions of the constitution, destroying one-half of the money of the people, committed treason, compared with which the treason of Jefferson Davis is conspicuous patriotism. They have usurped tyrannical power, for if they destroy silver, they may destroy both gold and paper and deprive the people of all money! Congress has no such power. It is an abuse of power. The Supreme Court has decided in the Legal Tender decision twentieth Wallace 545 that whatever power there is in this country over currency is conferred on Congress; that "If this is not so it is annihilated." Every lawyer knows, every sensible person knows, that whenever a power is withheld by the constitution from the states and from individuals and is conferred upon congress, it cannot be returned by congress to the parties from whom it is withheld. Congress is bound by oath and by the behests of the public welfare to exercise its prerogative and yet this important power under a Democratic and Republican rule has been wantonly farmed out to private corporations to be exercises for private gain. What a stupendous crime! The constitution provides that congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the several states. This power also was regarded as too important and so was taken away from both and lodged in congress. It is one of the most important and sacred trusts confided to the general government. Instead of exercising it a democratic and republican congress allowed the whole vast system of interstate commerce to be dominated by corporate vikings and associated plunderers whose open and gigantic robberies are without a parallel in the history of mankind. The vast commerce of this nation is regulated by them in defiance of the constitution, justice, fair dealing and mercy. If this robbery is to be permitted, the Declaration of Independence must not be taught. The Constitution and the New Testament should be committed to the flames.

The constitution provides; That no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any states, that no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one state over those of another. And yet it is known to all that the railroads in the exercise of their usurped power of regulating commerce practically levy the most enormous taxes upon articles exported from the several states. They discriminate against the inhabitants of one state in favor of those in another. By unfair rates they destroy the manufacturing interests in one locality in order to foster those of another. They bankrupt individuals to enrich others. Congress is forbidden to do these things and should the attempt be made it would be resisted by a revolution. But the democratic and republican parties permit the lords of rail and to commit these outrages openly
and with impunity. If these political robbers are permitted to
ply their calling, the doctrine of "equal rights" must be blot­
ted from the hearts of the people. They have squandered the
public domain, they have enslaved the people to debt, not only
the present generation, but generations yet unborn. They have
thrust millions of their fellow citizens out to starve and die,
and are now persecuting them because they are not good citizens.
They have struck down silver and by withholding an adequate
money supply they have made flesh and blood cheap, and gold
scarce and dear. They have dwarfed the fast growth of our civ­
ilization, driven hope from the hearts of millions, shaken the
faith of the world in free government, discouraged those who
sit in darkness in other lands, and strengthened the cause of
despotism in every part of the globe. They have refused to­
regulate commerce among the several states. They have fostered
monopoly and made it easy for a few to appropriate the wealth of
the many. Created millionaires by the thousands of cringing
paupers by the millions. They have grossly and terribly betray­
ed the trust of the people, and have made it possible for a lead­
ing politician of this state to pronounce the purification of
polities an "Iridescent Dream." They have made the constitution
a by-word, bedimmed the light of the stars in our glorious flag;
handed the commercial supremacy of the world to England; made
America an annex of Great Britain, and brought us fact to face
with a crisis in which liberty will be lost, or the people will
prevail by obtaining possession of the government and restoring
constitutional liberties guaranteed us by our forefathers. We
challenge the world to investigate these charges, and unhesi­
tatingly pronounce the democratic and republican parties traitors
to the constitution, and enemies to the liberty and prosperity
of the American people. We appeal to the American people to
pronounce sentence in the coming election, and record against
them on the wall of nations "weighed in the balance and found
wanting."

We challenge investigation of the demands and principles of the
reform party. The populist platform is full of life and mean­
ing. It is abreast with the living age. It deals in a plain,
practical, sensible way with the problems of the hour. They
build their political structure upon the four great pillars of
the Republic, Reverence for God, Reverence for Law, Reverence
for Man, Reverence for Woman.

Their demands are based upon equity, which is the self-­
evident truth upon which the constitution is based.

"Equal justice to all, special privileges to none."

They have sprung into existence to fulfill the "mandates of God
and the will of the sovereign people," and lead the nation up
to the broadest step in the prayer-worn, blood-stained march
of human progress that civilization has ever taken. They have
planted their standard and will maintain their line of battle
on the broad plateau of liberty, fraternity, equality, towards
which the eyes of every true American turn today with longing vision. Their platform of principles, their declaration of purposes are in harmony with the constitution and founded upon the basic principles of Christianity, appealing to the heart and judgment of an enlightened civilization to promote the best interests of humanity. Their rank and file is composed of those who believe in the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln. Their unity of thought and action is irresistible. They challenge the attention of the world, invite investigation the most searching, they stand for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio undisturbed and unvarying of 16 to 1; it is the only political party in existence that says to robber England, "Hands off our money; American finance for Americans!"

They demand abolition of banks of issue, a volume of money commensurate with the increasing population, a money resting upon the credit and resources of a prosperous nation, and having for its value not the quality or quantity of the perishable material of which it is composed, but relying solely upon the seal of authority, the stamp of the power of the government. The populists dare to follow the example of the Divine Teacher, Jesus Christ, and expel the money-changers from the temple. They demand that the highways of the nation's trade and commerce shall be owned and operated by the government in the interests of the people and not for the benefit of corporations, who have "no bodies to be kicked or souls to be saved." The people's party says there is no room in this nation under the provisions of the constitution of the associated plunderers, known as railroad corporations, rob and oppress the people, and they demand unequivocally, that the toll gates, through which the wealth producers must pass, shall be owned and operated by the government in the interests of the people. When transportation is conducted similarly to the post-office department, strikes and lock outs will be unknown. They demand that the lands, the heritage of the people, given in the lavish prodigality by the old parties to railroad corporations, and alien syndicates, be reclaimed and restored to the people. Thus they go back to the foundation upon which the government was placed, the primary right to live and labor upon the earth. In our neighboring county of Marion, Lord Scully, an English landlord, owns many thousands of acres of land. Not one acre of this vast tract of land can ever become the home of any one except a tenant, and no tenant can remove a bushel of corn, wheat, potatoes, or other products of his toil before paying rent, without incurring legal liability. "He that owns the land, owns the man that lives upon the land," and liberty is but a dream. The old parties have set up statute laws against the natural rights of man, and thus, through his image, they strike at God. All true reforms, says Mazzini, are religious. So the populists of today represent a demand for the enactment into law of the truths taught by Jesus; the truths which must prevail before Christ's kingdom can be established, and the earth made fit abode for man. And now were there but one reason given to show that the people's party is the only party that can solve the problems of the day,
and to prove that the other parties are inefficient and unwilling to do so, that reason or argument is found in the recent legislation and attitude of the old parties, and the demands of the populists on the all important question of money. The history of the world shows that a decrease in the volume of money, or scarcity of money, has been the cause of every social disorder, financial panic, commercial crisis, every great and general fall in prices and stagnation in business from the earliest steps in our civilization up to the present time. August 15, 1876, Congress created a commission, whose duty it should be to take into consideration the whole question of money, and the effect of an increasing or decreasing volume of money upon human affairs. This commission was composed of three democrats, and three republicans, and two financial experts as assistants. The report of this commission is well worthy the perusal of every earnest reader. It is an exhaustive and able treatise, and the facts and deductions contained therein were so at variance with the financial policy pursued by the democratic and republican parties, that it is so difficult to obtain a copy; it was evidently suppressed because of the truth it contained. Among other things, the commission says: (Quotation omitted). Compare these statements with the prophetic and tragic words of Senator Teller a few weeks ago, when the democrats and republicans combined to decrease the volume of money by destroying the money of the constitution, in the repeal of the Sherman law: "Mr. President, this is the most terrible moment of my legislative life; we are about to go through the valley of the shadow of death; we are entering upon a financial system, from which there is absolutely no escape. I want to warn the American people that if they do not resist, they will enter upon a system of industrial slavery that will be the worst known to the human race." Yet, despite the thundering lessons of history, despite the tragic workings and warnings of honest men, the democrats and republicans combined to decrease the volume of money and bring this unspeakable woe upon their own people. Have you heard the political representatives here denounce this crime of the centuries? Have you heard them demand an increase in the volume of money? No, but they have demanded the tariff, notwithstanding Senator Ingalls tell us that "the tariff amounts to no more than a fly on a cart wheel." Yet these learned gentlemen, either one of which could represent both parties with equal accuracy, have no other remedy to offer than a discussion of the tariff, as it relates to wages and profit. They are building on the sand while the floods are raging about them. They have no solution to offer for the problems, and they are about to perish in the ruin they have wrought. The populists demand a trinity of finance, gold, silver and paper in sufficient quantity to free the people of this nation from the exactions of the usurer, and the tyranny of the bondholder. They say to Shylock, "Take every iota of your pound of flesh, but on your peril, not one drop of American blood," Garfield says, "whoever controls the volume of money is absolute master of all industry and commerce." The old parties have decreased the supply, given a privileged few the control
of the circulating medium, and thus bound labor hand and foot to
the car of greed. The demand of the populists of the day is the
question "voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye
the way of the Lord." Men may fail, but eternal truths and
principles shall live and triumph. Discussions will end in vic-
tory; investigation will bring conviction; agitation is bearing
fruit, and finally through sorrow and oppression, the people will,
in the public capacity say that "since all wealth is produced by
labor, the laborers shall enjoy what they produce." They shall
say and enforce by ballot, "The general government shall take
entire charge of the money business, the facilities for trans-
portation and the transmission of intelligence and conduct them
for the general good." "Each for all and all for each." The
populists have turned their faces toward the light, and are mar-
shalling the hosts of freedom along this line. They offer the
only solution of conflicting ills and existing problems; their
demands are religious as well as political, and every man who
accepts the teachings of the divine and gentle Master, must
believe in their principles. Calm and consciousness of being
right, secure in the common sense the common honesty of the peo-
ple, they work and wait for that good time soon to be when the
Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of man shall prevail.
MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT
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you know that in these modern years there has been a great deal of talk about natural rights, and we have had an numerous host of philosophers writing books to tell us what natural rights are. I believe that today both scientists and philosophers are agreed that they are the right to life, the right to liberty, the right to speech, the right to go where you will and when you please, the right to earn your own living and the right to do the best you can for yourself. One of the greatest of these philosophers and writers, Herbert Spencer, has accorded to woman the same natural rights as to man. I believe, every thoughtful man in the United States concedes that point.

The ballot has been for man a means of defending the natural rights. Even now, in some of the localities of the world these rights are still defended by the revolver, as in former days, but peaceable communities the ballot is the weapon by means of which they are protected. We find, as women citizens, that when we are wronged, when our rights are infringed upon, inasmuch as we have not this weapon with which to defend them, they are not considered, and we are very many times imposed upon. We find that the true liberty of the American people demands that all citizens to whom these right have been accorded should have that weapon.

(The Speech from here on was taken up by other women of the delegation).
MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

Declaration of Principles 1904

The following Declaration of Principles, prepared by Mrs. Catt, was adopted by the convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association in 1904.

When our forefathers gained the victory in a seven years' war to establish the principle that representation should go hand in hand with taxation, they marked a new epoch in the history of man; but though our foremothers bore an equal part in that long conflict its triumph brought to them no added rights and throughout the following century and a quarter, taxation without representation has been continuously imposed on women by as great tyranny as King George exercised over the American colonists.

So long as no married woman was permitted to own property and all women were barred from the money-making occupations this discrimination did not seem so invidious; but to-day the situation is without a parallel. The women of the United States now pay taxes on real and personal estate valued at billions of dollars. In a number of individual States their holdings amount to many millions. Everywhere they are accumulating property. In hundreds of places they form one-third of the tax-payers, with the number constantly increasing, and yet they are absolutely without representation in the affair of the nation, of the State even of the community in which they live and pay taxes. We enter our protest against this injustice and we demand that the immortal principles established by the War of the Revolution shall be applied equally to women and men citizens.

As our new republic passed into a higher stage of development the gross inequality became apparent of giving representation to capital and denying it to labor; therefore the fight to suffrage was extended to the workingman. Now we demand for the 1,000,000 wage-earning women of our country the same protection of the ballot as is possessed by the wage-earning man.

The founders took an even broader view of human rights when they declared that government could justly derive its powers only from the consent of the governed, and for 135 years this grand assertion was regarded as a corner-stone of the republic with scarcely a recognition of the fact that one-half of the citizens were as completely governed without their consent as were the people of any absolute monarchy in existence. It was only when our government was extended over alien races in foreign countries that our people awoke to the meaning of
the principles of the Declaration of Independence. In response to its provisions, the Congress of the United States hastened to invest with the power of consent the men of this new territory, but committed the flagrant injustice of withholding it from the women. We demand that the ballot shall be extended to the women of our foreign possessions on the same terms as to the men. Furthermore, we demand that the women of the United States shall no longer suffer the degradation of being held not so competent to exercise the suffrage as a Filipino, a Hawaiian or a Porto Rican man.

The remaining Territories within the United States are insisting upon admission into the Union on the ground that their citizens desire "the right to select their own governing officials, choose their own judges, name those who are to make their laws and levy, collect, and disburse their taxes." These are just and commendable desires but we demand that their women shall have full recognition as citizens when these Territories are admitted and that their constitutions shall secure to women precisely the same rights as to men.

When our government was founded the rudiments of education were thought sufficient for women, since their entire time was absorbed in the multitude of household duties. Now the number of girls graduated by the high schools greatly exceeds the number of boys in every State and the percentage of women students in the colleges is vastly larger than that of men. Meanwhile most of the domestic industries have been taken from the homes to the factory and hundreds of thousands of women have followed them there, while the more highly trained have entered the professions and other avenues of skilled labor. We demand that under this new regime, and in view of these changed conditions in which she is so important a factor woman shall have a vote in the solution of their unnumerable problems.

The laws of practically every State provide that the husband shall select the place of residence for the family, and if the wife refuse to abide by this choice she forfeits her right to support and her refusal shall be regarded as desertion. We protest against the recent decision of the courts which has added to this injustice by requiring that the wife also accept for herself the citizenship preferred by her husband, thus compelling a woman born in the United States to lose her nationality if her husband choose to declare his allegiance to a foreign country.

As women form two-thirds of the church membership of the entire nation; as they constitute but one-eleventh of the convicts; criminal; as they are rapidly becoming the educated class and as the salvation of our government depends upon a moral, law-abiding, educated electorate, we demand for the sake of its integrity and permanence that women be made a part of its voting body.
In brief, we demand that all constitutional and legal barriers shall be removed which deny to women any individual right or personal freedom which is granted to man. This we ask in the name of a democratic and a republican government, which, its constitution declares, was formed "to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty."
MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

Appeal for Action-1904

When the constitution of Colorado was first made in 1876 a provision was placed in it that at any time the Legislature might enfranchise the women by a referendum of a law to the voters. That was done in 1893 and it passed by 6,000 majority. Last year an amendment to the constitution was submitted to the electors, now both men and women, concerning the qualifications for the vote and in it there was included, of course, the recognition of the enfranchisement of women quite as much as that of men, so that it was virtually a woman suffrage amendment. It received the majority of 35,000 showing certainly that after ten years of experience of the people, they were willing to put woman suffrage in the constitution, where it became an integral part of it and permanent.

When the American constitution was formulated it was the first of its kind and this was the first republic of its kind. Man suffrage was an experiment and it was considered universally a very doubtful one. We find overwhelming evidence that the thinkers of the world feared that if this republic should fail to live it would come to its end through the instability of the minds of men and that revolutionary thought would arise to overturn the government. We find it in George Washington and Benjamin Franklin and all of our statesmen as well as those who were watching the experiment here so anxiously from across the sea. What was the result? The result was they made a constitution just as ironclad as they could, so as to prevent its amendment. They made it as difficult for the fundamental of the nation to be changed as they knew how to do it ...........

Those of us who wish to enter the political life, who believe that we have quite as good a right to express ourselves there as any man -- what is our position? Within the last century there has been extension after extension of the suffrage, and every one has put suffrage for women further off . . . .........

Do you not see that while in this country there are millions of people who believe in the enfranchisement of women, while there is more sentiment for it than in any other, yet we are restricted by this stone wall of constitutional limitations which was set at a time when a republican form of government was totally untried? Because of this we find ourselves distanced by monarchies and the women enfranchised in other lands are coming to us to express their pity and sympathy....So I ask that you will this time make a report of the House of Representatives and if you do not believe that we are right, for Heaven's sakes make an adverse report. Anything will be more satisfactory than
the indifference with which we have been treated for many years. Do at least recognize that we have a cause, that there are women here whose hearts are aching because they see great movements to which they desire to give their help and yet they are
claimed down to work for the power that is not yet within their hands.... If you, Mr. Chairman, feel that you cannot offer a favorable report because the majority of the committee do not favor-able, then I beg of you, in the behalf of the women of
the United States, to show where you stand and to give an adverse report.

(The following is an extract of Mr. Catt called "The New Time"
1905)

This is a glorious Fourth of July. In a hundred years the
United States has grown into a mighty nation. This last has been
a century of wonderful material development, but we celebrate
not for this. July 4 commemorates the birth of a great idea.
All over the world, wherever there is a band of revolutionists
today they celebrate our Fourth. The idea existed in a world
before but it was never expressed in clear, succinct, intelligible language until the American republic came into being...
Taxation without representation is tyranny, it always was
tyranny, it always will be tyranny, and it makes no difference
whether it be the taxation of black or white, rich or poor,
high or low, man or woman ......... The United States has lost
its place as the leading exponent of democracy. Australia and
New Zealand have out-Americanized America. Let us not For-
set that progress does not cease with the 20th century.
We may our institutions are liberal and just. They may be lib-
eral but they are not just for they are not derived from the
consent of those governed. What is your own mental attitude to-
ward progress? If you should meet a new idea in the dark, what
would you do? Robespierre said that the only way to regenerate
a nation was over a heap of dead bodies but in a republic the
way to do it is over a heap of pure, white ballots.
MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

Eulogy on Susan B. Anthony


Every century has produced a few men and women whose memories the world has adjudged worthy of perpetuation. The dear friend who has gone from us was one of our century's immortals. Both friends and foes of the causes she espoused are agreed that this honor is hers. Her eighty-six years measure a movement whose result have been more far-reaching in the change of conditions, social and civil and political, than those of any war of revolution since history began.

When this woman opened her eyes upon the light of our world there was scarce a civilized nation whose standards were not tainted by the protection of human slavery somewhere within its domain. Not a woman was there in any land, or among any people, who did not live under the shadow of oppression of laws and customs which should have been found alone in barbarism. When Miss Anthony laid down her self-appointed task of uplifting the world to a more just order of things, these inequities had passed away as the result of that mighty movement. There is today an infinitely broader field of opportunity, of happiness and of usefulness for women than when she came. There is an immeasurably sounder, healthier and more rational relationship between the sexes than when she began her work. There is a higher womanhood, a nobler manhood and a better humanity. This woman for a large part of half-a-century was the chief inspiration, counsellor and guide of that movement. Few workers have been privileged to see such large results from their labor.

There were great women associated with her from time to time, women of wonderful intellect, of superb power, of grand character, and yet she was the greatest of them all, the greatest woman of our century, and perhaps the greatest of all times. Although she possessed intellectual attributes in full measure and was an acknowledged power upon the platform, there were other women equally well endowed. Her greatness lay in that rare qualities of her character, which have not been duplicated in any other leader.

Well do I remember my first intimate work with Miss Anthony sixteen years ago in a campaign in South Dakota. She was then seventy years of age. Should we hear of man or woman of those years today going into a new and sparsely settled country to conduct a campaign we should marvel at it. Yet so full of energy and determination was she that no one thought of her age. She remained there for months, living under hardships and privations of which she never complained. Toward the close of that campaign, women began to whisper to each other and to say:
"Oh, if we lose this amendment it will kill Miss Anthony. She has so set her heart upon it that at her time of life and shock of defeat will surely prove fatal." So we all redoubled our efforts, working no longer for the cause alone but for her sake as well. The day after the vote was taken, we gathered in headquarters at Huron to hear the returns. As the reports piled up the adverse results, Miss Anthony passed from one to another, giving a cheerful word everywhere, smiling always, and bringing back the fleeting courage of all with her strong, "Never mind never mind, there will be another time. Cheer up, the world will not always view our question as it does now! By and by there will be victory." This incident is indicative of her true greatness.

It was that hope when others saw nothing to hope for; that splendid optimism which never knew despair; that faith which never forgot the eternal righteousness of her cause; that courage which never recognized disappointment, that tenacity of purpose which never permitted her to deflect in the slightest from the main object of her life, which combined to make her greater than others. This is the combination of a Savonarola or a Bruno. She never knew defeat. When that happened which other called defeat, she has what to think of it merely as the establishment of a mile post to indicate the progress which had been made, and she never doubted that victory was just ahead.

We had hoped that this wonderful woman might remain with us for many years to come. We believed that our hopes were warranted by the youth which she preserved in spite of her advancing years, and by the activity and ardor which never forsok her. We had hoped that she might see the full fruition of her desires. All over the world there had been prayer without ceasing that she might remain until her dearest hope should become an established fact; But I believe I speak for all enlightened womanhood when I say that we almost forget the grief and disappointment in the prayer of thanksgiving that this great soul has been permitted to live even thus long and to give its splendid services to the world. We realize that her life has given to many nations a higher perception of life and duty and that it has lifted society to a higher plane, and we are grateful. We are rejoiced that she was permitted to make her life a continual and triumphal march of well-doing until the very end.

She seemed to have been especially called to do a work which none but her could do. That work was not completed; but where in the beginning there was but a tiny force of workers, not there is a vast army to carry it on. This army has its leader, a superb and fearless leader, and I feel sure that I speak for every man and woman in this army when I say that we, one and all, at the grave of her whom we have loved, pledge anew our loyalty to the leader and fresh devotion to our common cause. Perhaps, then, the world did not need her any more. Perhaps she could now be spared to go to her well-deserved rest.
But we mourn her today, and every heart aches that we must let her go. We admire, we revere, and we honor her because she was great, but we mourn her because we loved her. Who can tell why we love? There was something in her one may not describe which won our hearts as well as our devotion. Perhaps it was her simplicity, her forgetfulness of self, her thoughtfulness of others, which made us love her. We have not lost a leader alone, but a dear friend, whose place can never be filled. We shall never see her like again.

Had the poet wished to put into verse that which was the motto of her life, the spirit which always actuated her, he could not have worded it better than when he wrote:

"To the wrong that needs resistance,
To the right that needs assistance,
To the future of the distance
Live yourself."

We can pay her no higher tribute and build her no grander monument than to write those words in our hearts and make them the guide for the remainder of our lives, as we go on with the work she laid down.
Although the Constitution of the United States in section 3 of Article X seems to have relegated authority over the extension of the suffrage of the various States, yet, curiously, few men in the United States possess the suffrage because they or the class to which they belong have secured their right to it by State action. The first voters were those who possessed the right under the original charters granted by the mother country and as the restrictions were many, including religious tests in most of the colonies and property qualifications in all, the number of actual voters was exceedingly small. When it became necessary at the close of the Revolution to form a federation for the "common defense" and the promotion of the "general welfare", it was obvious that citizenship must be made national. To do this it became clearly necessary that religious tests must be abandoned, since Catholic Maryland, Quaker Pennsylvania and Congregational Massachusetts could be united under a common citizenship by no other method. The elimination of the religious test enfranchised a large number of men and this without a struggle for any movement in their behalf.

In 1790 the first naturalization law was passed by Congress. Under the Articles of Confederation citizenship had belonged to the States but since it was apparent that it must now be national, a compromise was made between the old idea of States rights and the new idea of Federal union. Each of the original States had its representatives in the convention which drafted the Federal Constitution and by common consent it was there planned that citizenship should carry with it the right to vote, although this was to be put into the State constitutions and not in the national. These delegates, influencing their own States in the forming of their constitutions, easily brought this about and without any movement on the part of those who were to be naturalised. This common understanding in the National Constitutional Convention and the Naturalization Act of Congress in 1790 certainly enfranchised somewhere between three-fourths and four-fifths of all men in the United States at this time.

The population of the colonies at the time of the Revolution was two and a half millions and even though all men had been voters the number could not have been more than seven or eight hundred thousand. By the census of 1800 there were 31,000,000 men of voting age in the United States. The Act, therefore, of the U. S. Government virtually enfranchised millions upon millions of men. Generations then unborn have come into the right of the suffrage in this country under the Act and men of every nationality have availed themselves of its privileges to be some voters.
Although, technically speaking, enfranchisement of the foreign-born was extended by the States, yet in reality it is obvious that the real granting of this privilege came from Congress itself. The thirteen original States retained their property qualifications after the formation of the Union and these were removed by State amendments. This extension of the suffrage was made in most cases many years ago, when the electorate was very small in numbers.

This history of the enfranchisement of the negro is well known. States attempted it by amendment of their constitutions but in no case was this accomplished. Congress undertook to secure it by national amendment and although this was ratified by the necessary three-fourths of the States Legislatures yet it must be remembered that all the southern States were virtually coerced into giving their consent. The Indians were enfranchised by Acts of Congress.

The evolution of man suffrage in the United States shows that but one class received their votes by direct State action—the non-property holders. They found political parties and statesmen to advocate their cause and their enfranchisement was made easy by State constitutional action.

In 140 years of our national life no class of men have been forced to organize a movement in behalf of their enfranchisement; they have offered no petition or plea or even given sign that the extension of suffrage to them would be acceptable. Yet American women, who have conducted a persistent, intelligent movement for a half-century, which has grown stronger and stronger for the past years, appealing for their own enfranchisement and are supported now by a petition of 400,000 citizens of the United States are told that it is unnecessary to consider their plea since all women do not want to vote. Is it not manifestly unfair to demand of women a test which has never in the case of men in this or any other country? Is it not true that the attitude of the Government toward an unenfranchised class of men has ever been that the vote is a privilege to be extended and it is optional with the citizen whether or not he shall use it? If any proof is needed it can be found in the fact that the U. S. Government has no record whatever of the number who have been naturalized in this country. It has no record of the number of Indians who have accepted its offer to vote as a reward for taking up land in severalty. Manifestly the Government, is represented by Congress and the State Legislatures, considers it entirely unnecessary to know whether men who have had the suffrage "thrust upon them" use it or not, but imperative that women must not only demand it in very large numbers but give guaranty that they will use it, before its extension shall be made to them.

Is it not likewise unfair to compel women to seek their enfran-
obscenity by methods infinitely more difficult than those by means of which any man in this country has secured his right to a vote? Ordinary fair play should compel every believer in democracy and individual liberty, no matter what are his views on woman suffrage, to grant to women the easiest process of enfranchisement and that is the submission of a federal Amendment.
MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

Address to Senate Hearing
Dec. 15, 1915

From the "History of Woman Suffrage" Vol. V, --pp. 753-754.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee:

Since our last appeal was made to your committee a vote has been taken in four Eastern States upon the question of amending their constitutions for woman suffrage. The inaction of Congress is not submitting a Federal amendment naturally leads us to infer that members believe the proper method by which women may secure the vote is through the referendum. We found in those four States what has always been true behavior whenever any class of people have asked for any form of liberty and was best described by Macaulay when he said: "If a people are turbulent they are unfit for liberty; if they are quiet, they do not want it." We met a curious dilemma. On the one hand a great many men voted in the negative because women in Great Britain had made too emphatic demand for the vote. Since they made that demand it is reported that 10,000,000 men have been killed, wounded or are missing through militant action, but all of that is held as naught compared with the burning of a few vacant buildings. Evidently the logic that these American men followed was: Since some turbulent women in another land are unfit to vote, no American woman shall vote. There was no reasoning that could change the attitude of those men. On the other hand the great majority of the men who voted against it, as well as the great majority of the members of Legislatures and Congress who oppose this movement, hold that women have given no signal that they want to vote. Between the horns of this amazing dilemma the Federal amendment and State suffrage seem to be caught fast.

So those of us who want to learn how to obtain the vote have naturally asked ourselves over and over again what kind of a demand can be made. We get nothing by "watchful waiting" and if we are turbulent we are pronounced unfit to vote. We turned to history to learn what kind of demand the men of our own country made and determined to do what they had done. The census of 1910 reported 27,000,000 males over 31. Of these 3,500,000 are direct descendants of the population of 1800; 2,458,973 are negroes; 15,040,378 are aliens, naturalized or descendants of naturalized citizens since 1800. The last two classes compose two-thirds of the male population over 31. The enfranchisement of negro men is such recent history that it is unnecessary to repeat here that they had made no demand for the vote. The naturalization laws give citizenship to any man who chooses to make a residence of this country for five years and automatically every man who is a citizen becomes a voter in the State of his residence. In the 115 years since 1800 not one single foreigner has ever asked whether he wanted to vote or not. It had been
literally been thrust upon him. Two-thirds of our men of voting age today have not only made no demand for the vote but they have never been asked to give any evidence of capacity to use it intelligently.

We turned again to history to see how the men who lived in this country in 1690 got their votes. At that time 5 per cent of the total population were voters in New York as compared with 25 per cent now. There was a struggle in all the colonial States to broaden the suffrage. New York seemed always to have lagged behind and others and therefore it forms a good example. It was next to the last State to remove the land qualification and it was not a leader in the extension of the suffrage to any class.

In 1740 the British Parliament disqualified the Catholics for naturalization in this country. That enactment had been preceded in several of the States by their definite disfranchisement. In 1699 they were disfranchised by an Act of the Assembly of New York. Although the writers on the early franchise say that Jews were not permitted to vote anywhere in this country in 1701, as they certainly were not in England, yet occasionally they apparently did so. In New York that year there was a definite enactment enfranchising granted to them. In 1737 the Assembly passed another disfranchising Act. Catholics and Jews were disfranchised in most States. It is interesting to learn how they became enfranchised. One would naturally suppose that together or separately they would make some great demand for political equality with Protestants but there is no record that they did. I find that the reason why our country became so liberal to them was not because there was any demand on their part and not because there was any special advocacy of their enfranchisement by statesmen. It was due to the fact that in the revolution, Great Britain, having difficulty with the American Colonies on the south side of the St. Lawrence River, did as every belligerent country does and tried to hold Canada to by granting her favors. In order to make the Canadian colonies secure against revolution the British Parliament, which had previously disfranchised the Catholics and the Jews, now extended a vote to them. The American Constitution makers could not do less than Britain had done, and so in every one of the thirteen states they were guaranteed political equality with Protestants.

The next great movement was the elimination of the land qualification and in this we find that history is practically silent. In Connecticut and Rhode Island a small petition was presented to the Assembly asking for its removal. In New York in the constitutional convention of 1821 when some members advocated its removal others asked: "Where is the demand? Who wants to vote that has no land?" That answer was that there had been some meetings in New York in behalf of removing this qualification. Not one of them had seen such a meeting but some members heard that a few had been held in the central districts
of the State. This constitutes the entire demand that has been made by the men of our country for the vote.

In contrast we may ask what have women done? Again I may say that New York is a fair example because it is the largest of States in population and has the second city in size in the world and occupies perhaps the most important position in any land in which suffrage referendum has been taken. Women held during the six months prior to the election in 1915, 10,300 meetings. They printed and circulated 7,500,000 leaflets weighed more than twenty tons. They had 777 treasuries in the State among the different groups doing suffrage work and every bookkeeper except two was a volunteer. Women by the thousands contributed to the funds of that campaign, in one group 12,000 public school teachers. On election day 6,330 women watched at the polls from 5:45 in the morning until after the vote was counted. I was on duty myself from 5:30 until midnite. There were 2,500 campaign officers in the State who gave their time without pay. The publicity features were none more numerous and unique than any campaign of men or women had ever had. They culminated in a parade in New York City which was organized without any effort to secure women outside the city to participate in it, yet 30,000 marched through Fifth Avenue to give some idea of the size of their demand for the vote.

What was the result? If we take the last announcement from the board of elections the suffrage amendment received 535,000 votes 33,000 more than the total vote of the nine states where women now have suffrage through a referendum. It was not submitted in Wyoming, Utah or Illinois.

These are some of the conditions women must overcome in a referendum. One can eventually be carried even in New York but we believe we have made all the sacrifices which a just Government ought to expect of us. Even the Federal Amendment is difficult enough, with the ratification of 36 legislatures required, but we may at least appeal to a higher class of men. We were obliged to make our campaign in twenty-four different languages. ... It is too unfair and humiliating treatment of American women to compel us to appeal to the man of all nations of the earth for the vote which has been so freely and cheaply given to them. We believe that we ought to have the benefit of the method provided by the Federal Constitution.
To the Nat. Am. Conv. 1913 from "Hist. of Woman Suffrage" Vol V526-8

If the Governor is a Republican tell him that it had not been that two Republican Senators, Borah of Idaho and Wadsworth of New York, refused to represent their States as indicated by votes at the polls, resolutions by their Legislatures and planks in their party platforms, the suffrage amendment would have passed the 65th Congress. It then would have come into the regular sessions of forty-two Legislatures with more than thirty-six pledged to ratify and without a cent of extra cost to any State! When a Republican Governor calls an extra session in order to ratify he merely atones for the conduct of two members of his own party. They, not he, are to blame that it became necessary. If the Governor is Democratic say that had it not been for two Northern Democratic Senators, Pomerene of Ohio and Hitchcock of Nebraska, who refused to represent their States on the question as indicated by their Legislatures and platforms, Congress would have sent the amendment to the 1919 Legislatures and it would have cost the State nothing. The Democratic Governor who calls a special session only makes honorable amends for their misrepresentation of members of his own party.

We should be more than glad and grateful today, we should be proud -- proud that our fifty-one years of organized endeavor have been clear, constructive, conscientious. Our association never resorted to lies, innuendoes, misrepresentation. It never accused its opponents of being free lovers, pro-Germans and Bolsheviks. It marched forward even when its forces were most disorganized by disaster. It always met argument with argument, honest objection with proof of error. In fifty years it never failed to send its representatives to plead our cause before every national political convention, although they went knowing that the prejudice they would meet was impenetrable and the response would be ridicule and condemnation. It went to the rescue of every state campaign for half a century with such forces as it could command, even when realizing there was no hope. In every corner it sowed the seeds of justice and trusted to time to bring the harvest. It has aided boys in high school with debate and later heard their votes of "yes" in legislatures. Reporters assigned to our Washington conventions long, long ago, took their places at the press table on the first with contempt and ridicule in their hearts but went out the last day won to our cause and later became editors of newspapers and spoke to thousands in our behalf. Girls came to our meetings, listened and accepted, and later as mature women became intrepid leaders.

In all the years this association has never paid a national lobbyist, and, so far as I know, no State has paid a legislative lobbyist. During the fifty years it has rarely had a salaried officer and even if she has been paid less than her earnings capacity elsewhere. It has been an army of volunteers who have estimated no sacrifice too great, no service too difficult.
speech as president of international woman suffrage alliance

from "history of woman suffrage" vol. v pp. 469-470.

Mr. chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I fear that the hearings before this Judiciary Committee have become in the eyes and understanding of many of the members a rather perfunctory affair which you have to endure. May I remind you that since the last hearing something new has happened in the United States and that is that more than a million men have voted for woman suffrage in four of the most conservative States of the East? I consider that that big vote presents to this committee a mandate for action which was never presented before. There are those, doubtless, who will say that this is a question of State rights. I have been studying Congressmen for a good many years and I have discovered that when a man believes in woman suffrage it is a national question and when he does not believe in it he says it is a question for the States.

Mr. Catt told of the prominent educator who was sent from Belgium to investigate the working of woman suffrage in the United States and after he had made a visit to the States where it existed he summed up the result by saying: "I am convinced in favor of the votes but my heart is still opposed." There are members of this committee," she says, "who are governed by the head instead of by their hearts" she continued.

Gentlemen, this movement has grown bigger and stronger as the years have passed by until today millions of women are asking in all the States for the vote. The president of Cornell University, Dr. Schurman, said that the reason for now aggressively advocating woman suffrage was because he had discovered in studying history that it was never good for a government to have a restless and dissatisfied class; he had made up his mind that the women of the nation did think that they had grievances, whether they had none or not, and he believed that a government was stronger and safer when grievances were relieved.

A few days before the election in order to show that the women wanted to vote there was a parade in New York City and 20,000 marched up Fifth Avenue, among them a great number of public school teachers of the city, 13,000 of whom had contributed to our campaign funds. These women have the most difficult problems they are teaching all that the new-comers know of citizenship and they were asking their share in that citizenship and they a man whose name is known to every one of you was sitting at the window of a clubhouse watching the women pass hour after hour until at last this great group of teachers, sixteen abreast marched by with their banners. He looked out upon them and what do you think he said, "I am convinced that the women of
New York do want to vote and I will help them?" That is what an honorable American citizen, an open-minded man, would have said. Instead he exclaimed: "My God! I never realized what a menace the woman suffrage movement is to this country! We have got to do something next Tuesday to keep the women from getting the vote."

There is not a man on this committee or in this House who can produce a single argument against woman suffrage that will hold water, and the thing that is rousing the women of this land continually and making them realize that our Government visits down on us a daily injustice is that the doors of our ports are left wide open and the men of all the nations on earth are permitted to enter and receive the franchise. In New York City women must ask for it in twenty-four languages. . . . . . .
Only Yesterday

To the International Congress of Women, Chicago, Illiniois, July 16-22, 1933. From "Our Common Cause Civilization" published by the National Council of Women of the United States, New York City.

I belong to a generation that has done its work and is now rapidly going out. You belong, or some of your society belong, to a generation that is coming in. I am very sure the Program Committee, in assigning to me the poetic subject, "Only Yesterday," pictured a grandmother of venerable age, telling sweet tales at the fireside, with her grandchildren at her feet — I, being the grandmother, and you the children.

But, alas, we are not here to listen to stories. We have come to solve the baffling problems of civilisation. And yet, I was told to bring you a message out of the past and I do not dare disobey.

To you who are going to do the work of your generation, let me say that whatever happens in the next fifty years, be it for better or worse, gain or loss, it will be the responsibility of your generation. Perhaps it looks easy to you now, and you are thinking of what you want to make right in the world, and how to do it. You may go on and think you are thinking right and think you are doing right, but perhaps the people of the other side will come to a contrary conclusion on the same subject, and when the time comes for you to go, that other side may have won, and you may have lost in the struggle.

If we could only come into the world knowing as much as we all think we know when we go, civilization might move on at a whizzing speed, but because we are always in a state of controversy, never sure what is right or what to do, civilization will continue to move at snail's pace.

Did you ever hear the story of a woman's revolution in this country? Did you know there was one? It is not strange for you who have come from other lands not to know this bit of history, but I will warrant there is many an American woman here tonight who has never heard of it. So, out of the past, I chose that bit of history to bring to you, in hope that you might take an interest in it and next time, know it.

I was one of those old ones here when the Congress of Women was held forty years ago. There are few of us left, but the greatest enjoyment, in this Congress, is the comparison between the women of this day and those of forty years ago.

I well remember when that Congress began. I had a very good seat, well down in front. It was a grand sight to all of us young women — I was forty years younger, at least, than I am now — the great number of foreign females. They looked
so interesting to us. And so, on that morning, when all of them were to come upon the platform and be introduced, we were there looking at them with admiration.

In those days, every woman wore a train, and the foreign women's trains were far longer and wider than the women of this country wore. As those women went up upon the stage we had an opportunity to see their costumes in full, and we found it very interesting. But, alas, the building in which the Congress was to be held was not yet completed, and all over the platform there was dust and rubbish and shavings. So when each woman came forward to make her little speech, she came in a cloud of dust, and upon her train were piled high and the shavings that lay about.

I tell you that story to you because it seemed to me strange how clearly I could remember it. I can fairly see every shaving on their trains.

I found that there was a suffrage meeting in that Congress, and that I was on the program, but I have no recollection of such a meeting or of making such a speech. Yet I remember those shavings very well.

Let me return to the revolution. It was in the year 1876. Our nation was one hundred years old, and we were going to celebrate the occasion with the grandest ceremonies our country could devise. In connection with it, there was an exposition held in Philadelphia, on July 4, in Independence Square, thence came that charter of American liberty we know as the Declaration of Independence.

They sent from end to end of this country, from ocean to ocean, all our orators, to tell people about this great event and to revive interest in the Declaration of Independence. So it happened that on New Year's night, there were celebrations in every city town and village in the land. There was noise and there was oratory, there were fireworks, there the Declaration, and when the people went home for breakfast, after a night of revelry, they had had a new experience.

They had welcomed in the Centennial Year. Under the influence of that boastful oratory; the pride of men mounted higher and higher, but the humiliation of women sunk lower and lower, for they were never mentioned; no one ever said anything about them. It was all a business of men.

When it was time for the Exposition and for the great celebration, there had been three years of talk among the women as to what they had better do. Some of them thought the wisest thing was to dress a great many women in black and have them walk up and down the streets of every town where there was a celebration. There were others who said it would be better to have men dressed in sackcloth and ashes, sitting.
The most brilliant suggestion was that, if men wanted to glorify themselves and their nation, they ought to give to women the same rights, privileges and immunities they had enjoyed for themselves.

By and by, the women thought that these and many other suggestions were not very practical and they continued to talk until they came to an agreement. They began with a desire to have a headquarters in Philadelphia, and they went, in a delegation, to find a place. They found it — a house owned by a woman. The house had a large double parlors, suitable for meetings. They agreed to rent the place. The contract was drawn. But, in Pennsylvania, under the laws of 1876, a husband had to confirm any contract made by his wife, and, when this woman’s husband saw that contract, he went into a towering rage and tore it into shreds. He said he would never allow such outlandish women as these to occupy his wife’s house.

It isn’t an interesting story; it only tells you the status, the legal status of the women of this country in most of our states, as short a time ago as 1876.

The women found another place, and there they kept on talking. They finally concluded that they would draw up a woman’s Declaration of Independence. They said, “If the old Declaration does not include women, let us have one that will!”

So they drew it up, and they asked the privilege of a place on the official program, where they might read this new Declaration. Strangely enough, it was not granted. They went to have a personal interview with the Chairman of the Commission that had the Exposition in charge, and, he said, “If you were to be allowed to speak and read your Declaration on that platform, everybody in the United States would remember it and forget everything else on the program.”

So they went home and again asked those in authority to give them fifty tickets for the platform. I have not been able to ascertain what they intended to do with those fifty tickets, but the men in charge apparently thought it was some dangerous conspiracy, and they did not grant so much as one. By some process, however, the women did secure five tickets, and five officers, under the leadership of Susan B. Anthony, entered the great place where the celebration was to be held.

They pressed forward toward the platform. There was such a crowd that nobody noticed them. And there they stood,
quite near the platform, while Richard Lee read the Declaration from the original document, crumpled as it was, held in place by a frame.

When he had finished, this document was held up for the audience to see. The audience rose; men tossed up their hats, and cheers followed cheer. It was the opportunity of all the stars for the women's movement, just them. The women pressed forward, and the men, standing in the aisles, not knowing why they wanted to reach the platform, but supposing they had good reason, helped them along and made way for them.

The Vice-President of the United States was presiding, and he saw them coming. It is said that he turned deathly pale, but before he could think what to do, Susan B. Anthony stood before him. At that moment, the Chairman of the whole commission, at the other end of the platform, called out with an angry voice, "Order! Order!" He meant for the women to keep still, but all over the great audience they thought he was advising them to be silent in order that the women might have an opportunity to be heard.

Other men repeated after him, "Order! Order!" and suddenly there was a mighty silence, and at that moment in a clear voice, Susan B. Anthony handed to the Vice-President of the United States, a long roll, all tied in red, white and blue, and said, "I hand to you, the Chairman of this meeting, this Declaration of Women's Independence, and I do it because the one you have heard is for men only.

At that point, she turned, and all the women marched away handing out left and right, printed copies of this Declaration;

Outside, they found a platform built for musicians. They mounted it, and there, under the broiling July sun, Susan B. Anthony read the Women's Declaration, while another one of the five held a great umbrella over head. As soon as she had completed it, they went on their way, handing out more copies as they went. They found their way to a church where a meeting had been called at twelve o'clock noon, and the people were overflowing into the streets for there they were to hear these officers tell their experiences. Lucretia Mott, in her eighty-fourth year presided. Mrs. Stanton read the Women's Declaration! The officers had gone to the official program recited how they had taken it there, and thus made it part of the officials proceedings.

Then came the speakers. Because so many of you think the Suffrage Movement began about 1910, that it evolved and grew out of the Temperance Movement or the Club or some other movement. I give this personal word. The Suffrage Movement was the oldest all the movements among women in
I have traveled the trails of Woman Suffrage campaigns for forty-six years, and yet I did not arrive in the world in time to see twenty-three of the thirty-one women who signed the Woman's Declaration.

I say this in order that you may realize what a long time it has been to reach the justice of equality for women.

Well, these speakers were mostly there, these thirty-one women, and many others; and they made their speeches one after another, and, as I have said it, it seems to me the most thrilling, most impassioned, most powerful programs of speeches that ever have taken place.

For five consecutive hours, that audience sat and listened. Meanwhile, William Evarts, the renowned orator and Secretary of State, was speaking over in the Square, and making a very honored, finished, cultured address, telling of the great achievements of this your nation and of the remarkable people who lived here. But the women's program was far more impassioned, for they were aggrieved, they felt cheated, they were wronged, and they were in a spirit of high rebellion. They read their Declaration, and when the Hutchinsons, made famous in the war, the Civil War, arose to sing their most famous song "A hundred Years Hence," I must read that to you if I can find it -- it was not until then that they would consent to adjourn, after five hours.

The women stayed all summer. They had meetings in their parlors, twice a week, and the women who came to the Exposition visited them in large numbers. They signed the Declarations by hundreds; they enlisted in the cause. They went home to carry on.

This is the song:

One hundred years hence, what a change will be made
In politics, morals, religion and trade;
In statesmen who wrangle or ride on the fence,
These all will be altered a hundred years hence.

(second stanza omitted)

Whenever men of the Commission thought of the incident which had disturbed them, it was not in a happy frame of mind. They never knew that what had happened on that Fourth of July had been not an interruption of a program but a revolution.

There was the same old Declaration of Independence, with its list of grievances. There was the same program of wrongs to be righted. There was a small army behind it all and it moved on! The only difference between that revolution and a man's revolution, was that there were no guns and no desire to kill anybody.
They went on, and forty-four years later, that Declaration carried in toto for all those years, not the vote alone but all the rest of the wrongs that ought to be righted. In forty-four years, that Declaration was adopted by the Nation.

You may put the two Declarations side by side, you may read them carefully, and you will find that in neither of them has there been a complete enforcement of what they said they stood for, but the Woman’s Declaration of 1876 has won a complete victory as did the man’s Declaration, made a hundred years earlier — and the women won without a gun, without a hospital, without a corpse, and without a tax. They have paid their way as they went and there was nothing to pay in their conclusion.

This is a story that perhaps you think has little bearing, because so many times women did things of curious character in that campaign. We used to call some of the things “stunts” that women did, like the king’s army that marched up and down the hill. They did it for the sake of advertising their cause. But these things were not at all like what happened in Philadelphia. There was no program, there were no grievances in Philadelphia. There was no program but a revolution, and it happened on July 4, 1876.

When those women separated that day, going each her own way, they never met again. It was a curious thing. The curtain fell over them, they were so old; the generation had come to an end. Susan B. Anthony, being younger, lived on and led for thirty years after, but the great majority of that group carried on since 1848, never met again. It was the woman’s victorious revolution.

And then came Chicago, in 1893. There are stories almost the same, but I will not stop to tell them to you. But, when that great fair was over, when the Congress of representative women came to an end, with all the congresses that went after the Woman’s Movement had been put upon its feet and the feet marched on and band played ever after, all the way, until together we marched in the final port of triumph of 1930. This is something of the message I would give you of our past.

But, curious as these stories may be, let me tell you that the Exposition of 1876 met under the dark clouds of depression almost as terrible as this. Three years before the Exposition was held in Chicago, there came the panic of 1890. Well, we have another now. Is it not a curious thing that an exposition, extravagant and costly, a panic and a boom for woman’s liberty, should come hand in hand at the same identical moment?

And yet, that is exactly what happened in ’76 and ’93.
I do not know what you are going to do to the Woman's Movement here today — perhaps nothing; perhaps something wonderful — but I do ask you, in conclusion, a question you cannot answer, a question to put to your generation. Your generation may evade it as other generations have, but if it does, it will leave civilization hanging on a dead bough, over a fire of brimstone. It is, in other words, the most terrible question that has yet been yet put to the human race, and it must be solved or you cannot build civilization. All your problems go to naught if you cannot find the answer —— what is it?

The question is this: Will the next exposition, the one which will take place in 1976, when we are 200 years old—will it come in the midst of a depression, or will your generations find how to abolish depressions? If you do, you will begin with the greatest cause of them, and the greatest cause of a depression is war, and always has been, and always will be.

Until the world is brave enough to put an end to war, and then proceed to find whether there are other causes that must be considered, we will go on with our depressions. I think we might endure another panic. Many people have said that civilization cannot stand it. I think we might, but we cannot endure another depression the world around.

Why is it that the world does not know that there is not enough and not credit enough in the world to conduct another international war? There was not enough last time and that is the difficulty now.

We are talking of recovery. Well, we must recover before we can have the pleasure of another war and another depression. But, in the meantime, the honest citizen will face the war question, not by saying "Let us work for peace; let us talk about peace," but "Let us begin at the very bottom and find out how we can prevent the depression." When you do that, you must go backward to the abolition of war.

Have you noticed it in all the books you read, and in all magazine articles, in all the talk you hear about this depression. But, in the meantime, the honest men will admit that they are too timid to face this problem, to bring ourselves face to face with it.

I have asked if I think Woman Suffrage has achieved anything? Why haven't the women done more than they have?

When you can explain why men go to Geneva to disarm, and stay there for two years and don't do it, when you can explain why men go to London to cure economic ills and then want to go home the next day without doing anything, then, I think, it is time that the men ask the women have not solved the
great problems of the world.

My dear friends, I want to say to you women that the difference between this Congress and the other was that you are no longer petitioners. They were, all the world around petitioners, forty years ago. Now you talk as though you had the equality of the citizen. You have a poise, a self-reliance, not an ability but a knowledge that is forty years ahead of that which the women had in 1893.

I believe that you must achieve bravery you have never had. I believe you drive men to do their duty concerning this question of war. I don't know how, but I don't see so much of faith or promise in men who did tell us at the end of the war that there should never be another. It doesn't seem to be coming that way. It is perhaps for you to do, to bring the problems of civilization to their solution and make an end of those that are more serious.
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The Modern City and
the Municipal Franchise

Given to the National American Convention in 1906. From the

Preface: It was at this meeting that Miss Jane Addams of Hull
House, Chicago, made the address on The Modern City and the Munici-
pal Franchise for Women, which was thenceforth a part of the
standard suffrage literature. Quotations are wholly inadequate.

It has been well said that the modern city is a stronghold of
industrialism quite as the feudal city was a stronghold of mil-
itarism, but the modern cities fear no enemies and rivals from
without and their problems of government are solely internal.
Affairs for the most part are going badly in these great new
centres, in which the quickly-congregated population has not
yet learned to arrange its affairs satisfactorily. Unsanitary
housing, poisonous sewage, contaminated water, infant
mortality, the spread of contagion, adulterated food, impure
milk, smoky laden-air, ill-ventilated factories, dangerous
occupations, juvenile crime, unwholesome crowding, prostitu-
tion and drunkenness are the enemies which the modern cities must
face and overcome, would they survive. Logically their elec-
torate should be made up of those who in the past have at
least attempted to care for children, to clean houses, to pre-
pare foods, to isolate the family for moral dangers; those
who have traditionally taken care of that side of life which in-
evitably becomes the object of municipal consideration and
control as soon as the population is congested. To test the
electorate's fitness to deal with this situation by his abili-
ty bear arms is absurd. These problems must be solved, if they
are solved at all, not from the military point of view, not even
from the industrial point of view, but from a third, which is r
apidly developing in all the great cities of the world -- the
human welfare point of view.

City housekeeping has failed partly because women, the tradi-
tional housekeepers, have not been consulted as to its multi-
form activities. The men have been carelessly indifferent to
much of this civic housekeeping, as they have always been in-
different to the details of the household...The very multiform-
ousness and complexity of a city government demand the help of
minds accustomed to detail and variety of work, to a sense of ob-
ligation for the health and welfare of young children and to a
responsibility for the cleanliness and comfort of other people.
Because all these things have traditionally been in the hands
of women, if they take no part in them now they are now only
missing the education which the natural participation in civic
life would bring to them but they are losing what they have
always had.
Memorial address to
Canon Samuel A. Barnett

Given to the American Federation of Settlements. From "The Ex­
cellent Becomes the Permanent" by J. Addams - Macmillan Co. 1932.

A memorial tablet to Canon Barnett has been placed in Westminister Abbey on which the bronze repeats the advice so dearly fami­
iliar to his friends, "Fear Not to Sow Because of the Birds." In high relief at the right end of the tablet stands forth a sower, the free gesture in a sweep of his arm reminiscent of Millet. Through the dress of a British farmer one recognizes the figure and head of Canon Barnett as if careless of ecclesiasticism even the the beloved abbey itself and eager to give the hard English soil one more sowing. While I stood looking at it one evening, stirred by its message and its beauty, yet daring to question a little the mixture of portraiture and symbolism, a working woman waiting near the organ loft to lead home her blind son, kindly explained the tablet to me. She told me that before he was made Canon of Westminster, he had lived with the very poor in Whitechapel of course understood the difficulties of working people so that all of those res­ponsible for keeping in order the abbey and the close "liked him the best."

As the rest of the world, she associated Canon Barnett with East London although she could not have known the difficulties he encountered there nor that they all proved but a stimulus to his ingenuity and resourcefulness. He was a Vicar of St. Jude's in Whitechapel when Toynbee Hall — the pioneer Univer­sity Settlement — through his efforts was opened at Christ­mas time in 1884. The year before at a great meeting held at Balliol College, Oxford, Samuel Barnett had made an impression on behalf of those masses of the people in the East End of London "who live without knowledge, without hope, and almost without health." Because Arnold Toynbee's old rooms at Bhamas College in the early eighties still constituted a cen­ter for much spirited talk in philosophy and economics, a group of men to whom the place was long familiar met there af­ter Canon Barnett's great sermon, and out of their aroused consciences and their tender memories of Arnold Toynbee's great hopes for the people, the plans for the first settlement em­erged.

This academic origin was reflected in the very structure of Toynbee Hall, which was built around a quadrange, reminiscent of Oxford as were also its library, its commons and general appointments. The young men who responded to Canon Barnett's clarion call and later actually went to live in what one them described as "The strange and dim outer world of East London," were not asked to give allegiance to any program of social re-
form nor did Canon Barnett appeal to self-sacrifice, or perhaps it was that he made the appeal completely, for one of the early Toynbee Hall men once said to me, "The warden insists that we must sacrifice the very feeling that are sacrificing."

Canon Barnett put his faith in men rather in measures, and considered personal contact with poverty as the indispensable and method of approach. Although he gave much time and effort to remedial legislation, he believed that the value of laws to a community lies not so much in their intrinsic merits as in their administration, and that this in turn depends upon personal qualities. He told the Oxford men that the English parish system which had assumed people of sufficient leisure and ability to carry through the administration of civil affairs and to contribute to the education and social welfare of the whole, had broken down in East London. Each parish in the poorer areas was inhabited only by the very poor. All of those who had obtained better positions in the world had incontinently moved to other districts. He asked the Oxford men to go into East London with him, not in order to patronize the poor population for whom life was already overburdened, nor primarily to teach them. He asked them to go there in order to become the good citizens without which crowded cities are unable to keep even the mere forms of self-government. He expected them to take up the social and civic duties which must be undertaken by someone if cultural forces are to find channels and instruments through which they can reach those who have every right to their beneficence.

Perhaps Canon Barnett's greatest achievement came through the power he possessed of setting men into the right spiritual relationship to one another, and certainly this is what he attempted to do from the very first advocacy of the settlement, stoutly insisting that the human gains would be reciprocal.

The young Samuel Barnett could not possibly have foreseen that the problems of the working class would in the coming years absorb the interests of economists and publicists, that they would afford the paramount issues in Parliament, and that in less than half a century a political party would come into power committed to their understanding and remedy; but if he had known these things he could in point of fact have given no better advice to young men ambitious to get on in the world than that they should make themselves familiar with the daily living of working people. When I was in London in 1915, on a public mission, two of its leading citizens who granted interviews, I had known years before when they were young men residing in settlements: Herbert Asquith, at that time Prime Minister, and Winnington Ingram, Bishop of London.

The earlier groups of residents were involved more or less directly in the great dockers' strike, which brought the condition of the ill-paid and submerged so vividly before the English nation in a sharp crisis of unemployment; in the episode of "Jack,
the Ripper*; in the first of careful research into industrial conditions resulting in Charles Booth’s epoch-making volumes. In the development of the English social movement through three stirring decades the Garden of Toynbee Hall constantly urged “requisite knowledge”. He pointed out the irreparable mischief men of good will had done, through their ignorance, with social schemes which had made no appreciable difference to the dwarved and mutilated lives of the East End. He urged the responsibility of the Government and the municipality to provide a minimum of education, recreation, and of comfort for the whole population; to give to all citizens the basic opportunity for a civilized life, even though it might require for some of them no insurance against unemployment and pensions for old age. He was much too pragmatic, however, not to see with increasing indignation, the havoc of character, the sordid shifts and struggles for which large public funds, and the competition of charitable and religious agencies was responsible. He therefore longed to bring into East London, not, primarily, new schemes of funds, but sympathetic people ready to make friends with the poor and to draw them out of their narrow environment. For it was, after all, the daily life of the soden hopeless adults which he found the most heart-breaking. Because of his passionate devotion to education and to affairs of the mind, Canon Barnett carried on an unceasing effort to make University Extension teaching more sympathetic and to evolve new methods of imparting modern thought and culture to those so absolutely cut off from access to them. He welcomed the erection of mosaic — copies of great pictures — in the fronts of public buildings, which might suffer “thoughts and hopes to passersby”, as Matt’s beautiful mosaic in the front of St. Jude’s had done for many years; he arranged traveling parties to the great historic spots in England and on the continent; he constantly secured oratorios and picture exhibits for the poorer parts of London; he used all the suggestions for a fertile intellect to make the national holidays more truly recreative. It was largely due to his unceasing efforts that a permanent art gallery was established in the East End, and a free library on Mile End Road. Many of these larger entertainments could not have procured without the help of a group of public spirited citizens, living in the district of Toynbee Hall.—

Throughout the years his brilliant wife aided and abetted a multitude of good work. She was serving under Octavia Hill as a lady rent collector when she met the young curate who had recently refused a living near his beloved Oxford that he might take a parish in the neglected East End of London. Through many years it became her joy to supplement his initiative by what she pleased to call her “lesser gift for carrying on,” so to fuse her energy and enthusiasm for social reform with his that in the vicarage of St. Jude’s in Toynbee Hall, in the Canon’s house in Bristol, or in the close of Westminster Abbey, it is difficult to separate the achievements one from another. In that district of “uninhabitable habitation:” they
purchased some of the worst tenement property, remodeling it into houses both for artisans and unskilled laborers. The East End Dwellings Company finally emerged from their effort, as did open spaces and playgrounds in slowly increasing numbers, and eventually the Garden City Suburb itself founded by Mrs. Barnett -- now Dame Henrietta Barnett -- on Hampstead Heath. They inaugurated flower shows for the East End, and they were the first people anywhere to initiate a plan for systematically sending children into the country for a holiday. They must have felt repaid for such effort when one of the children wrote back: "There are no strikes out here although there are very many wasps."

It is said that Canon Barnett's greatness lay in his sense of direction so that those who knew him well knew that they could steer by him as if he were a spiritual instrument. There is an inherent danger in continuing to follow the advice of those who were no longer in touch with the living world, but it is a testimony to the sound understanding which Canon Barnett possessed that at this moment when new social problems were emerging, or rather those to which he devoted so much thought and energy are assuming new shapes and insistently pressing for solution that his advice is still sane and valued.

A case in point is the present tendency today as regard as obnoxious and to subject to prompt repression, all the divergence from the orthodox political state or social creed. We are glad to remember that Canon Barnett declared himself unequivocally against government by repression. One of his most scathing descriptions of the East End was, "This police-controlled district, where education by mother and schoolmaster, by policeman and by opinion is education by repression...it is no wonder that men and women are dwarfed, ugly and worn, although often disciplinarian and quite willing to have the poor suffer as a result of their own poverty, the discipline element in the administration of relief, at times, gives him grave doubt. He once wrote to his brother, "More and more I come to see that men have no call to punish man." "He always fails in his attempt to destroy him. Man must educate man, but never assume a superior palate of a condenser."

Another contemporary situation for which we may seek spiritual direction from him is the current attempt to label large bodies of men with obnoxious name and then to treat the men themselves as the public thinks the doctrines indicated by the labels deserve to be treated. It is as if our social judgment were insensibly falling back into those ancient categories which once divided men according to race or religion, whereupon they were harshly judged by men of other races or other religions who applied their widely differing standards with much self-righteousness, but with no understanding. Can-
on Barnett stated over and over again that the only genuine service to men was to give each one the chance of helping himself by the power of that which was best within him and that the discovery of this power must come through the knowledge and sympathy of personal friendship and come in no other way. It is part of our present tendency pointed a crusade to St. Jude's, that he might serve the East End for the remaining nine months and perhaps yet realize the plans in which he had uninterrupted faith. He counted much upon the relationships he might be called to establish through the humble capacity in the parish where he had so long served as vicar. He set forth his faith in salvation through loving kindness, in strength through understanding with such humility, such pity, such yearning to know more full the hard lot of the poor, that I had a sudden conviction that the beauty of holiness is a real thing; that to walk humbly with God is human achievement so beautiful as to be congruous even with the song of the nightingale and with evening light shining through the boles of trees. I was further convinced that it was not inevitable that we should always experience a peculiar disappointment, a sense of conspicuous failure when human nature inadvertently measures itself against a moment of poignant beauty in the outer world.

As we emerged from a ravine into the hard streets of Bristol, Canon Barnett pointed to a large house outside the city looming distantly through the night and told me that the man who lived there spent all his time hunting, ranging from birds in Scotland to big game in Africa, that he cared nothing for the cottages of his estate which had so shocked me that morning. Canon Barnett then added, "From my point of view, his lack of social responsibility is as much of a disgrace to me, a servant of the church, as are the wretched homeless men who sleep in the Commercial street doorways; or the long hours of grinding toil that result in absolute destruction of the human mind; or the stupidity and hardness of heart that proclaim a willingness to settle that problem of capital and labor by bullets."

That same evening I heard him talk with a group of Bristol dockers, amiably agreeing with them that to abolish the canons might be well to the first steppin democratizing the church, but no man there doubted his love for that church, nor his faith in her future, when he said to the men that he would be most willing to see working men ruling her if they would but be fed by her.

I was on my way back from Paris Exposition where I had served as a juror in the department of Social Economics. My mind was full of a book much read in France in the summer of 1900, "L'Imparfaite Boste," whose author I have now forgotten, but whose contention that the passion to serve mankind may be as imperative as any other and sufficiently powerful to inhibit
egotistic impulses and ambitions, seemed to be amazingly ex-
emplified in this man.

Another association with Canon Barnett's memory outside of East London is in Oxford at Barnett House, the memorial er-
coted to him in the midst of the old established colleges. There is a great vitality about it, expressed through the large groups of working men who come to utilize its library and its tutorial classes through the vigorous workingmen's societies, whose Oxford headquarters for groups scattered throughout the British Isles are housed there. It is all vag-
ely reminiscent — as the cap and gown dimly suggest the monk's habit — of the breaking into sacred precincts by an-
other class which years ago created the university itself. As the laity then insisted that knowledge be shared with them, the working man is now making a similar demand. Perhaps the present generation of Oxford men are little uneasy at time:
as their medieval predecessors had been in the presence of those minds "who find their happiest exercise not along the beaten track but in self-guided speculation and inquiry." But one finds no trace of such uneasiness in Barnett House, only a readiness to help forward every inquiring mind, self-trained though it may be, as if Canon Barnett's belief that "the reve-
sation of God to our time comes by knowledge" was the orthodox creed of the House bearing his name, or was at least accepted as the dictum of pious founder.

At a reception in Barnett House, I found the room crowded with scholars and trade unionists, a combination which we ought easily to find in the United States but which point of fact is more often seen in England. The fine white head of the poet Laureate rose above the shaved heads of the resolute miner who had come up for a term at Ruskin College and was a little too determined not to be frightened by anything Oxford might offer.

I envied for our universities the friendly discussion and the fine library to which almost every scholar there had contrib-
uted, and above all the young working man in charge of the Worker's Education Association who had his office on top floor of Barnett House. At the luncheon in the beautiful dining hall of All Souls and later in the garden of Balliol, where the genial master urged us to pick mulberries, either from the tree planted by Queen Elizabeth or from the two daughter trees according to one's preference in currants and mulberries, I was constantly teased by the thought that of course, Oxford must be superior to us in tradition and beauty, but why did we allow it to eclipse us in friendly relations to working men, in freedom of discussion and daring experiments in adult edu-
cation? We can justly say in our defense that American univer-
sities are filled with children of working men, that it would be as absurd to build them special colleges as it would be to
erect the Toynbee Hall Student Hostelry; that dozens of promising young people leave our neighborhood for the best institutions of learning. But in spite of all this we sorely need the activity which is stated as one of the aims of Barnett House, that of "promoting educational conferences and inquiries with reference to adult education and political, social and economic questions." How may we stir ourselves to discontent that so much current education on these questions is derived from partisan newspapers, misinformed reporters, unbalanced propagandists, and homesick refugees?

Is it that we lack what Canon Barnett so abundantly possessed — trust in God, unceasing search for knowledge combined with tolerance and perseverance, and above all with courage and good will? May we remember these sterling qualities as we echo the words spoken in Toynbee Hall at the memorial services: "He served God, he served mankind, he served the state, he served us, his remote followers." May we add what one of our fellow countrymen had said: "The dead are not dead if we have loved them truly, if in our own lives we give them immortality, take up the work they have left unfinished, preserve the treasures they have won, and round out the circuit of their being in the fullness of an ampler orbit."

(pages 133-141)
All of us who knew Joseph Tilton Bowen realize that a memorial in his name should suggest courtesy, hospitality and comradeship. To this end it seemed to his wife that nothing suitable could be forever associated with him as a country club built upon an attractive site which would extend a constant hospitality to those most sorely in need of rest, of health, and recreation. Such a memorial would certainly be more appropriate as well as more beautiful than anything that could be erected in the crowded part of the city in which Hull House stands, for Mr. Bowen, throughout his life had preserved that simplicity and charm which we commonly consider the great gift of the country.

It is not altogether easy to find natural beauty in the environs of Chicago. I was with Mrs. Bowen when she visited sixty-seven possible sites lying in all directions from the city, but when this one was finally decided upon, because it was not only entirely suitable, but as by far the most beautiful of all, we had no regrets for something we had not chosen. Sometimes one would like to move the ravine from one place, the gentle slope from another, and put them together in a way Nature seldom permits; but in this place all desirable things seem to have been combined without the interference of man, although we are happy that he had long ago been permitted to add a garden, an orchard, a well surrounded by lilacs and an interesting old house.

It adds greatly to the value of a memorial that the people to profit by it, to use it intimately, should have known and admired the person to whom the memorial is dedicated. Through the various Hull House organizations, Mr. Bowen had a large acquaintance with many people living in our neighborhood. I had been much impressed with the things they have said during these last few months, when the common experience of death has drawn us together in a peculiar fellowship. We remember that "we are not singled out for a special judgment when we give up our dead, but enter into a common sorrow that makes the world one, and dissolves all other feelings into sympathy and affection."

Humble people who had known Mr. Bowen but slightly had yet attained a sincere appreciation of his good life, of his care for those who needed help, of his devotion to his family.

Because it was difficult to wait for the formal opening, we
have already had gatherings here during the beautiful spring weather. At one of these, several touching addresses were given by members of the Hull House Woman's Club. As you know, Mrs. Bowen had erected a building for that club and her husband with her, had been active in promoting its activities. A woman who had known him for many years expressed somewhat awkwardly the general impression she had always had that a husband must be one of two things: either he was sober and steady but inclined to be disagreeable or else, as she knew sometimes to her sorrow, he was so pleasure-loving that he would lead a dance and be a jolly partner but was not always admirable in other ways. To know a man at once so kindly and "highly respectable", ready to enter into all the pleasures of the club and yet dignified and courteous, was to her therefore a revelation of a new type.

I recall the parties which Mrs. Bowen gave once a year when each member of the club could bring an escort, and because there were more than a thousand people would attend one party we were obliged to have them in three different buildings. I am giving the details of this because it was Mr. Bowen's scheme, and without him it never would have been successfully carried out. Each guest had received the invitation either a pink ticket or a blue ticket. The people with a blue ticket went first to Bowen Hall where there was dancing, and the pink-ticket people went to supper into the coffee house and the blue-ticket people went to the theatre; then the pink-ticket people went to Bowen Hall and the Blue-ticket people went to supper. We used to say each time that it could not be done without a stampede and it became almost a matter of personal triumph to Mr. Bowen when it worked out so smoothly year after year.

I also recall Mr. Bowen's pleasure in the opening of the Boys' Club and his hard work during the last few days that all might be in readiness. As the first automobile drove up with our guests, Mr. Bowen was sweeping off the front walk while I gave a final polish to the stair inside. There was always a whole-hearted cooperation to the last detail in everything that came to Hull House through his wife. His delightful participation never failed and his spirit of hospitality spread throughout the entire place until everyone felt the contagion.

It is easy to associate him with a Boys' Club, for many of us who knew Mr. Bowen during the years when his children were growing up about him most vividly recall his spirit of youth, his charm and zest for life. In the words of a wise man, "To remain young long, in the spontaneity and tenderness of heart, to preserve ever, not only in the outer behavior but in the inner life, a certain lightness, a certain elasticity — this is the best way to rule our lives; for what greater force is there than youth?"

Because of this inner life, he had an understanding of young people founded upon an encouragement of their ardor and an ea-
poured for their enthusiasm. He did not feel that necessity to temper the zest of youth which so often results in alienating it. This vivacity of perennial comradeship with the young was perhaps the most outstanding manifestation of his power to work out human relationships in terms of good will.

Yet it was not confined to young people, for the aged and the infirm were equally attracted to him. There is a famous story in the family of his adventures one summer when he visited an elderly relative on Rhode Island and found in her boarding house six old ladies, all of whom — including one in a wheelchair, and one on crutches — seemed to him in great need of a little pleasure. He chartered a launch in which he took the seven old ladies for a day's excursion upon the bay. Unhappily the boat was run down by a huge steamer and all the helpless guests, while not thrown into the sea were rescued from the sinking launch only by the most heroic efforts on the part of the captain and their gallant escort. When they were finally placed upon the steamer, finding themselves being carried ever farther away from home, they shed copious tears; but upon their return next day, safe and sound, they at once became a chorus of admirers for their kind host whose courtesy and courage never failed them and who because the hero of an opus with seven variations.

Joseph Tilton Bowen instinctively followed the advice "to live not in contention with other, but for the help, delight, and honor of others, and for the joy and peace of our own lives." It is a great gift, his ability to establish sincere and direct relations with human beings of all sorts, and he habitually made such genuine relationships, whether he was president of the Church Club of Chicago chairman of the Schools committee of the Commercial Club, a Director of the Bar Harbor Horse Show, or of the Board of St. Luke's Hospital. His kindliness were always restrained by the courtesy of the gentleman who never intruded even the wise word. If it is true that "he who hateth his brother in the darkness and knoweth not whither he goeth," so it is true that he who is content with bungling and half-hearted human relations spends his life amid a twilight of souls and knows nothing of glory of human brotherhood. That Mr. Bowen had come to recognize brothers in all men because he had long recognized God as the Father of all men, made the foundations of his wise and courteous relationships all the more secure. His rector, who knew him long as a warden of St. James, has termed him "an apostle of life" and describes his marvellous gift as that of "a man in whose company it seemed as if the world was bound to go right — it could not but go right — you had but to look at it and speak to it and it would go right."

His friend and physician, Dr. P. F. V. I. V., has just said that there is only one thing amongst our human difficulties worse than not to be able to get into the country, and that is not to want to go...He will not encounter that difficulty among our peasant
neighbors who have gathered oranges in California and olives in Greece, who have gleaned the poppy-strewed wheatfields of Europe and dug for peat in the bogs of Ireland. They spent their first years in America in those unsanitary habitation found in the most crowded quarters of our cities, and they fairly languished for the country — for the feel of the earth beneath their feet, and the sight and smell of growing things. Dr. Favell has asked that an invitation to share a place such as this sounds one of the deepest and tenderest human notes, not only because the thing is good, but because the response which it evokes is in itself uplifting. We venture to hope that we may in time add solace for homesick souls, and the offer of friendship to the friendless.

It is a great responsibility for the Hull House trustees to lift the Joseph Tilton Bowen Country Club to its highest development, to be sensitive to its growing possibilities, to realize that fresh air can really penetrate only into the lungs of those who breathe with freedom and happiness. Perhaps our greatest source of beauty in the immediate environs of Chicago is found in the dunes that stretch to the east and the north of the city. We are on the brink of a beautiful stretch of marsh and dunes directly north of these grounds. During the last few months, when the buildings of the club-house has brought us here very often, these marshes have not only stood for their own beauty and sorrow which was pressing upon the hearts of Mr. Bowen's friends, but in some mysterious way they have suggested the tranquility of his religious faith, such a mood as has been portrayed in a poem: (poem omitted).

Someone asked me the other day what motto we were going to put over the door, apparently in the conviction that every club must have a motto over the door. I was a little startled by the suddenness of the question and while I could not remember the exact quotation, in the back of my head there rolls a line "Secure, from the slow stain of the world's contagion." I suppose all of us who live in the midst of the city find ourselves easily stained by the contagion of the world, and have a place to be secure from it, to which we can repair is not only delightful, but necessary to the health of our souls.

If such a refuge is ever developed here, with its inner garden which Mrs. Bowen has permanently endowed, it will be a most fitting tribute to him whose name it bears. We may well say: (poem omitted).
Memorial to
Jordon Dewey

from "The Excellent Becomes the Permanent" J.Addams-Macmillan Co. 1933.

In the heart breaking death of our well beloved, nothing is harder to understand, and nothing is harder to bear than the sense of disappearance, so sudden, so irreversible, so mysterious that it at length becomes the one fixed point in our ephemeral living. All else grows unreal in our period of sorrow, while that consciousness of loss, that perpetual defeat of the senses is the one thing which never changes.

When he who has gone from our familiar living is a little child, who has surrounded us with that affection which Mr. Dewey has himself described as "the most appealing and the most rewarding of all affections", almost as hard to endure as the immediate loss itself is the realisation that his future will exist without relation to ourselves, that his growth will go forward without our fostering and defense, without the fulfilling of all those hopes which fasten themselves so securely upon a child of unusual ability and suggestive charm.

And yet in a distinct and sturdy personality, such as Jordon Dewey possessed, which had already unfolded itself for eight years in the midst of exceptional surroundings for feeding its nascent powers and for supplying the equipment with which to reproduce that which the active, persistent mind most vividly apprehended, we have in our own hands a key, an artifice, as it were, by which we may read the future. We cannot read it absolutely, as thought it were written in a book, life as it is lived on earth does not unfold itself in that way, but we may read it in a very remarkable degree by our perceptions, by our knowledge of what his personality implied and was destined to achieve. It has been recently said that it becomes less and less impossible to foretell the quality of life which shall fill the span of a man's years, when we have once apprehended the trend of his character. Courage and intelligence can make the future of a friend our own possession, whether he has lived upon the earth for less than a decade, or for three-score years and ten, even as courage and intelligence are required to learn the lessons of the past or to make the present of any value to us. If a moral certainty may be deduced from given premises, may we not say that the gifts of mind and remarkable character of Jordon Dewey have placed these premises within our grasp.

To know such a promising life, to feel the touch of his spirit is to have the future unfold itself before us a new amplitude, to give it a larger meaning; it is to recover for a moment those hopes of our youth which we have dropped in our dull discouragement with life's limitations, to be revisited by the
Country people, among whom so much of Gordon Dewey's life was spent during his happy summers, and those simple, warm-hearted folk in Ireland among whom he at last died, firmly believe that the child who is destined to leave this life prematurely is blessed with a premature unfolding.

It is certainly safe to predict that this fine and gallant spirit would inevitably have entered into the bitter heritage which is sure to come to all the sensitive spirits of our contemporary life, that he was destined to feel the smart and pang brought by the consciousness of the degrading poverty in the world, as he would have shared the growing belief, newly come among men, that it may be possible not only to alleviate, but at last to remove it, if the race but makes a concerted effort. He too would have been stirred by the faint hope that our helpless suffering may be but the first intimation of a challenge for this long-neglected crusade.

Did he do something better for this problem of poverty than if he had gone the dreary round of life the rest of us plod, filled with a sense of futility of our efforts? Did he not at the end add the touching and evanescent grace which youth and unconsciousness have ever brought to suffering and privation?

We are told that through the long days of his illness and convalescence in the Liverpool Hospital his eager little spirit turned toward Western Ireland with a veritable longing for the Land of Heart's Desire, that the journey thither was full of happy anticipations, and that for three days he blithely joined in the homely round of daily life on a simple farm, sweetly unconscious of the bitter poverty which stretched for miles around him; that he found only joy and satisfaction in "the milk and the fire," in the care of the animals, in the warm-hearted welcome of the warmest-hearted people in the world.

Could he have done more to comfort even the poverty-stricken of Ireland than to have given them this simple comradeship, to have thus shared their life and found it sweet?

He possessed in a remarkable measure that trait which we are accustomed to associate only with the mature mind of wide and tolerant experience, a sense of the humor in life and the ability to meet a situation by a flank movement, as it were, by giving it the unexpected turn, pulling out the sting from any childish disappointment by a perception of the gentle incongruity and the ironic charm in the disappointment itself.

This can only be illustrated: I remember my astonishment when I first encountered it in the little red-frocked baby of three. His mother had bidden him to show me a Christmas book, and he trotted down the hall in search of "Father Goose", only to come
gleefully back again without the book, but holding a tiny white feather in his hand, as he chuckled: "I couldn't Fasser Goose, but I found a goose fesser in the hall."

The independence of mind with which he ventured the little joke, the complete sense of comradeship with which he took me into it and gave me at once to understand that although we might differ in our tastes for books, there could be but one right of turning an awkward situation into a pleasure, secured for me from that moment a new and intimate friend. Our minds are filled with reminiscences of him. One pictures the grave little figure as he shakes hands through the car window with Admiral Dewey, restraining his boundless enthusiasm with a quaint sense of the dignity which is befitting one who bears the same great name. When asked what he said to him, he replied, "I couldn't say much because I am a Dewey, too."

He had a curious interest in the contemporary events of the world. He has an indefatigable reader of the daily papers, not only with the inquisitive interest of a precocious child, but with a sense of belonging to it all, of holding an integral part in the drama, a tiny protagonist of his time. One recalls his unexpected query across the breakfast table as to the chances of the Japanese in the war, and his recital of cogent reasons for his predicted outcome of the struggle. His direct connection of the defeat in Manchuria with the governmental wrong of the Empire revealed that serene sense of righteousness which children so often have, and which we lose in the confusion of life. His eager assertion, "They must be beaten, you know, because they have been so mean to the Poles and Finns," gave me the same sense of astonishment of the wisdom of the child of seven that I had felt at the wit of the child of three, the consciousness that he has thus early acquired the freedom of the human city, as it were, and would forevermore walk its motley streets with wide and tolerant wisdom. Gordon Dewey came into the life of his family eight years ago. By no possible alchemy can one human soul take the place of another, nor can a child that is here ever satisfy the longing for the child that is gone, and yet the passionate loyalty to "him whom we see not" perhaps finds its first yearning solace for the very love's undying sake from the new-born, from "him whom scarce we see". It is not given to us to interpret the experience of even our dearest friends, but certain it is that this dear child was born not only into his full heritage of family affection, but received an added tenderness of almost tragic passion.

We long to comfort that stricken family group across the sea, and we are overwhelmed with a double sense of inadequacy. We are unable to fittingly express our sorrow and sympathy for them, and again unable to make a satisfactory statement of our appreciation of the value of that life which is in itself worthy of the best memorial that we can give it. In a moment of such inadequacy we borrow expression from a poet:

(poem omitted).
The craving to perpetuate the memory of one we love, only to make tangible and enduring for yet a human span, the personality that has passed from the region of daily intercourse and beyond reach of household affection is, perhaps, one of the oldest cravings of the hungry human heart.

This desire, this bidding the beloved "to stay a little", has inspired the earliest art, as well as art's highest achievements; it has softened and humanized the primitive religions and it has also built the myriad churches and cathedrals which fill the larger half of Christendom. It is man's most universal admission of the fact that he can hold fast to the things which are eternal, only thru the sorrow and weaknesses of broken human affection.

It is man's fortune that the family whose hearts are filled with that old desire, to whom has been given proof not only of family affection and devotion, but evidence also of the concern for the affairs of that larger relationship, which links all men of one generation to one another, and into a common heritage.

Fortunate is that group of friends in whose memory there lingers not alone a sense of personal kindness and gracious intercourse, but a consciousness of that wider sympathy which would fail include all those who are lonely at heart. A memorial to such an one stands not only for that which is eternal in love and desire, but also which is a promise of final healing, and of right relation in our tangled human affairs.

Because of her interest in the little children of the Hull House nursery, because of her concern for the education and training of the young people who form classes here, because of her readiness to send comfort and succor when special distress was in our midst, the organ which we dedicate today, has been built in this room, by her husband and her children to the memory of Sarah Rozet Smith. It expresses their unchanging affection, and devotion, and it stands here rather than elsewhere because Mrs. Smith was for many years a warm friend and generous donor to Hull House, and also, that which touches us still more closely, a constant sympathizer with the ultimate purposes which underlie its various activities. This was true, in spite of the fact that Mrs. Smith was reared in a conventional city, in the midst of a conventional circle at the period when wealth and breeding meant withdrawal from the rougher aspects of life. But because she claimed not only her children's affection but also shared in their interests, her later years found her full of sympathy for those beaten in life's struggles; because she not only preserved the best traditions and customs of the past but a gentlewoman she was, but was also ready to learn of the issues
of the hour through the experiences of the large-hearted man who stood by her side, she was able to keep to the end an open mind toward those social problems which so constantly perplex us all. Through many discussions held in her presence, I cannot recall a single unkind or unfair word spoken of those who are so readily blamed. Something of the touching confidence with which each child learns anew the mystery of the world through its affections, she learned of this bustling city, as it were apart from it and yet made conscious of its significance, through those she loved. Because this Mrs. Smith gave graciously to Hull House that the most precious gift—the time and services of her daughter, when she would gladly have claimed this companionship for herself, and she often gave that which most women consider impossible, the use of her own house.

One incident stands out in my memory: a member of one of the early Hull House clubs passed through the city on a journey in search of health, exhausted and disheartened, within a fortnight of her death, she was taken directly from the railway station to Mrs. Smith's house, where she remained with her little girl, the recipient not only of skilled medical attention and professional nursing, but of the most exquisite hospitality and friendliness. I know whereof I speak for I myself received it during a long and tedious convalescence; indeed my mind is crowded with recollections of days filled with this gentle courtesy and friendship during a summer in Europe, during weeks at a seashore, during hours of refuge in the well ordered home; and although I recall all those with vivid affection, nothing so endears her memory to me now as that kindness to one who was her friend, because then so sorely in need of friends.

This organ becomes part of the equipment of the Hull House Music School, whose faculty of four were all Mrs. Smith's personal friends and familiar guests. The heads of the school had discussed its growing plans with her during summers spent in the Tyrol, in the White Mountains, on the North Shore. For many years she was an enthusiastic attendant at the recitals of the school. The only Christmas concert she failed to hear was one given the year of her last illness, the day she was all on our minds.

Many of the members of the school have been the recipients of her kindness and hospitality, and on their side have gladly contributed, as they could, for her pleasure, in the little celebrations of birthdays or other family anniversaries. A year ago today they sang at her funeral service. As they learn to use this beautiful instrument, as a few of them at least will master its intricate and marvellous possibilities, I can pledge in their genuine appreciation a fitting tribute to her memory, a living memorial of which this organ itself is; but a prototype. It comes to them from the group of people who have known them longest and best, somewhat as a recognition of their ten years of sustained purpose and painstaking study. It registers a confidence that they will use worthily so fine a thing. When they sing the compositions of their teacher, to the memory of Mrs. Smith, the rendition is by no means formal,
but expresses their own friendship and gratitude as the composition itself expresses their more intimate affection and a larger understanding on the part of the composer. This organ is placed in Hull House to be used for public concerts and anniversaries. We speak often in Chicago, and quite rightly, of the need of that which will unify our moral forces and draw together our dissipated purposes — to make them more effective and at last to bring some measure of relief to our social and municipal ills. It may quite easily be true that this sense of unity, this compact of our better natures must be first attained through art — through that which has traditionally been the most potent agent for making the universal appeal and inducing men to forget their differences. A neighborhood such as this is an exaggeration, but it is at the same time an epitome of the city's divergences. The people about us represent sharp differences of speech, of tradition, of custom, of religious beliefs. Sometimes they seem to stand together only on the common ground of political equality, to be united only by the unquenchable desire for civil liberty — the result of long denials. We thank God for these, and yet we sadly need that truer unity which comes through similarity of aspirations and ideals.

Let us hope that this organ shall in some measure contribute to the process of fusing our divergent past and unifying our aspirations for that which is to come; that men who could not be brought to sit side by side in one another's churches will sit side by side in this room listening to its message concerning that which binds us into an indissoluble brotherhood.

As we all stand equal in the shadow of the grave, wherein no man calls his brother land or master; so in the enveloping music of this noble instrument which has come to us through those whose lives have been so lately darkened by that shadow, whose hearts are yet tender with the pain of parting, may we realize that equality which we attain only when we are lifted up together above our petty differences into an encompassing sense of unity.

We dedicate the Hull House organ to the memory of Sarah Roset, wife of Charles Mather Smith, and through that memory we dedicate it to all that is gentle and of good report.
It is difficult for those of us here to speak of our personal relations with Mrs. Wilmarth although for many of us those relations extended over many years and we hold the memory of them as a great treasure.

But we may say something of her public life, of her influence in Chicago for more than fifty years when she lived in the center of it nor only spiritually, but actually upon the site of her first home. She was naturally one of the earliest women in the group responsible for the first feminine organizations in the country, in those far-off days when a woman was supposed to be entirely absorbed in her family and if she sought any interests outside the home because the object for criticism. It is easy for us to understand how disconcerting Mrs. Wilmarth must have been to such critics with her conventional dress, her gentle high-bred demeanor, her mind so stored, not with the knowledge that "puffeth up" but with the wisdom that brings humility. She was a perfect antithesis of their conception of a self-assertive public woman. She brought to the pioneer movement in Chicago gifts of a finely endowed and cultivated mind. Only a few weeks ago, when I was in England, a man of letters with a name familiar on both continents said that curiously enough the person of greatest intellectual distinction whom he had met in America had lived not in Boston or New York but in Chicago. He was surprised simply because Europeans do not usually associate our city with intellectual affairs. But his clever description, even without his recollection that the lady lived in a hotel on the lake front, left no doubt in my mind that he was describing Mrs. Wilmarth. Without his powers of discrimination, we all realize that Mrs. Wilmarth possessed a mind of that indefinable grace for which we use the word distinction because it is so difficult to find the proper word.

She had the rare faculty of never putting her less gifted friends at a disadvantage for as we talked with her we mysteriously found ourselves included within that kingdom of the mind in which she habitually dwelt. This gentle inclusion had about it something of Keat's description of poetry which 'strikes the reader as a wording of his own highest thoughts and appears almost as a recollection.' She brought from the first into the woman's movement of Chicago an historic knowledge of the best in life and literature as a standard by which to measure achievements and to inspire continuous sacrifice and effort, what George Eliot has something elaborately formulated: (quoted poem omitted).
When the two early women's clubs of Chicago diverged as to their type of work, the Fortnightly remained more literary and scholarly and the Women's Club became more engaged in the life of the city. Mrs. Wilmarth kept her supreme place in both of them and was highly honored in both of them and was regarded as a leader. In each, however, she felt the need of a modification in the direction of the other, as it were. For instance, when Professor Breasted of the University of Chicago presented her with certain Egyptian vases which he had uncovered in his first exploratory expedition which she had so generously helped to finance, she placed them, not in the rooms of The Fortnightly but in the Chicago Women's Club. Later, during those dark days following the World War, when any difference of opinion was treated with scant respect, it was in that conservative Fortnightly that she, with a few liberal-minded members, arranged for a discussion, no as usual on the purposes of the war but upon its processes, upon war as a human institution and as to how far it is fitted to cope with the complicated issues of modern society.

She was a charter member of the interesting Every Day Club whose members lunched together whenever current public events seemed to justify a discussion of their merits without bias or pre-disposition. We recall her intelligence and kindness, her wide information infused with her great tolerance of spirit, founded not upon the determination to be tolerant— which is often in itself so obnoxious but upon her wide and sympathetic understanding of life itself.

She was identified with the beginning of the Woman's City Club, was its first president, and remained its honorary president to the end of her life. It was not easy in the early days of such an organization to know just what a Woman's City Club could do which would be effective and useful, and there were many pitfalls to be avoided. But I am sure that all of those who gladly elected her as their leader never doubted her wisdom, her devotion to Chicago, and her gallant spirit, whether a given undertaking was for the moment successful or unsuccessful.

Referring to her many activities and reform movements, one thinks at once of the Consumers' League, of which she was president for many more than ten years full of stress and difficulty for those who attempted to modify industrial conditions, even from the point of view of the consumer. I recall tedious journeys to Springfield in the interest of the child labor law— at that time by no means a popular cause; her jealous work for an adequate educational test to be applied to school children when their working papers were issued; that she was the head of the first effort to give scholarships to children whose return to school deprived their mothers of needed wages; that she visited department store managers year after year as a member of the committee attempting to secure a Saturday half-holiday for working women. There are a dozen other or—
ganizations now carrying on the activities which the Consumer's League undertook in those pioneer days.

In all this so-called reform work she was never a fanatic, expecting moral rules at the expense of human nature. She retained always her spontaneity, and a knowledge of wrong-doing did not rob her of tenderness and understanding.

We also associate with her the Legal Aid Society and with the Women's Trade Union League. In neither of these was her task always easy. I can see her now, standing in the dingy police station at Desplains Street bailing out people who, but for sympathy and help, might have remained in the cells over night and doing it quite without a suggestion of condescension, pushing aside gratitude with a gracious intimation that it was always a privilege to help a forward-looking public effort. Whatever the prisoners, in the bottom of their hearts, may have thought of themselves they knew that for her they represented an advance guard.

Perhaps I say a word of her connection with the settlements of Chicago. One of the very first public meetings that was held for us, thirty years ago, when Hull House was young, was convened in Mrs. Wilmarth's house. True to her belief in obtaining the widest possible background of knowledge, she invited Thomas Davidson, who was considered one of the leaders in the philosophic thought of America. Unhappily the philosopher disagreed with our theories. I recall his irritation with one of our favorite phrases that the "things that make us alike are finer and stronger than the things that make us different." Our hostess, however, was equal to the task of interpreting and reconciling philosophic differences, and from the early beginning she stood by the settlement movement in Chicago in its various manifestations. She was for many years a Trustee of Henry Booth House, and was long identified with the Fredrick Douglas Center. In the very last days, the latter settlement and spoke with much interest and some apprehension of the future of Chicago as it related to a better relationship between the white and the colored people. Her mind traveled back to her experiences in the abolition movement and in the broad understanding of the difficulties which have developed since she smilingly recalled a phrase of Booker Washington's which we sometimes quoted to each other during the war: "I will permit no man to make me hate him."

In her literary and intellectual life she was friendly to the young writers and artists beginning their struggles in Chicago. Those young people who year by year are making our city a little more of a literary and art center could all go to her freely for help and understanding and they almost all knew her. She was to them as to so many of us, a center of spiritual power and intellectual life. In those rooms of hers over-
looking the lake, there was much that was suggestive in bronze
and print of the lake, there was the finest achievements of hu-
man spirit. When I was hard put to it for a quiet spot in
which to write or one combining the tools and the mood in
which to try to formulate some complicated situation so often
developing in the current life of Chicago, I habitually found
myself in her storeroom. It was across the hall from the
lake rooms, every inch of the walls filled with pine shelves
upon which stood the books which were constantly overflowing.
A plain table and chair stood in one corner among the trunks
and boxes here, it seemed to me, the very essence of peace.
If I could not obtain the "long view in that room, it was
useless ever to hope to secure it anywhere. She was always
within call and always knew whether it was a child of Rossitti
to whom Swinburn wrote his "Birth Song" or during which century
gargoyles first appeared in the European cathedrals and what
in the world they were trying to say. Mrs. Wilmart possessed
wide knowledge, not because she collected curious bits of in-
formation but because the adventurous life of the human spirit
had long been her permanent interest.

I spent the nights and days of the Progressive Convention in
her rooms when the various committees, appointed with such
ardent hopes, held their meetings in the Congress Hotel. I
had sat beside her a fellow delegate through the halcyon days
in the Coliseum when it seemed at least to those of us inside
the vast building that a new kind of political party was being
launched which should redress the wrongs of the humblest citizen,
not through the coercion of the master group in the state but
through their enlightened cooperation. I recall my deep dis-
appointment in the platform committee when the "two battle-
ships a year" were included and, worse of all, when the fortifi-
cation of the Panama Canal was recommended. Her half-humor-
ous acceptance of the defeat of our cherished hopes as we
left the committee at three o'clock one morning, and her gay
comment as to how frail a barrier woman's influence seemed to
be in spite of its vaunted power, even in the new party which
had welcomed us so enthusiastically, was one of those ironic
shafts which alone can effectively pierce the dense preoccupa-
tion of the overzealous.

And yet with all her ripeness of mind, she carried about with
her the touch of youth. I recall that, as we came out
of the Progressive Convention one day, she said as simply as
a child, "How much I always like to march under arches!" We
can all remember four years later, when the Republican Convention
was meeting in Chicago, that she joined the parade of suff-
ragists presenting their cause at the coliseum, although the
wind blew and the rain fell and she had but recently recovered
from an attack of pneumonia. She was always ready to stand by
her cause, and her high-hearted attitude toward life never for a moment deserted her.

May I recall, with you, those lines from Milton's "Paradise Lost," lines were made to learn at school and therefore can never forget. I have found myself applying them to her many times, when I saw her following her convictions in the midst of differing opinions. (poem omitted)

I would fain say a word of comfort, if I were able, to her children and grandchildren. I can at best remind them that they have the fragrant memory of a life which was "an unending commerce of fine deeds and great thoughts," and that even in this hour of sorrow and loss, we congratulate them upon this goodly possession, perhaps the finest heritage possible. They and the other of her kinsfolk, her old friends, and the entire city of Chicago will always be the poorer for her passing but grateful that she lived among us for so many years.

The very last hours of her life in her home on the shore of Lake Geneva were enfolded in the warmth and stillness of a beautiful summer's night. It seemed fitting that at such a moment her great spirit should fare forth into the Unknown. I have stood by many deathbeds but never one so associated with all that is most gentle and beautiful and in nature that death itself seemed to take its place unchallenged, recalling Whitman's lines: (poem omitted).
Memorial Speech To
Jenny Dow Harvey.

From "The Excellent Becomes the Permanent" by Addams, ppl7-25.

In the presence of a sorrow such as this, in the consciousness that a rare spirit has gone from us while it was still full of sweetness and growth, in the piercing grief that a young mother has left her little children, it takes all of our steadiness and courage to face the mystery of justice — to divine the path wherein lies fortitude and resignation.

It is hard to even associate death with eager, flame-like spirit of our beloved, and yet she made the only possible preparation for it — that of free and joyous right-living. The minds of all of us here are crowded with sweet memories of her; let us draw together through them and comfort one another as best we may.

Almost exactly fifteen years ago I first saw her when she came to offer services in connection with the House which we were planning. In the midst of my preoccupation I was conscious that I had no right to hope for such quality and charm as this eager young girl was offering. There was something of such exquisite enthusiasm, of desire to know that something of life of the poor in order to serve them without reservation, of a touching humility in regard to her own powers with a certain proud consciousness that they were too fine to be wasted, such an impatience to know of the larger experience, that she carried with her and very aroma of the Spirit of Youth, to whom the world is wide and for whom all things are possible.

During the next three years we saw her almost daily with the little children of humble people, her varied gifts, her willingness and her ability to become as a little child among them, her abdation to their interests, her merriment over the discovery made one day quite accidentally that the children thought she was a little girl in a white apron and had never dreamed that she was a "grown up lady," all combined to produce the most successful following I have ever known to Froebel's command "to live with the children."

One recalls those day, with a choking in the throat, as a passing of something which was as touching, as exquisite as youth itself. This ephemeral quality of her life, the need of shielding and guarding so precious and delicate a thing, her parents felt keenly in those days of her first contact with rougher things. Her father was often a conspirator in innocent plots by which she might be supplied with little comforts, a smoothing of the rude path which she had marked out for herself. Her first scorn when she found this out would inevitably be followed by a quick compassion and a quizzical appreciation of the irrational bond between parent and child.
We can all recall those busy days of preparation which came after the kindergarten days; the frank and joyous acceptance of the highest gifts which life can offer to a woman. It seems to me that I have never seen a more simple, high-bred acceptance of life's joys, a more confident going forward to meet them, than was first revealed in the establishment of that first home. It was to many of us a revelation of time-rip experiences lifted up to their highest possibility, and lived out with ardor and inspiration.

Of the later years filled with the duties and the cares of a devoted wife and mother, it is impossible to speak. She traveled the happy road which has been trodden by the willing feet of many women, but I am confident that I speak for most of us in this room when I say that we have never seen more absolute welcome to life's obligations, a more exquisite com­radeship between parents and children, a more complete devotion and even gratitude to all that a household of little children impolites. The most persistent image of her which has come into my mind during the last sad weeks has been that of a young mother playing a game with an imperious boy of three, not in the abstracted half-hearted manner in which most adults play with children, but with a vividness and gayety almost to equal his own, and yet the game was a mere vehicle for the exquisite affection and appeal with which she enveloped him, dropping it at length in sheer despair because it became over­weighted with her love and devotion, and she must seek more direct expression. I shall always carry that impression of her as she caught the child in her arms against a background of blue sky reflected in the smooth flowing river.

And yet, although her life was so rich in all the noblest af­fections, she did not become wholly absorbed in them. She had from girlhood an insatiable hunger of mind which constantly fed itself with high thoughts and good books. We can all recall the keen relish with which she read aloud the pages which had brought her solace or inspiration. Sometimes she would offer gentle apology because the reading was so long, and re­gret that the books she found satisfying were always "too thick." I remember old discussions in which I pitted Marcus Aurelius against her beloved Emerson, her early enthusiasm of Frederick Harrison's "Meanings of History," with her wonder over the stupidity of a world which learns to hardly the lesson of the past, her quick finding of the best books lying upon one's table, and her instinct for the kernel of its message. She had above all the open mind, the untrammeled, searching, ample spirit.

She was of those called "the once born," and carried from her childhood a sense of harmony with life, of the joyousness and righteousness of it all; she was not of dual nature, and yet she was no shallow optimist who thinks that all things work together for good without our sincere and unceasing effort. She was quick to be touched by the misery and grotesqueness of life,
and never failed in her gallant effort to make things better. With something of the noble simplicity and naivete of a fine child she was undismayed at the most complicated situations, and in her enthusiasm for the best educational methods and belief in the reality of social force, she brought to bear not only a clear mind, but that charm and ardor which often attains results when colder methods fail. Her outer behavior but revealed the inner life, for she kept to the end of her animation, her elasticity. She was ever a reminder, an earnest, of all that is essential in you. In a life of blessing and serving, death was crowded out of her thoughts save as she feared it for those she loved -- in the words of one of her own sages, "The free man thinks of nothing so little as death, and his wisdom is a meditation not of death, but of life." etc.

And yet we know, now that death has set his seal upon her, that too, in time, must seem gracious and right. We will remember at last that the paramount interest of life, all that makes it lofty and worthy, all that lifts it above the commonplace, lies in the sense of mystery that constantly surrounds it, in the consciousness that each day as it dawns may bring the end either to ourselves or to our best beloved. A great artist in a noble parable has portrayed the experience of a man who, after long searching, discovered the draft of immortal life, the drinking of which would put him beyond the reach of death and enable him to live on from one generation to another. Before he drains the cup, which will exclude him from the brotherhood of mortals, he looks about him to take final account of relation between life and death, of the part which the consciousness of death plays in the drama of the world. He discovers all at once, that life has suddenly grown sordid and shallow when death is taken out of it, that the consciousness of the unknown is all that can give life a meaning and make it in any sense worth living. At last, quite voluntarily and with a prayer that he too may share the great human experience, he spills the contents of his long-sought-for cup upon the ground, and gladly comes into the destiny which envelops us all, into that expectation of death which is indeed not a tragedy but a blessing, the incomparable gift of the Infinite to the mortal.

To you, who have lost a devoted wife, a dear daughter, a sister, a friend, I can only remind you that nothing can really console the heart save the effort we make to fulfill the duties of the heart, and at last we must turn for comfort to her dear children, to the little brother who is "new-born among us." Therefore at the moment let us quote not from poems of sorrow, but from that exquisite "Birth of Song" of Swinburne: (poem omitted).
Memorial Speech To
Henry Demarest Lloyd


The life of Henry Demarest Lloyd embodied beyond that, perhaps, of any of his fellow citizens the passion for a better social order, the hunger and thirst after social righteousness.

Progress is not automatic; the world grows better because people wish that it should and take the right steps to make it better. Progress depends upon modification and change; if things are ever to move forward some man must be willing to take the first steps and assume the risks. Such a man must have courage, but courage is by no means enough. That man may easily do a vast amount of harm who advocates social changes from mere blind enthusiasm for human betterment, who arouses men only to a smarting sense of wrong or who promotes reforms which are irrational and without relation to his time. To be of value in the delicate process of social adjustment and reconstruction a man must have a knowledge of life as it is, of the good as well as of the evil; he must be a patient collector of facts, and furthermore, he must possess a zeal for men which will inspire confidence and arouse to action.

I need not tell this audience that the man whose premature death we are here to mourn possessed these qualities in an unusual degree.

His search for the Accomplished Good was untiring. It took him again and again on journeys to England, to Australia, to Switzerland, wherever indeed he detected the beginning of an attempt to "equalize welfare," as he called it, wherever he caught tidings of a successful democracy. He brought back cheering reports of the "Labor Co-partnership" in England, through which the workingmen own together farms, mills, factories and dairies and run them for mutual benefit; of the people's banks in Central Europe which are at last bringing economic redemption to the hard-pressed peasants; of the old-age pensions in Australia; of the country without strikes because compulsory arbitration is fairly enforced; of the national railroads in New Zealand, which carry the school children free and scatter the unemployed on the new lands.

His book on "The Swiss Sovereign" is not yet completed, but we all recall his glowing accounts of Switzerland, "where they have been democrats for six hundred years and are the best demo-
orates", where they can point to the educational results of the referendum, which makes the entire country a forum for the discussion of each new measure, so that the people not only agitate and elect, but also legislate; where the government pensions fatherless school children that they may not be crushed by premature labor. The accounts of these and many more successful social experiments are to be found in his later books. As other men collect coins or pictures, so Mr. Lloyd collects specimens of successful cooperation — of brotherhood put into practice.

He came at last to an unshaken belief that this round old world of our is literally dotted over with groups of men and women who are steadily bringing in a more rational social order. To quote his own words: (quotation omitted) His friends admit that in these books there is an element of special pleading, but it is the special pleading of the idealist who insist that the people who dream are the only ones who accomplish, and who in proof thereof unroll the charters of national and international associations of workingmen, the open accounts of municipal railways, the records of cooperative societies, the cash balances in people's banks.

Mr. Lloyd possessed a large measure of human charm. He had many gifts of mind and bearing, but perhaps his chief accomplishment was his mastery of the difficult art of comradeship. Many times social charm serves merely to cover up the trivial, but Mr. Lloyd ever made his an instrument to create a new fascination for serious things. We can all recall his deep concern over the changed attitude which we, as a nation, are allowing ourselves to take toward the colored man; his foresight as the grave consequence in permitting the rights of the humblest to be invaded; his warning that if in the press of our affairs we do not win new liberties, then we cannot keep our old liberties.

He was an accomplished Italian scholar, possessing a large Italian library; he had not only a keen pleasure in Dante, but a vivid interest in the struggles of New Italy; he firmly believed that the United States has a chance to work out Mazzini's hopes for Italian workingmen, as they sturdily build our railroads and cross the American plains with the same energy with which they have previously built the Roman roads and pierced the Alps.

He saw these fine realities in humble men which easily remain hidden to duller eyes. I recall a conversation with Mr. Lloyd held late last September during a Chicago strike which had been marred by acts of violence and broken contracts. We spoke of the hard places into which the friends of labor unions are often brought when they sympathize with the ultimate objects of the strike, but must disapprove nearly every step of the way taken to attain that object. Mr. Lloyd referred with great regret to the disfavor with which most labor men
lock upon compulsory arbitration. He himself believed that as the State alone has the right to use force, and has the duty of supression toward any individual or combination of individuals who undertake to use it for themselves, so the State has the right to insist that the situation shall be submitted to an accredited court, that the State itself may only resort to force after the established machinery of government has failed. He spoke of the dangers inherent in vast combinations, of labor as well as in the huge combinations of capital; that the salvation of both lay in absolute publicity. As he had years before made public the methods of a pioneer "trust" because he early realized the dangers which have since become obvious to many people, so he foresaw dangers to labor organizations if they substitute methods of shrewdness and of secret agreement for the open moral appeal. Labor unions are powerless unless backed by public opinion, he said; they can only win public confidence by taking the public into their counsels and by doing nothing of which the public may not know.

It is so easy to be dazzled by the voting strength of labor. We forget that capital cannot enter the moral realm, and may always be successfully routed by moral energy; that the labor vote will never be "solid" save as it rallies to those political measures which promise larger opportunities to the mass of the people; that the moral appeal is the only universal appeal.

Many people in this room can recall Mr. Lloyd's description of the anthracite coal strike, his look of mingled solicitude and indignation as he displayed the photograph of the little bunker boy who held his pigmy hand his account sheet, showing that at the end of his week's work he owed his landlord more than at the beginning. Mr. Lloyd insisted that the simple human element was the marvel of the Pennsylvania situation, sheer pity continually breaking through and speaking over the heads of the business interests. We recall his generous speculations as to what the result would have been if there had been absolutely no violence, no shadow of law-breaking during those long months; if the struggle could have stood out as a single effort to attain a higher standard of life for every miner's family, untainted by any touch of hatred toward those who did not join the effort. Mr. Lloyd believed that the wonderful which the strikers in the main exerted when it has but prefigured the strength which labor will exhibit when it has at last learned the wisdom of using only the moral force. "If a mixed body of men can do as well as that, they can certainly do better." We can almost hear him say it now. His ardor recalled the saying of a wise man "The belief that a new degree of virtue is possible acts as a genuine creative force in human affairs.

Throughout his life, Mr. Lloyd believed in and worked for the "Organization of labor", but with his whole heart he
longed for what he called "the religion of labor", whose mission it should be to "advance the kingdom of God into the un-evangelized territory of trade, commerce and industry." He dared to hope that "out of the pain, poverty and want of the people there may at last be shaped a new loving cup for the old religion".

His friend William Walter said of him: "Lloyd believed that society might be ordered by love, that the highest sentiments might dictate the ordinances and statutes of the state. With his whole heart he longed for the higher order of living things, and every little step, or promise of a step towards a heavenlier country, he observed and studied and talked about from the housetops. This is a revival of religion; it is a bringing once more the heavenly and the perfect into the consciousness of men."

Let us be comforted as we view the life of this "helper and friend of mankind" that happily we may, in this moment of sorrow, "establish our wavering line."
Fillian Relations

There are many people in every community who have not felt the "social consciousness," who do not share the effort toward a higher social morality, who are even unable to sympathetically interpret it. Some of these have been shielding from the inevitable and inevitable failure which the trial of new powers involve, because they are content to attain standards of virtue demanded by an easy public opinion, and others of them have exhausted their moral energy in attaining to the current standard of individual and family righteousness.

Such people, who form the bulk of contented society, demand that the radicals, the reformers, shall be without stain or question in their personal and family relations, and judge most harshly any deviation from the established standards. There is a certain justice in this; it expresses the inherent conservatism of the mass of men, that none of the established virtues which have been so slowly and hardly acquired shall be sacrificed for the sake of making problematic advances; that the individual, in his attempt to develop and use the new and exalted virtues, shall not fall into the easy temptation of letting the ordinary ones slip through his fingers.

This instinct to conserve the old standards, combined with a distrust of the new standards, in a constant difficulty in the way of these experiments and advances depending upon the initiative of women, both because women are the more sensitive to the individual and family claims, and because their training has tended to make them content with the response to these claims alone.

There is no doubt that, in the effort to sustain the moral energy necessary to work out a more satisfactory social relation, the individual often sacrifices the energy which should legitimately go into the fulfillment of personal and family claims, to what he considers the higher claims.

In considering the changes which are increasing democracy is constantly making upon various real relationships, it is impossible to ignore the filial relation. This chapter deals with the relation between parents and their grown-up daughters, as affecting an explicit illustration of the perplexity and readjustment brought about by the various attempts of young women to secure a more active share in the community life. We sometimes see parents very much disconcerted and perplexed in regard to their daughters when these daughters undertake work lying quite outside of traditional and family interests. But these parents insist that the girl is carried away by a foolish enthusiasm, that she is in search of a career, that she is restless and does not know what she wants. They
will give any reason, almost, rather than the recognition of a genuine and dignified claim. Possibly all this is due to the fact that for as many hundreds of years women have had no larger interests, no participation in the affairs lying quite outside personal and family claims. Any attempt that the individual woman formerly made to subordinate or renounce the family claim was inevitably construed to mean that she was setting up her own will against that of her family's for selfish ends. It was concluded that she could have no motive larger than a desire then to serve her family, and her attempt to break away must therefore be wilful and self-indulgent.

The family logically consented to give her up at her marriage, when she was enlarging the family tie by founding another family. It was easy to understand that they permitted and even promoted her going to college, travelling in Europe, or any other means of self-improvement, because these merely meant the development and cultivation of one of its own members. When, however, she responded to her impulse to fulfill the social or democratic claim, she violated every tradition.

The mind of each one of us reaches back to our first struggles as we emerged from self-willed childhood into recognition of family obligations. We have all gradually learned to respond to them, and yet most of us have had at least fleeting glimpses of what it might be to disregard them and the elemental claim they make upon us. We have yielded at times to the temptation of ignoring them for selfish aims, of considering the individual and not the family convenience, and we remember with shame and self-pity which inevitably followed. But just as we have learned to adjust the personal and family claim, and to find an orderly development impossible without recognition of both, so perhaps we are called upon now to make a second adjustment between the family and the social claim, in which neither shall lose and both be ennobled.

The attempt to bring about a healing compromise in which the two shall be adjusted in proper realization is not an easy one. It is difficult to distinguish between the outward act of him who in following one legitimate claim has been led into the temporary violation of another, and the outward act of him who deliberately renounces a just claim and throws aside all obligation for the sake of his own selfish and individual development. The man, for instance, who deserts his family that he may cultivate an artistic sensibility, or acquire what he considers more-fulness of life for himself, must always arouse our contempt. Breaking the marriage tie as Ibsen's "Nora" did, to obtain a larger self-development, or holding to it as George Eliot's "Romola" did, because of the larger claim of the state and society, must always remain two distinct paths. The collision of interests, each of which has a real moral basis and a right to its own place in life, is bound to be more or
less tragic. It is the struggle between two claims, the de-
stuction of either of which would bring ruin to the ethical
life. Curiously enough it is almost exactly this contradic-
tion which is the tragedy set forth by the Greek dramatist, who
asserted that the gods who watch over the sanctity of the
family bond must yield to the higher claims of the gods of the
state. The failure to recognize the social claim as legiti-
mate causes the trouble; the suspicion constantly remains that
woman's public efforts are merely selfish and captious, and
are not directed to the general good. This suspicion will nev-
er be dissipated until parents, as well as daughters, feel
the democratic impulse and recognize the social claim.

Our democracy is making inroads upon the family, the oldest
of human institutions, and a claim is being advanced which in
a certain sense is larger than the family claim. The claim
of the state in time of war has long been recognized, so that
in its name the family has given up sons and husbands and even
the fathers of little children. If we can once see the claims
of society in any such light if its misery and need can be
made clear and urged as an explicit claim, as the state urges
its claims in the time of danger, then for the first time the
daughter who desires to minister to that need will feel recog-
nized as acting conscientiously. This recognition may easily
come first through the emotions and may be admitted as a response
to pity and mercy long before it is formulated and perceived by
the intellect.

The family as well as the state we are all called upon to
maintain as the highest institutions which the race has evol-
ved for its safeguard and protection. But merely to preserve
these institutions is not enough. There come periods of re-
construction, during which the task is laid upon a passing gen-
eration, to enlarge the function and carry forward the ideal
of the long-established intellect. There is no doubt that
many women, consciously and unconsciously, are struggling with
this task. The family, like every other element of human life,
is susceptible of progress, and from epoch to epoch its ten-
dencies and aspirations are enlarged, although its duties can
never be abrogated and its obligations can never be cancelled.
It is impossible to bring about the higher development by
any self-assertion or breaking away of the individual will. The
new growth in the plant swelling against the sheath, which at
the same time imprisons and protects it, must still be the
truest type of progress. The family in its entirety whole,
must be carried out into the larger life. Its various members
together must recognize and acknowledge the validity of the
social obligation. When this does not occur we have a most
flagrant example of the ill-adjustment and misery arising when
an ethical code is applied too rigorously and too conscienti-
ously to conditions which are no longer the same as when the
code was instituted, and for which it was never designed. We
have all seen parental control and the family claim assert their
authority in fields of effort which belong to the adult judgment of the child and pertain to activity quite outside the family life. Probably the distinctively family tragedy of which we all catch glimpses now and then, is the assertion of this authority through all the entanglements of wounded affection and misunderstanding. We see parents and children acting from conscientious motives and with the tenderest affection, yet bringing about a misery which can be scarcely hidden.

Such glimpses remind us of the tragedy enacted centuries ago in Assisi, when the eager young noble cast his very clothing at his father's feet, dramatically renouncing his filial allegiance and formally subjecting the narrow family claim to the wider and more universal duty. All the conflict of tragedy ensued which might have been averted, had the father recognized the higher claim, and had he been willing to subordinate and adjust his own claim to it. The father considered his son disrespectful and heartless, yet we know St. Francis to have been the most tender and loving of men, responsive to all possible ties, even to those of inanimate nature. We know that by his affections he freed the frozen life of his time. The elements of tragedy lay in the narrow of the father's mind; in his lack of comprehension and his lack of sympathy with the power which was moving his son, and which was but part of the religious revival which swept Europe from end to end in the early part of the thirteenth century; the same power which built the cathedrals of the North, and produced the saints and sages of the South. But the father's situation was nevertheless genuine; he felt his heart sore and angry, and his dignity covered with disrespect. He could not, indeed, have felt otherwise, unless he had been touched by the fire of the same revival, and lifted out of and away from the contemplation of himself and his narrower claim. It is another proof that the notion of a larger obligation can only come through the response to an enlarged interest in life and in the social movements around us.

The grown-up son has so long been considered a citizen with well-defined duties and a need of "making his way in the world" that the family claim is urged much less strenuously in his case, and as a matter of authority, it ceases gradually to be made at all. In the case of the grown-up daughter, however, who is under no necessity of earning a living, and who has no strong artistic bent, taking her to Paris to study painting or to Germany to study music, the years immediately following her graduation from college are too often filled with a restlessness and unhappiness which might be avoided by a little clear thinking, and by an adaptation of our code of family ethics to modern conditions.

It is always difficult for the family to regard the daughter otherwise than as a family possession. From her babyhood she has been the charm and grace out of the household, and it is hard to think of her as an integral part of the social order,
hard to believe that she has duties outside of the family, to
the state and to society in the larger sense. This assumption
that the daughter is solely an inspiration and refinement to
the family itself and its own immediate circle, that her deli-
cacy and polish are but outward symbols of her father's protec-
tion and prosperity, worked out very smoothly for the most part
so long as her education was in line with it. When there was
absolutely no recognition of the entity of woman's life be-
yond the family, when the outside claims upon her were still
wholly unrecognized, the situation was simple, and the finishing
school harmoniously and elegantly answered all requirements.
She was fitted with grace the fireside and to add lustre to
that social circle which her parents selected for her. But
this family assumption has been notably broken into, and edu-
cational ideas no longer fit it. Modern education recognizes
woman quite apart from family or society claims, and gives her
the training which for many years has been deemed successful
for highly developing a man's individuality and freeing his
powers for independent action. Perplexities often occur when
the daughter returns from college and finds that this recog-
nition has been but partially accomplished. When she attempts
to act upon the assumption of its accomplishment, she finds
herself jarring upon the ideals which are so entwined with
filial piety, so rooted in the tenderest affections of which
the human heart is capable, both that daughter and parent are
shocked and startled when they discover what is happening, and
they scarcely venture to analyze the situation. The ideal for
the education of woman has changed under the pressure of a
new claim. The family has responded to the extent of grant-
ing the education, but they are jealous of the new claim and
assert the family claim as over against it.

The modern woman finds herself educated to recognize a stress
of social obligation which her family did not in the least
anticipate when they sent her to college. She finds herself,
in addition, under an impulse to act her part as a citizen of
the world. She accepts her family inheritance with loyalty and
affection, but she has entered into a wider dall as well, which,
for lack of a better phrase, we call the social claim. This
claim has been recognized for the family claim is again ex-
clusively and strenuously asserted. The situation has all the
discomfort and of transition and compromise. The daughter
finds a constant and totally unnecessary conflict between the
social and the family claims. In most cases the former is re-
pressed and gives way to the family claim, because the latter
is concrete and definitely asserted, while the social demand
is vague and unformulated. In such instances the girl quietly
submits, but she feels wronged whenever she allows her mind to
dwell upon the situation. She either hides her hurt, and
splendid reserves of enthusiasm and capacity to the go to
waste, or her zeal and emotions are turned inward, and the re-
sult is an unhappy woman, whose heart is consumed by vain re-
grets and desires.
If the college woman is not thus quietly reabsorbed, she is even reproached for his discontent. She is told to be devoted to her family, inspiring and responsive to her social circle, and to give the rest of her time to further self-improvement and enjoyment. She expects to do this, and responds to these claims to the best of her ability, ever heroically sometimes. But there is the larger life of which she has dreamed so long! That life which surrounds and completes the individual and family life? She has been taught that it is her duty to share this life—and the highest privilege to extend to it. This divergence between her self-centred existence and her best convictions becomes constantly more apparent. But the situation is not even so simple as a conflict between her affections and her intellectual convictions, although even that is tumultuous enough, also the emotional nature is divided against itself. The social claim is a demand upon the emotions as well as upon the intellect, and in ignoring it she represses not only her convictions but lowers her springs of vitality. Her life is full of contradictions. She looks out into the world, longing that some demand be made upon her powers, for they are untutored to furnish an initiative. When her health gives away under this strain, as it often does, her physician invariably advises a rest. But to be put to bed and fed on milk is not what she requires. What she needs is simple health-giving activity, which, involving the use of all her faculties, shall be a response to all the claims which she so keenly feels.

It is quite true that the family often resent her first attempts to be part of a life quite outside their own, because the college woman frequently makes these first attempts not so awkwardly; her faculties have not been trained in the line of action. She lacks the ability to apply her knowledge and theories to life itself and to its complicated situations. This is largely the fault of her training and of the one-sidedness of educational methods. The colleges have long been full of the best ethical teaching, insisting that the good of the whole must ultimately be the measure of effort, and that the individual can only secure his own rights as he labors to secure those of others. But while the teaching has included an ever-broadening range of obligation and has insisted upon the recognition of the claims of human brotherhood, the training has been singularly individualistic; it has fostered ambitions for personal distinction and has trained the faculties almost exclusively in the direction of intellectual accumulation. Doubtless, women's education is all at fault, in that it has failed to recognize certain needs, and has failed to cultivate and guide the larger desires of which all generations are full of at heart.

During the most formative years of life, it give the young girl no contact with the feebleness of childhood, the pathos of suffering, or the needs of old age. It gathers together
crude youth in contact only with each other and with mature men and women who are there for the purpose of their mental direction. The tenderest promptings are hidden to hide their time, which could only be justifiable if a definite outlet were provided when they leave college. Doubtless the need does not differ widely in men and women, but women not absorbed in professional or business life, in the years immediately following college, are baldly brought face to face with the deficiencies of their training. Apparently every obstacle is removed, and the college woman is at last free to begin the active life, for which, during so many years, she has been preparing. But during this so-called preparation, her faculties have been trained solely for accumulation, and she has learned to utterly distrust the finer impulses of her nature, which would naturally have connected her with human interests outside of her family and her own immediate social circle. All through school and college the young soul dreamed of self-sacrifice, of succor to the helpless and of tenderness to the unfortunate. We persistently distrust these desires, and, unless they follow well-defined lines, we repress them with every device of convention and caution. One summer the writer went from a two weeks' residence in East London, where she had become sick and bewildered by the sights and sounds encountered there, directly to Switzerland. She found the beaten routes of travel filled with young English men and women who could walk many miles a day, and who could climb peaks so inaccessible that the feats received honorable mention in Alpine journals, — a result which filled their families with joy and pride. These young people knew a nicety the proper diet and clothing which would best contribute toward endurance. Everything was very fine about them save their motive power. The writer does not refer to the hard-worked men and women who are taking a vacation, but to the leisured young people, to whom this period was the most serious a year, and filled with the most strenuous exertion. They did not, of course, thoroughly enjoy it, for we are too complicated to be content with mere exercise.

With Whitechapel constantly in mind, it was difficult not to advise these people to use some of this muscular energy of which they were so proud, in cleaning neglected alleys and paving soggy streets. Their stores of enthusiasm might stir to energy the listless men and women of East London and utilize latent social forces. The exercise would be quite as good, the need of endurance as great, the care for proper dress and food as important; but the motives for action would be selfish ones into social ones. Such an appeal would doubtless be met with a certain response from the young people, but would never be countenanced by their families for an instant.

Fortunately a beginning has been made in another direction, and a few parents have already begun to consider even their little children in relation to society as well as to the family. The young mothers who attend "Child Study" classes have a larger notion of parenthood and expect given characteristics from their
children, at certain ages and under certain conditions. They quite calmly watch the various attempts of a child to assert his individuality, which so often takes the form of opposition to the wishes of the family and to the rule of the household. They recognise as acting under the same law of development the little child of three who persistently runs away and pretends not hearing his mother's voice, the boy of ten who violently, although temporarily resents control of any sort, and the grown-up one who, by an individualized and trained personality, is drawn into pursuits and interests quite alien to those of his family.

This attempt to take the parental reaction somewhat away from mere personal experience, as well as the increasing tendency of parents to share their children's pursuits and interests, will doubtless finally result in a better understanding of the social obligation. The understanding, which results from identity of interests, would seem to confirm the conviction that in the complicated life of today there is no education so admirable as that education which comes from participation in the constant trend of events. There is no doubt that most of the misunderstandings of life are due to partial intelligence, because our experiences have been so unlike that we cannot comprehend each other. The old difficulties incident to the clash of two codes of morals must drop away, as the experience of various members of the family become larger and more identical.

At the present moment, however, many of those difficulties still exist and may be seen all about us. In order to illustrate the situation baldly, and at the same time to put it dramatically, it may be well to take an instance concerning which we have no personal feelings. The tragedy of King Lear has been selected, although we have been accustomed so long to give him our sympathy as the victim of ingratitude of his two older daughters, and of the apparent coldness of Cordelia, that we have not sufficiently considered the weakness of his fatherhood, revealed by the fact that he should get himself into so entangled and unpleasant a relation to all of his children. In our pity for King Lear, we fail to analyze his character. The King of his throne exhibits utter lack of self-control. The King in the story gives way to the same emotion, formerly exhibited in his indulgent treatment of them.

It might be illuminating to discover wherein he had failed, and why he found himself rootless in spite of the fact that he strenuously urged the family claim with his whole conscience. At the opening of the drama he sat upon his throne, ready for the enjoyment which an indulgent parent expects when he has given gifts to his children. From the two elder, the responses for the division of his lands were graceful and fitting, but he longed to hear what Cordelia, his youngest and best beloved child, would say. He looked toward her with expectancy, but instead of delight and gratitude there was the first dawn of character. Cordelia made the awkward attempt of an untrained
soul to be honest and scrupulously to express her inmost feeling. The king was baffled and distressed by this attempt at self-expression. It was new to him that his daughter should be moved by a principle obtained outside himself, which even his imagination could not follow; that she had caught the notion of an existence in which her relation as a daughter played but a part. She was transformed by a dignity which recast her speech and made it self-contained. She found herself in the sweep of a feeling so large that the immediate loss of a kingdom seemed of little consequence to her. Even an act which might be construed as disrespect to her father was justified in her eyes, because she was vainly striving to fill out this larger conception of duty. The test which comes sooner or later to many parents had come to Lear, to maintain the tenderness of the relation between father and child, after that relation had become one between adults, to be content with the responses made by the adult child to the family claim, while at the same time she responded to the claims of the rest of life. The mind of Lear was not big enough for this test; he failed to see anything by it but personal slight involved, and ingratitude alone reached him. It was impossible for him to calmly watch his child developing beyond the stretch of his own mind and sympathy.

The man should be so absorbed in his own indignation as to fail to apprehend his child's thought, that he should lose his affection in his anger, simply reveals the fact that his own emotions are dearer to him than his sense of paternal obligation. Lear apparently also ignored the common ancestry of Cordelia and himself, and forgot her royal inheritance of magnanimity. He had thought of himself so long as a noble and indulgent father that he had lost the faculty by which he might perceive himself wrong. Even in the midst of the storm he declared himself sinned against than sinning. He could believe any amount of kindness and goodness of himself, but could imagine no fidelity on the part of Cordelia unless she gave him the sign he demanded.

At length he suffered many hardships; his spirit was buffeted and broken, he lost his reason as well as his kingdom; but for the first time his experience was identical with the experience of the men around him, and he came to a larger conception of life. He put himself in the place of "the poor naked wretches," and unexpectedly found healing and comfort. He took poor Tim in his arms from a sheer desire for human contact and animal warmth, a primitive and genuine need, through which he suddenly had a view of the world which he had never had from his throne, and from this moment his heart began to turn toward Cordelia.

In reading the tragedy of King Lear, Cordelia receives a full share of our censure. Her first words are cold, and we are shocked by her lack of tenderness. Why should she ignore her
father’s need for indulgence, and be unwilling to give him what he so obviously craved? We see in the old and yet characteristic of the selfishness of a loving and kindly nature alone.

His eagerness produces in us a strange pity for him, and we are impatiented that his youngest and best-loved child cannot feel this, even in the midst of her search for truth and her newly acquired sense of a higher duty. It seems to us a narrow conception that would break thus abruptly with the past and would assume that her father had no part in the new life. We want to remind her that pity, memory, and faithfulness are natural ties, and surely as much to be prized as is the development of her own soul. We do not admire the Cordelia who through her self-absorption deserts her father, as we later admire the same woman who comes back from France that she may include her father in her happiness and freer life. The first had selfishly taken her salvation for herself alone, and it was not until her conscience had developed in her new life that she was driven back to her father where she perished, drawn into the cruelty and wrath which had now become objective and tragic.

Historically considered, the relation of tear to his children was archaic and barbaric, indicating merely the beginning of a family life since developed. His paternal expression was one of domination and indulgence, without the perception of the needs of his children, without any anticipation of their entrance into a wider life, or any belief that they could have a worthy life apart from him. If that rudimentary conception of family life ended in such violent disaster, the fact that we have learned to be more decorous in our conduct does not demonstrate that the following the same line of theory we may not reach a like misery.

Wounded affection there is sure to be, but this could be reduced to a modicum if we could preserve a sense of the relation of the individual to the family, and of the latter to society, and if we had been given a code of ethics dealing with these larger relationships, instead of a code designed to apply so exclusively to relationships obtaining only between individuals.

Doubtless the clashes and jars which we all feel most keenly are those which occur when two standards of morals both honestly held and believed in, are brought sharply together. The awkwardness and constraint we experience when two standards of conventions and manners clash but feebly prefigure this deeper difference.
FLORENCE ELLINWOOD ALLEN

I  WOMEN AND WORLD PEACE - - - - 1925
II  THE LIVING POWER OF LAW - - - - 1926
III  TEN YEARS AFTER - - - - - 1929
IV  REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS - - - 1930
V  THE STATE SHALL DO NO WRONG
Speech was delivered at Conference on Causes and Cures of War in Washington, D.C. 1935. From Modern Eloquence, p. 50-6. (Senator Rand of La. had whole speech read in Cong. Record.)

MEMBERS OF THE PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS AND FRIENDS!

While I listened to the splendid expositions by the distinguished military officers, I have been wishing that I had the force and eloquence to take advantage of this opportunity. I have before me delegates from such splendid groups, delegates from the American Association of University Women, those women who have had the training that a hundred years ago was denied to women the world over; delegates from the Council of Women for Home Missions and the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions of North America, the women who believe that the ethics and philosophy of Christ ought to be put into practice in our daily life; from the General Federation of Women's Clubs, that splendid group which links together so many organizations with such a vast field of cultural and civil activities; from the National Board of the Young Woman's Christian Associations which beneficently directs the activity of the young womanhood of the entire Nation; from the National Council of Jewish Women, with such a heritage of law-making behind them that they well may be proud and we may well be proud to have them affiliated with us in this gathering; from the National League of Women Voters, a league whose membership rambles over the entire country, a league which believes "every woman an intelligent voter," and thereby every man shall be made a more intelligent voter; from the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, that fighting group which first said that the evil of the open saloon must go in America; and last but not least, from the National Women's Trade Union League, the group of women who do work with their hands so well competing with labor in the open market that they force the world to give them an honest living.

When we think of the ramifications of these organizations, their territorial extent, the numbers which they represent, can we underestimate the power which resides in this particular group? And, more than that, it is significant that this is a group of women, not because the war problem is primarily a woman's problem. Women suffer hideously in war but so do men. Every boy who lost his life in the World
War had the greatest human right denied him. We find these truths to be self-evident - that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, rights that cannot be taken away, rights that cannot be given away - among them the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Did you ever think what a deprivation of the right to life war is?

And we are here as a group to make a new declaration of independence, to say that henceforth we will be independent of the curse of war; that we hereby demand that the tyranny of the most colossal evil that the world has ever seen shall cease. And, my friends, it is significant that this is a woman's gathering, because while men suffer with women in war, and while men work with women to do away with war, as the presence of these distinguished speakers evidences, the fact does remain that women's task is peculiar with regard to the abolition of war.

Women have to teach the human race that ethical standards can be set up and maintained between nations, as well as between individuals. Women have to teach the coming generations that the rules of right and wrong can be applied to every group; that there is no situation in which the law of justice can not and does not function if applied. Women have to teach the race that this thing is not impossible; that law can be substituted for the use of armed force in the settlement of international difficulties. And in the long run, my friends, over and above and behind and underneath all of the plans which will be urged here for the cure of war, and I undoubtedly am in accord with the spirit of all of them and with many of their features, the fact remains that you and the women of the world who believe that this evil can and must be abolished, have to go out to change the convictions of men's minds that war is legal and sanctioned and necessary, and that is primarily a task for women.

And then, too, women have another peculiar responsibility in this matter, because they have within them that thing which Kidd calls the emotion of the ideal, that long-range power of looking far off into the future; that power of working for something which they see not, something which they only hope and dream will come to pass. Thousands and thousands of women in this country joined the ranks of those who demanded the liberty should be given to women, as well as to men, and died before we ever had the vote. That spirit within women comes, perhaps, partly from our physical
naturally and partly from the long, and training of the ages
which has compelled us to achieve a masterly self-control.
That power makes it possible for us to sacrifice and renounce
and work for something which will not immediately be ac-
complished, and, of course, my friends, in spite of advances
which have been made in our lifetime in the peace movement,
you and I know that it will be a long, hard progress, and
that years and centuries will go by before the peace fabric
will finally reach full completion.

Now, this emotion of the ideal present in women makes
us perhaps see with a certain clearness certain fundamental
facts, because we are looking forward to the attainment of
the final consummation. We look forward to a great thing;
we look forward to the abolition of war itself, and nothing
less. Because of that perhaps we see more clearly certain
practical aspects in the situation, and we wonder, as women,
how it comes that government spends so little money and such
little effort for making peace, and so much money and such
much effort for making war. We say to ourselves that if
centuries ago the finest minds of the Nation had been gathered
together to develop peace, instead of to keep war machinery
well oiled, perhaps by now the peace fabric would have been
built. We say to ourselves that if in 1500 A.D. the great
energies of the races had been poured into substituting law
for war, the World War would never have been fought. And
then we say, too, that we demand substantial steps toward
peace. We care little in the mass just how it is done in
detail. Women are not particular as to who does it; they
are not particular as to who gets the honor of the great
achievement. They are not particular as to the name by
which the thing is called, but women want war branded and
made disreputable; they want its use made criminal; they
want the sanction taken away from war and adjudication sub-
stituted for war. They want, in a word, law not war.

And just because we have within ourselves this great
power, this emotion of the ideal which is essential toward
achieving causes as colossal as this, we confront particular
dangers. It has been said here in America since the women
got the vote that we ought to be used mainly as a channel
for engendering enthusiasm. My friends, creating enthusiasm
is worthy for certain objects, but let us by all means
scrutinize the objects. Let not these groups, let not these
fine groups act as cheer leaders in a game in which they do
nothing but the cheering.

And we face other pitfalls. I shall speak particularly
of one this afternoon. It contains correlative dangers. We
face the danger of thinking that we can help to do away with
without actual knowledge, and we face the correlative
danger of thinking that we can be of no use in eliminating
war unless we are experts. I shall first speak of the need
of actual knowledge. We must not emotionalize. Every step
we take; every measure we demand must be based upon our
knowledge of actual facts. Let me illustrate very simply
with regard to one subject which is to be considered by
you in this conference. I speak of the codification of
international law. Now, some people think that the codi-
fication of international law would have great weight in
doing away with war because they think that if law could be
gathered together governing the conduct of nations, then
we would have laid the groundwork for orderly adjudication
of international disputes. And, my friends, if codify means
to enact, then I agree that the codification of international
law is very necessary; but codification in its usual sense,
in the sense in which lawyers generally use it, does not
mean to enact law. It means to make a compilation, to make
an orderly, systematic assemblage of laws already existing.
But there is practically no international law existing en-
forced by the courts with regard to the conduct of nations.
Take the latest books on international law - Scott or Stowell
or Munro - and look through those textbooks in which courts
have enforced international law, and you will look in vain
for any case which has held any nation guilty of the crime
of making deliberate, premeditated, aggressive war. You
will look in vain for any case which finds any nation guilty
of stealing, or guilty of extortion. Because of my legal
experience I perhaps particularly see the need of such law.
I have presided in a number of murder trials and sometimes I
ask myself, how I ever could have impeached a jury in a
murder case, or how the jury could have convicted the prisoner
or how the prisoner could have been sentenced by the court if
there had been no law making murder a crime. And I wish to
explain here very simply what to me the phrase "outlawry of
war" means. It does not mean that the enactment of law mak-
ing war a crime will of itself prevent war.

* * * * * * * *

Why, my friends, human history shows that this is the
next step in our social development. There was such a thing
as war between individuals. There was private warfare be-
tween individuals; that private warfare has been abolished.
There was warfare to determine legal questions, Men used
to go out and fight to decide questions of titles to land
in what we called the "wager of battle." That has been
abolished, and the dual, which clung so long and so persistently—that has gone with the advance of civilization. Shall we say that men, men who swim beneath the sea in boats and who climb the sky in airplanes, are incapable of applying to themselves in groups the same law which they applied to themselves as individuals?

Now, I shall speak to you of another danger which we face—that is, the danger that we shall think we know too little to assist in solving this problem. I was interested to read the other day in a statement of a speech made by a distinguished officer for whom I have the highest personal regard, that he said that pacifism in the United States was rampant because of women's insatiable desire to mix in things which they did not understand. And he said that we did not understand war, because war is a question of mathematics and science. Of course, I do not know whether this distinguished officer said what is ascribed to him; but the fact does remain that that view exists. I grant that science goes into the making of war. I could not calculate the trigonometric formulas of our great modern guns; moreover, very few men could. Science, of course, governs all of the law of chemical explosions; science governs military tactics; science must always come into play when war is made; but the question of keeping out of war, the question of maintaining peace, and the question of establishing peace is not a question of science and mathematics; it is a question of establishing moral principles between the nations as law, enforceable as law, and that is not a question of the curve or the momentum or the velocity of a gunshot.

And then, on the other hand, there are some people who think we cannot help to establish peace because there is so much to know about the peace question. And, there is much to know; there is much to know about the Dawes plan; there is much to know about the whole question; and if we are really to understand the workings of the League of Nations, our treaty relations in the Senate, the World Court, and the workings of the Pan-American Union, we shall need much of one, to read the League of Nations' documents, to keep up to date with anything that is going on in the Senate, to keep posted upon our relations, particularly with South America and Central America and the Caribbean, and to report back up to her own club.
But, after all, the great basic policies which underlie the making of peace are not difficult of comprehension. Any ordinarily intelligent person can understand them. I will even say that never until in this country the ordinary person, the non-expert voter, is taken into the confidence of the peace expert, never until that time can America take her place among the leaders in the peace movement of the world.

I remember there was a great meeting held once at the Masonic Hall in Cleveland at which Mrs. Catt spoke. Will Irwin had told us what would happen to the world in the next world war; that war would be directed against the whole civilian population; how the advance of chemical warfare would make the next war something undreamed of. Mrs. Catt had some scholarly address to make, and instead of making it she threw down her manuscript and came down into the center of the stage and called upon the women of the United States to end war. That call we are still hearing. I suppose I have quoted one hundred times something which she said that night. She said: "The women in this room can do this thing; the women in this room can do this thing." And when she said that she said something truer than she knew. She said something which she knew from her own experience to be true for she had seen just such a movement grow from a meeting in a little room; she had seen the woman's suffrage movement start when women had no training, no education, no money, nothing but the inherent rightness of their cause; she had seen it sweep over the whole civilized world in her lifetime. The women in this room can do this thing. The women in this room can do anything which is right and just, my friends.

Think of the colossal absurdity that we should have lived to this year of our Lord, 1925, and the law for nations during all this time until very recently has been, "The State can do no wrong." We have to change that law; we have to write new law; we have to say, "The State shall do no wrong."

We have great odds against us; we have great interests and great powers against us; we have something, on the other hand, to inspire us. The boys, you know, went out and met six times their number in the great day of the first advance, six times their number of the crack troops of Europe, and sent them reeling back in their tracks; and, of course, they fought for a number of things, but they fought principally because they thought that that would end war. If we have any conception of their sacrifice we will never let that standard fall; we will make this war the war which did end war.
Sometimes I am depressed over the international situation, but I heard something this summer which I intend to keep before me as a symbol of our hope. I knew a girl, Marge Johnson, who did war work in Italy and France and Germany. This summer she visited all of her little villages and she personally investigated and knew that this thing happened. At Montfaucon, in France, which was so shelled that it seems nothing but a remnant was left of the town when the armistice was signed, a man came one night at dusk and knocked at the door of a little cottage. A woman came to the door, and he asked if she was the woman of the house. He spoke French — a strange kind of French. She said, "Yes, I am the housewife." He said, "Perhaps you won't want to talk to me, because I am a German." She said, "Go on, monsieur." "I had a son who was killed in the war," he said, "he was killed near here and he was buried somewhere near here. I can ever this morning as early as I could to hunt for his grave and I could not find it; I thought perhaps I could find some cottage where I could stay all night and go on to-morrow morning in the search, but probably you won't want me to stay under your roof because I am a German." She said, "Monsieur, I had a son who was killed in the war, killed fighting for France in self-defense; your son was killed fighting under orders, and I suppose he was killed doing what he thought was right; but shall anyone say that as between a father who lost his son in battle and a mother who has lost her son in battle, there is a gap that cannot be bridged? Come in, monsieur, and stay this night."

I do not know how many of you would rise to that height; but, my friends, the great forces of human affection, the great love of fathers and mothers for children the world over are fighting this battle. With that irresistible aid the women in this room can do this thing; they can do it because it is eternally right. There is no situation in the world in which the rules of right and wrong cannot function. There is no group in the world to which the laws of right should not apply, and you and I have to study this problem in this conference, and go out to teach the race that we will have law, not war.
FLORENCE ELLENWOOD ALLEN

The Living Power of Law
(An address delivered before the Judicial Section of the Ohio State Bar Association, July 6, 1938.)

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIARY SECTION, AND OF THE OHIO STATE BAR ASSOCIATION:

I keenly appreciate these kind words on the part of the Chairman. It is some sixteen years since I first had the privilege of addressing this Association, and upon that occasion the Ohio Bar extended to me a privilege that I fear we do not often extend in the Supreme Court. They gave me five more minutes of time that they had originally allotted me.

And I came away with a realization of the courtesy which this body shows to women who enter the legal profession. My friends, I think I voice the sentiment of every woman in this state who practices at the bar when I acknowledge to you our gratitude for your cooperation and your sympathy. I have studied law in states where women had to form their own bar associations, because their practice was not admitted at the regular bar. I have friends, fine women, practicing in states where, not very long ago, when the woman attended a meeting of the local bar association, no man present would speak to them.

Now, my friends, I am going to speak to you for a few minutes upon "The Living Power of Law."

Some fifteen hundred years before the Christian era, in the land of Egypt, one who was voicing the wall of the anguished litigant of that day said that "the man who stands alone before the court, when he is a poor man and his opponent is rich, is in a hopeless plight while the court oppresses him asking silver and gold for the scribes."

This wall of the injured Egyptian sounds like a harsh condemnation of the legal methods of that time. And yet history shows that there was a vast body of just law in existence in that day, and that when men went before the courts with their cases, the great scrolls of the law were unfolded on the dais, so that the litigant might refer to the particular statute which he had in mind and justify his case, but because of the unjust administration of the law, the justice of the enactment often availed the litigant but little.

So, down through all of the ages, we have had this problem recurring generation after generation, how to make the law, not a dead letter, but a living force, how to have the law
do the thing that it was meant to do, which is to establish justice among human beings.

Here is this country we set in the beginning a supremely high standard, because we not only said that justice should be done between man and man, but we said that the ultimate righteousness of law should apply even to the state itself. We said that the state should not be supreme over the law. Abraham Lincoln expressed it magnificently when he said that other governments were founded upon the denial of human rights, but that this nation was established upon the affirmation of human rights.

You remember how in the Lincoln-Douglas debates, Douglas, with his clever mind, raised the query as to just what was meant in the Declaration of Independence when they said that all men were created equal. He said that that applied only to Englishmen. He said that it meant that Englishmen in this country were to have the rights of Englishmen on the other side. But Lincoln, cutting down through that sophistry with his trenchant logic, pointed out in unassailable argument how our forefathers in the Declaration were laying down the principle that the supreme righteousness of the law is available to every human being.

I cannot quote all that Lincoln said, because it is a long extract, but he was discussing the phrase in the Declaration of Independence which says that all men are created equal and that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. Of course, he admitted that all men are not born equal in the literal sense. He admitted that all men do not have the same physical endowment nor the same mental stature nor the same personality. But he said that our forefathers wrote that declaration into our charter of liberty, because they wanted to set the mark toward which we were to work, namely, the establishment of equal justice and equal opportunity for all men and women within our borders. He said that they wanted to make it, and these are his words, "a hard nut to crack." He said they wanted to make those words "a stumbling block" in the time when some men should try to deprive other men of their rights.

In this country we have indeed achieved a magnificent result in the building of the framework of this Government. When I think that that less than one hundred and fifty years ago the Constitution was established, and that now today throughout the civilized world there are two great systems of orderly government, one, the cabinet system, like that of Great Britain, and the other the Federal system like that of the United States, and when I think that we established this government during the time that we were opening up a frontier, a time when we were tilling the fields and felling the forests, and starting to go their all of the industrial and economic development that we have seen here, then it seems to me amazing that our forefathers established here in this United States a stable, orderly national organization out of the thirteen jealous and warring colonies.
As I look into history I find that that result was achieved for one reason mainly, and that was that the men of training and talent of that day cooperated in the building of the government. They did not deem it beneath themselves to fill what are sometimes held to be a small official position with small salaries. They did not believe that the earning of fees or money reward was more important than helping to work out a great enterprise.


George Washington insisted so strenuously that John Marshall should run for Congress that he called him to Mt. Vernon. The story runs, as you have read it, as you did in Beveridge's life of John Marshall, that Washington argued so vehemently that John Marshall made up his mind to leave before daylight so as to escape from the father of his country. He arose at dawn and was styling off the porch when out came Washington, and held him and forced him to be a candidate for Congress.

Madison and Monroe and Patrick Henry put their shoulders to the wheel and helped to establish the nation.

So here in this country we have built up a magnificent framework. But can we say that we really have carried out the spirit of our supreme pronouncement, the spirit of our declaration that here in this country human rights should be made supreme?

Think what that presupposed! It presupposed the abolition of the old theory of private property in office. The monarch did own his kingship. It was a hereditary belonging. It came to him because of his blood. He had private rights in his kingly office. And those who held their offices from the king held them because of his ownership of those offices.

When we established a Republic here we abolished the conception of private property in public office, and we said that those who held office should hold it as a sacred trust to represent the people from whom the office comes; that it should be not a government of the officials and by the officials and for the officials but a government of the people, and by the people and for the people.

Then, too, we abolished the idea that there should be a distinction between men in securing human rights, and in place of that idea we raised the new conception that, regardless of wealth or influence or race or condition, men and women should stand equal before the law, and the same yardstick of justice and equity should be applied in every situation.

Have we been able to established those principles with the same magnificent success which marks the building of our governmental
When you and I look out into the Nation around us, when we see the Supreme Court of one great state wiping out an entire city election, because the whole proceedings was tainted and permeated with bribery and fraud, when we see the Supreme Court of another state holding its governor guilty of a felony, when we see in a metropolitan city armored cars manned by bandits, patrolling the streets, large groups of lawless people putting themselves about the law, can we say that we have worded out our spiritual enterprise as efficiently as we have built the framework of our government?

So it is, my friends, that I wish to say to you there is just one way in which to make the law a living power. The law one way in which to make the law a living power. The law will be just what we in this room make it for this state. If the lawyers emphasize the public as well as the private side of law, if the lawyers abolish technicalities, if the lawyers help to elevate the jury system, if the lawyers do away with perjury, if the lawyers set up a standard of public service in the conduct of criminal cases, then we shall indeed make the law a living force, and not till then.

When I was first made an Assistant Prosecutor in Cuyahoga county, one fact struck me with compelling force. In the important office in which I had a niche, while I did the work, some of the work, of the criminal branch, in the Grand Jury and in the trying of criminal cases, I observed with peculiar interest the work of the civil branch. There I saw intimately how our office acted as legal advisors for the county of Cuyahoga, how we handled the vast property interests of the county, how we dealt with problems of taxation, affecting literally millions of dollars. And also I observed this, that, although I had attended two fine law schools, one of them in New York City and one of them in Chicago University, because of the fact that at that time and in the ancient time when I studied law, women were not commonly received in the better law schools — I observed this fact that although I had attended those two reputable law schools — and at the time that I attended Chicago University, such men as Roscoe Pound, now the dean of Harvard Law school, were my instructors — there was no course in our whole curriculum which would have given me the training I would have needed if I had been called into the civil branch of the Prosecutor's office. There were indeed text-books which dealt with the problem of township and county and state law. There were treatises by learned authors which would help men who were handling the work for instance of the Attorney General's Office, but I could not find to my knowledge any course of the law school with which I came in contact which dealt in detail with the subject what I might call the public aspects of law.

Then it seemed to me in the emphasis upon private rights which as a profession we made, sometimes we were slipping away from the old conception of our forefathers, that the same standards
of equity and justice should apply in our group relationships as in our individual lives. We spent much time on torts and contracts and real property and personal property and bills and notes. I believe in private property, and I believe in studying the rules of private property, and I do not advocate the relaxing of emphasis upon the knowledge of those things. However, there should be double emphasis among the lawyers and the judges, and part of the emphasis should be upon the law of private rights and part of the emphasis in my judgment should be upon the law of public rights.

Because there has not been that double emphasis we have slipped back from the old conception of our forefathers, which was to demand the same standard of integrity in public life as in our individual relationships, to demand of officials that they hold their office in sacred trust for the people whom they represent, and not for the official's own advantage, and we have slipped back from the old conception that every branch of our governmental life is to be handled by the interest solely of the people who constitute the state.

As lawyers and judges, if we are to establish the law as a living force, we have to cooperate in erecting this non-material conception of the law among the people at large just as our forefathers conception of the fabric of our governing machine.

For that purpose, you and I, have to work to abolish the technicalities which choke and hamper the development of fair and impartial justice through the law.

I have been doing a little gardening this summer, and I discover that the weeds are very free to grow and choke off the good seeds. And everyone of here who has sat in the Court of Common Pleas knows that technical construction often obstructs the real justice of the case.

I do not advocate the abolition of legal form. We have to have a well ordered system of presenting cases both in pleading and on the trial. However, sometimes the very merit of the controversy is enmeshed in technicalities.

We cannot perhaps out the Jordan knot so well as Lincoln did. When, during the Black Hawk War he did not know the exact order by which to get his company through a gate, told them to "disband and pass through and form in two minutes on the other side". It is not as simple for us to handle as that.

And yet the truth is that these various measures proposed by this public-spirited measure committee headed by Judge Darby might have been proposed decades ago; and decades ago in the United States of America lawyers and judges had it as one of their chief obligations to clear away legal technicalities from obstructing the path of genuine justice.
Then, too, it seems to me that as long as we have the jury im-
bedded in our system, his honorable body recognized by our
constitutions, we have the duty of helping to improve jury
service. And I am not sure, speaking as a judge, that we ought
to abolish this jury. Sometimes people say that the jury is
unintelligent. Maybe they are just unintelligent as the for-
eigner to whom an agent named Smith sold a tractor up in our
next of the wood. He sold the tractor and demonstrated it,
and it worked satisfactorily. The next morning as Smith was
sitting happily at breakfast he was told that Mike the foreign-
er wanted him at the front door. Out he went. Mike said,
"Machine no go; machine no go." Smith said, "I will be right
over as soon as I have finished breakfast". "No, come right
along," said Mike, "machine no go." So Smith hurried off with
Mike. When he got to the farm and tried to start the tractor,
it wouldn't start. He looked at the ignition. Nothing wrong.
He tested the spark plugs and the timer and did everything he
could think of to see what was the matter with the machine.
By and by he chanced to look to see whether there was any gasoline,
and there it was dry as a bone. Then, of course, Smith made
the air blue with expletives about this foreigner who did not
know how to run a tractor without gasoline. After he had ex-
hausted his wrath on Mike with all the names he could think
of, he said, "Well, I don't know why I blame you. After all
we can sell everything else with the tractor, but we can't
sell brains." "No, no, of course not," answered Mike, "can't
sell what ain't got."

My friends, with our technical training sometimes we think, here
is the jury that does not know much about what is going on.
But the juries I have had, twelve average men and women, often
have a more sensible view of the case than some highly
trained, brilliant, technical lawyer.

Sometimes when I sit hearing motions in the Supreme court—
and my friends, we do not read the briefs on those motions
(laughter); we read the briefs and really discuss the cases—
many and many a time, there will be some small error in the
gal handling of the case, but the court thinks that on the
whole the jury has done substantial justice and that the jury
has done better with the case than a group of lawyers perhaps
would do if they reviewed it. And that is the practical ex-
perience in dealing with the motions day after day, that this
jury, this maligned jury, does substantial justice.

Now, there was a time when in this virile country, awake with
all of the enthusiasm of the new enterprise of building the
nation, lawyers acting as leaders of public opinion could have
established a high standard for jury service and an enthusiasm
and a morale in jury service without counterpart the world
over.

We are told that in a county like Cuyahoga 13,000 out of
50,000 are called for jury service. We lawyers and we judges
if we carried out our duty of molding public opinion, could
teach the privilege and the opportunity of jury service and
could help secure intelligent persons for the jury so that we
would vastly elevate the character of the service that is given.

Now just one word with regard to the teaching of legal ethics
by the lawyers and the judges. When I was attending law
schools, I observed that toward the end of a three year term,a
full three year term, we spent an hour or two on legal ethics.

Last summer I happened to have occasion to read over some of
the dialogues of Plato (not in the Greek, I regret to say, but
in smooth English translation), and there I found a most inter-
esting thing that I had ever known before, that one occasion
one of the students of Socrates came to before him the
next day had dawned and sat waiting, panting with expectation and
eagerness, until the sun rose, out in the porch of Socrates' house, waiting to get Socrates to go with him to hear some
famous philosopher talk—about what? Not about the new Ford,
not about the invention of that day which would correspond to
the new Ford. Not about some projected invasion by the Spar-
tans. Not about some campaign off in Asia Minor. But mind you,
about, "What is virtue? What is justice? What is self-reli-
ance? What is Courage?"

Then they went to the house where the great philosopher was,
and whom did they find there? Not just hair splitter. Not just
Sophists, who make the worse appear the better cause. But they
found there the judges, the Generals, and the men of affairs,
of Athens, considering what was the essence of the virtues.
And the men in Athens who did the outstanding work of Athens
actually lived out the principles of which they talked. And
when they ceased to care about those virtues Athens fell off.

In that I think there is some lesson for us. How many times
do lawyers get together and say, "What is right in this contin-
gency?" How many times do we teach the young lawyers to con-
sider, "What is the justice and the equity of this contingency?"

Now, the old standards of our forefathers were standards of
scrupulous integrity, the kind that was shown by Abraham Lin-
coln when his client disappointed him.

You remember how the client made Lincoln sue for some consid-
erable sum which he said had not been paid. At the lawsuit
they put in evidence a receipt, signed by Lincoln’s client,
showing that the money had actually been paid. It was a re-
cipt that the plaintiff supposed had been lost and would nev-
er be used against him. Lincoln arose and stalked out of the
courtroom, his gaunt and mighty frame expressing humiliation
in every line, went back to the hotel and sat down, with his
feet up on the stove, his great head in his hands. By and by
the Judge sent for him and all the message Lincoln back was
this: "Tell the Judge I am busy. Tell him I have to wash hands.
And in closing, my friends, I would say to you, conscious of the power of this organization, that the length of America's day, the measure of our power and of our influence as a nation, depends upon those of us who cooperate in erecting and maintaining the old standards of the law, that officials hold their office in trust for the people, and that every controversy shall be measured by the same rules of equity and justice, without regard to the wealth or race or condition of the litigant. We must cooperate as lawyers in molding public opinion to the attainment of these great ends. And when we do think this, so long as we do thing, the sun of America will not set, but will always rise.
With incredible swiftness in 1919 the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution was ratified and the fight was won — women had the vote. The women's movement had burst into flower in this country in 1848, and during the years from then until 1919, the women who battled for the vote showed a devotion to an impersonal cause, which, did an unparalleled thing in history. Their greatest monument is our liberty. That individuals unschooled, hampered in the base right to earn a living, should within one century burst the shackles riveted throughout the ages, is a very miracle. But we who share the fruits of their efforts, we inherit a land for which we did not labor. We dwell in cities that we built not, and of vineyards which we planted not do we eat.

Have we, as the prophets of the old foresaw, for those who inherit instead of winning the land of freedom, forsaken our old ideals? We said when we were working for the vote, we said and we believed, that if we were enfranchised there would not be merely a doubling of the political vote. We said women were loath to take the leash of the parties and would not be whipped in line by machine domination to quite the same degree as men. We believed that women would and should indeed enter the parties, but that they would carry something of a cleansing with them. The men believed this also. Even in the days of jeers and scoffing the men who believed in freedom for others as well as for themselves thought we would contribute to the political life of America. They believed what we said.

What do the past ten years reveal? Are women in politics in general "honest grafters?" Does the law of diminishing returns make our participation in government useless? Are we venal, sheep-like, and lacking in resources politically?

To me there is only one answer to these questions. Here and there woman suffrage is attacked because of the act of some woman office-holder. To be sure, of the thousands of women in this country holding responsible office, the proportion of those who have not lived up to the standard is infinitesimal. But after all, the extension of the suffrage to women cannot be tested particularly by the acts of women office-holders. If democracy were to be judged by the acts of men in office, it would have voted, so some people think, immediately a failure. And yet probably if we were to compare today with the venal monarchical times, the times when there was legal property right in public offices, and that property right belonged to the king and his favorites, we might change our minds with reference to the efficiency and integrity of democratic government. Surely when the commend upon Lord Bacon as chancellor of England is
that in taking bribes he only did what others did, and also
that he never permitted a bribe to "reflect his judgment" in any
given case that indicates that the character of office-holders
under romantic and idealistic kingship, of which it is fashion-
able to approve in these modern days, was not above reproach.

Moreover, the attack of a clever modern essayist, who says
that under the law of diminishing returns giving the vote to
men does not justify giving the vote to women, is shown to be
pointless when we consider the real power of the ballot. Whe-
ther or not the ballot is exercised at all, whether or not it
is exercised foolishly, there is a potential power in the fran-
chise which makes it hold just a little stronger and more in-
fluential than the one who does not have the vote. It is partly
because of this fact that the alien finds himself at a dis-
advantage in dealing with governmental agencies. Other diffi-
culties, lack of education, the natural disability under which
one rests who cannot speak the language of the country in which
he lives, exist for the alien; but his inability to vote is
a very real factor in his social weakness.

Now whether or not the American system is the best, whether
or not democracy in the sense of self-government is wise, the
fact remains that under our system, prior to ten years ago,
one-half of the adult population possessed the potential power
of the ballot. The fact also remains that up to ten years ago,
under this system, one-half of the adult population did not
possess that power. The result was that when women complained
to county commissioners about nuisances upon public highways,
or objected to city officials about decaying garbage upon city
streets, their protests for the most part fell upon deaf ears.
They spoke not with the voice of the master, but with the
voice of the pleader. This situation has been vastly altered.
It would be impossible adequately to describe the change with-
out illustrations from every township, city, county and state
in the Union. Women working with government, however, are well
aware what the change implies. They see uneducated women,
ill-dressed women, women seeking blindly for information con-
cerning their rights in city halls and court houses afforded a
response that never was given before. The office-holder sees
in every woman a possible vote, and that means that he does
—not dismiss her with the curt unconcern which formerly, while
not always, often was the rule. This protection from the
average woman is a thing which the ordinary essayist cannot un-
derstand. Even though he spoke with the tongue of men and
angels, his experience as a writer has not usually qualified
him to realize the disadvantage which rests upon those who are
disfranchised under our system. A sheltered cloistered his-
torical student as a rule cannot appraise this disadvantage at
its full weight. Only those who have had their heads beaten
by the bludgeon of official indifferences, or have seen other
women endure the lashes of curt unconcern can understand this
point. The social workers who saw the operation of governmental
agencies upon the family prior to the enfranchisement of women,
Women lawyers, who practiced in the inferior courts were the
great body of the people, prior to the enfranchisement of
women, happy seen this situation. The handicap under which
women rested prior to 1919 in alimony cases, non-support cases,
cases of desertion, cases involving the serious offenses against
the person, seduction, rape, labored under a handicap diffi-
cult to describe. Ten years ago that disadvantage existed
for one-half of the adult race in this country; and further-
more, the large majority of women were and are of the poorer
classes upon whom the disability rests with a peculiar burden.
Now it has been wiped out.

In other words, the doing of justice in the extending of the
vote to women has not an act of mere academic formality. It
Carried with it vital rights all along the line.

Moreover, those who say that women have had no effect in clean-
sing of politics completely ignore the effect of their presence
in public life upon the courts. I am not now speaking of the
election of judges, although St. Louis has shown that women have
power in that positive direction. I speak of that indefinable
but important thing that we call atmosphere. The time was when
the criminal court too often was not a pleasing place. Salaci-
ous stories and double entendres abounded before the jury in
certain kinds of cases. The judge with his lone hand was
often powerless to prevent the things that were said and im-
plicated by lawyers of unclean mind. In my pre-voting days, when
I was an assistant county prosecutor, I used often to see in
the criminal court room a change in the entire atmosphere of
the trial just because a woman passed through the room. Now
that women sit upon the jury, appear as lawyers and prosecut-
ors, in various instances - it as judges, the tone has alter-
ed indescribably for the better. This fact is of enormous
value. When a trial of justice becomes a questionable bur-
elique the state is not the winner, and the raising of the
dignity and tone of court proceedings in these important mat-
ters, of which sheltered women know so little has been a vit-
ual gain.

The work of women in the jury during the last thirteen years has
confounded the critics of sex and has delighted and surprised
its most confident friends. Shortly after the extension of the
franchise to women, the use of women on the jury begun in
Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, and from that time on the
practice has been used as six men and six women upon each
jury called. I remember when I was a trial judge interview-
ing various of the judges of the Court of Common Pleas to se-
icure their opinion with reference to the work of women on the
jury. I approached one judge with something of hesitation.
He was an able judge and lawyer, but he had the reputation of
being opposed to women. To my amazement he gave me a letter
in which he said that the women, so far from being as good as
the men on the jury, were better, adding over his signature
this statement, that the women on the jury were less apt to be
bamboozled by the lawyers than the men. In the work upon the grand jury in Ohio, the women members have been a wholesome, salutary force in the enforcement of law and the repression of crime. The secrecy of the grand jury proceedings has often been called "fixing," as it is called; in other words, in a corrupt arrangement to "no bill" or nullify charges of crime in the grand jury. The inclusion of women on the grand juries in Ohio has decreased the possibility, in my judgment, of such a use of the grand jury mechanism. In at least one instance in Cuyahoga county, a grand jury which had a number of women members and a woman for its foreman, rendered notable service in sifting the evidence, and returning the evidence of indictments in a number of cases which in the term before had been "no billed" one after the other, with a machine precision which suggested almost conclusively the possibility that something was rotten in Denmark. The approval of the work of women on the jury is practically universal among the bench and the bar of the twenty-one states where they are employed; and no fair picture of the effect of the enfranchisement of women can ignore the tremendous impetus which the use of women on the jury has given to interest in the entire court system.

The effect of woman suffrage is very often confused with the effect of the Eighteenth Amendment. Much of the hostility against woman suffrage now manifest may undoubtedly be traced to the conviction that the majority of women in favor the eighteenth enactment. However, prohibition was enacted by men. The Eighteenth Amendment went into effect prior to the Nineteenth by two years. Moreover, with the exception of Mrs. Wilkebrandt, whose hands, no doubt, were considerably tied, prohibition has been enforced by men. The enforcement machinery has been in the hands of men from the start. Whatever credit there may be for prohibition as enforced belongs to men; whatever discredit there may be from the failure to enforce prohibition today, from ill-advised and unfortunate tactics with reference to prohibition, from derailing the administrative control of the law in the hands of those opposed to it from the start, certainly lies not at the door of women. Without claiming any maximum of intelligence or integrity for women. I question whether women in charge of the prohibition law would have put into office to enforce that law, as a matter of machine politics, men who had been actively connected with the so-called wet organizations prior to the enactment of prohibition, and in some instances men of little or no standing. I dismiss prohibition from my consideration, therefore, except for the statement which I believe to be true, that the majority of women in the United States prefer to retain the prohibition against the liquor traffic.

During the late ten years we have seen the flowering and the fruiting of certain scandals in government. It is a truism to say that the influence which gave rise to these scandals had been brewing for a long period of time. The reign of the bomber and the racketeer and the gunmen in New York and
Chicago, and many of the states, and had its inception decades ago when decent men handed over government to the least desirable class of the community. Put in office men who have no backbone, men who think they are there to say "yes" to their friends, and men who look upon the government as private property for their own personal advantage, with the profit limited only by "what the traffic will bear," and the inevitable result will be, as it has been in various part of the United States, to turn over the government to men who desire to be protected from violation of all law; to the men who wish to be ignored in the commission of arson, highway robbery, kidnapping, forgery and murder. Chicago, Indiana, New York and Washington have been reaping exactly what for a number of years we have sown in our apathy toward government.

The only cure for this evil is militant interest in government. When the great body of political life is dead and the spirit of democracy is atrophied, nothing less than a resurrection, a turning into new paths of steadfastness and ethics and idealism is required. How have the women answered to this demand? The response is that they have answered nobly. Their leaders have avoided the net which was spread for them, to lure them into examining the shell of things, to spend themselves in merely academic theories of government. They have also avoided the tendency which was to be feared, that women would devote themselves to methods of garbage disposal and street cleaning, ignoring the mighty issues of right and wrong. They have faced actualities of government and as a result, during the past ten years, women of diversified groups everywhere show an amazing increase of interest in governmental problems.

This never could have happened, at least in large degree, if women had been as before, deprived of the governmental function; but now everywhere begin we to feel the awakening which forecasts reform. Among small groups of women, which formerly held aloof from everything except household and personal interests, there is a stir. They begin to sense the fact that government has something to do with the protection of life and property; that schools and health, and the great question of war and peace, are matters of household concern in which they themselves may play a part. I have been somewhat familiarly in touch with women's organizations, both before and since our enfranchisement. Great bodies of women, numbering thousands in their membership, which formerly never permitted discussion of any subject deal with public service, now are seeking eagerly for leadership along that line. The rebound in this intensification of interest upon men themselves cannot be estimated. We can only say that in the awakening of public interest surely lies the key to the difficult problems that confront us.

It is always something of a special argument to speak of particular results of woman suffrage, for as soon as we claim that the women achieved this or that result, we raise a preliminary
argued as to whether or not the result was advantageous. If
we say that women have helped materially in the solution of in-
ternational problems during these ten years, some one arises
will say that, if for no other reason, because of their action
upon this or that treaty women should be disfranchised. However,
it seems to me that no article of this kind would be complete
without some mention what to me is the outstandng contribution
of women to our public life in the last ten years.

Women in America have had almost no opportunity actively to
build for world peace, from the official standpoint. They have
been even more remote from the problem than from the problem
of prohibition. During the past ten years women from various
European countries have acted as participating voting delegates,
with full powers, upon great international bodies; but in the
United States no women have as an official delegate upon
any international conference which has dealt with disarmament,
or with any cause or cure of war. The negotiations upon these
subjects have been managed entirely by men, and whatever credit
it is to given for the conduct of the negotiations must be as-
scribed to men instead of to women. However, although handi-
capped by lack of direct representation in these matters, wo-
men have had an influence upon international relationships in
this country for the last ten years which certainly never would
have been theirs without the vote.

One of the most astounding achievements of popular opinion in
the direction of world peace has been the right about face in
our attitude towards Mexico under the Coolidge administration.
Under Ambassador Sheffield we were rapidly drifting into a
situation where intervention would have been demanded. In-
tervention might not, but it might have led to war, -- a war in
which, after all, the main concern would have been whether our
Scheuys and Sinclairs, after their oil operations in this coun-
try should dictate to the Mexican government just how it should
act with reference to oil legislation. Too much praise can
hardly be accorded Dwight Morrow for his conduct of affairs in
Mexico, after the retirement of Sheffield. But to the Ameri-
can people belongs the main credit of having forced the change
of attitude and the change of ambassadors. The women played
an important part in the pressure of public opinion which forced
a change. The establishment of the conference of the Cause and
Cure of War, by Mrs. Catt, bringing out to the great women's
organizations, the church organizations, the women's clubs,
the business women, and the professional women, to the college
women, affected a form in which our relationships with Mexico
and the Caribbean were discussed with absolute candor. The
influence of women in the Conference on the Cause and Cure of
War was partly recognized by those opposed to the extension of
the peace movement. Before the first conference, held in Wash-
ington, an distinguished officer said in a public address that
pacificism in the United States was rampant because of the
women's invariable desire to mix in things which they did not
understand. It is true that there are certain features of the
war system which women "do not understand." Women cannot quite
understand why the men who make large investments in foreign
countries should desire to avail themselves of dollar diplomacy
to such a point that hostilities will ensue in which other
men's sons will fight their battles. Women feel that if there
be to be a war over markets or oil wells, it should be fought
by the men and the son of the man who want the markets and the
oil wells. Fortunately for the world this is an ineradicable
feminine instinct. The throwing of the spotlight upon Mex-
ico and the Caribbean, this sore spot in our relations, under
masterfully generalship of Mrs. Catt, has enormous influence.
Protests of women leaders throughout the country, on the plat-
form, in the press, in letters, played their full part, and if
the churches are to be approved for their full part in the
great controversy, let us not forget that it is conceded that
the majority of the church members' are women. It is always
impossible exactly to estimate the weight of interlocking forces;
but that the weight of the enfranchised womanhood of this na-
tion was against intervention of war with Mexico will certainly
be conceded.

When it comes to the enactment of the Multilateral Treaty for
the Renunciation of War, the case is even plainer. I think it
is not too much to say that the Kellogg Pact would not have
been ratified in this could not women been voting in this coun-
try. Women were a potent force in the years of education
which led up to the enactment of the Kellogg Pact. The first
endorsement of the so-called outlawry of war was made by the
National Women's Trade Union League. The National Young Wo-
men's Christian Association followed speedily with a ringing
endorsement at Hot Springs, Arkansas, in 1922. Between 1931 and
1933 the national Trade Women's League demanded that "we out-
law war." The International Federation of Working Women pre-
pared to declare "war to be a crime under the law of nations."
The American Association of University Women stated that it
favor the "outlawry of war by international agreement." They
General Federation of Women's Clubs said "We believe that war
is the supreme folly of the earth." The National Federation of
Business and Professional Women's Clubs affirmed its belief
that "War cannot be prevented while it is legal and sanctioned." The
National League of Girls' Clubs declared that "war should
be outlawed and abolished." The National League of Women
Votes urged our government to take further steps to "eliminate
causes of war and abolish war itself." In its plan of work at
the same convention, the National League of Women Voters re-
commended the initiation and support of measures "to develop
a code of international procedure by which war shall be declar-
ed a crime and outlawed as such." The National Women's Christ-
ian Temperance Union urged "the outlawry of war by internation-
al law." The Service Star Legion demanded the "promotion of
an international code for the maintenance of permanent peace,
and thereby substituting law for war." The Young Women's
Christian Association declared that "the further use of war as
an instrument for the "settlement of disputes should be aban-
and that war between nations should be declared to be a public crime and should be outlawed." And the result was that when Briand offered to Secretary Kellogg "to subscribe to any mutual engagement tending to outlaw war, to use an American expression, "the country had received an extensive education upon the subject at the hands of women. In 1938, 14,000 meetings were held in favor of ratification of the Multilateral Treaty, in under the auspices of women; hundreds of thousands of names on petitions, thousands and thousands of letters were secured by women for the enactment buying the treaty. Typical of the reaction was the vote of Senator Him Reed, of Missouri, who after criticizing the pact in his characteristic style, said that he voted for it because he did not wish to be hanged in effigy on every street corner in Missouri.

I do not minimize the work of men in this movement, nor the great leaders who made possible the consummation of the Multilateral Treaty. Every one of them deserves signal credit. But I am saying that the steady education work of women, which ramified out in every direction from these great women's organizations, and their militant drive for the enactment of the treaty, had colossal weight. It took a two-thirds vote to ratify, and I question whether the Kellogg Pact would have been written into our books, at least with the concurrence of America, unless the woman had been voting.

After all, ten years, historically speaking, are but as yesterday when it is passed; but these ten years have been long enough to show that the great words of Gertrude Baumer as to the enfranchisement of women and the movement for world peace are true: (quotation omitted).

In the years to come, as we fulfill the implications of the Pact of Paris by proceeding to write law abolishing the implications of the institutions of war, enfranchised women will be found to have played a powerful part in the great achievement. This prophecy will be true if we carry on along the lines of the past ten years.
Reduction of Armaments

Text of an address by Florence E. Allen, Judge of the Supreme Court of Ohio, over the National Broadcasting Company February 23, 1930.

Last November, speaking in Washington on Armistice Day, President Hoover made the significant statement that reduction in armament by the other countries of the world could not be "too low for us." In this statement the vast majority of the American people concur. The President had behind him and has behind him public opinion of this country in an effort to secure not merely parley and negotiation over disarmament, not merely negligible limitation of armament, but a positive reduction in armament. The President pointed out at that time that the men under arms, including active reserves, in the world, are almost thirty million in number, or nearly ten millions more than before the great war.

"The expenditures which are directly or indirectly attributable to the war and the national defense comprise of 30% of total federal expenditures. This will be the inevitable situation as long as war is the method of settling international disputes." This is not the statement of a revolutionary nor a mere idealist. It is the statement of a hardheaded man of affairs in an official financial result, namely, of Andrew D. Mellon, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in his annual report of 1925. Those vast expenditures made by our own country have by no means always gone to the men who stood under shell-fire. The men who went insane in the trenches in France came back to this country to meet with frequent neglect. The Congressional Record two years later after the armistice contains scathing statements by alienists and physicians and pointing out the disgraceful inadequacy of the hospitals and equipment for treatment of the men who live a living death today because they lost their minds in France. The last Congress passed a sadly belated bill for aid of disabled veterans, and those who work with the ex-service men know how much is still to be done.

Now, it has not all been spent upon the boys who manned the guns in trenches upon foreign soil. An ever-increasing amount has gone for battleships.

It is now proposed in London by our naval delegation, if the press quotes correctly, that we proceed to construct an additional super-dreadnought to cost some forty millions, and to construct additional cruisers which will cost approximately a billion dollars within five years, and to add to this cost upon already burdened taxpayers; and this in the face of the fact that every warship is mechanically obsolete at the moment when it is launched. Almost every thoughtful citizen accepts the facts that the next battle will be fought in the air.
The statement is made upon high military authority that no defense of warship or army will avail against the destruction possible when bombs are released, as they will be, from the air. The Cleveland Clinic disaster illustrated the possibilities in the direction of the use of poison gas. America must not be stripped of defense. However, since we see the astounding gain in air transportation with our own eyes, as a part of our daily life, we may well ask, without desiring in the slightest to relax proper means of our own defense prior to the establishment of law among the nations, why should America take the absurd step of alienating international friendship by this gesture of war in order to secure weapons which will be useless for the war purposes at their birth? And this after President Hoover has declared that reduction by the other countries "cannot be too low for us."

In a current issue of the Saturday Review of London, it is stated that "It is surely time for more Americans to realize that they, and not Europeans, are the greatest obstacles to the reduction of armaments." And unfortunately this command is borne out by the present situation with reference to battleships. Now the only great powers concerned with the building of battleships are the United States, Great Britain and Japan. Mr. McDonald has twice indicated his desire to take a very substantial step in the direction of abolishing the battle-ship. Upon February 7 Prime Minister McDonald proposed no replacement of existing ships before the next conference in 1935, and declared that his government "would wish to see an agreement by which battleships will in due time disappear altogether, as it considers them a very doubtful proposition in view of their size and cost and development of the efficacy of the air and submarine attack."

We have eighteen of these ships yet to build which cost anywhere from thirty millions to forty millions each and if their proposed construction were eliminated, our naval expenses would be vastly lessened. But instead of meeting Mr. McDonald halfway upon his proposition, to which Japan is reported to have indicated her assent, we proceed to slap Great Britain in the face with our proposal to construct the additional super-dreadnought and to enter upon an era of extensive cruiser building.

This situation with reference to the warship and cruisers illustrates the need of the expression of popular opinion upon the whole subject of war and peace. The President has pointed the way toward actual reduction, but he needs our backing, or the Jingoes will be too strong for him. From time to time we are told that international relations are the duty of the President into things which do not concern him. On the contrary the Constitution of the United States provides, in Article I, Section 8, that "The Congress shall have power --- to declare war." The Constitution further provides that the President shall have the power "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make
to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. Hence the Constitution itself, which is the charter of our liberties, took from the executive the power that is usually exercised by the executive, namely, the power of declaring war, and placed it in the representatives of the people, and took from the executive the power to make treaties, than generally exercised by the executive, and placed in the Senate, one of the bodies of Congress, representatives of the people, and required a two-thirds vote. Hence under the Constitution of the United States it is not only the right, but the duty of the citizen to inform the administration, the President, the Department of State, and the Senate and the Congress, of his wishes with reference to all measures bearing upon war and peace.

And when the citizen takes this action, its effect is enormous. Those of you who are listening in to this particular radio program, if you desire America not to shake the mailed fist by the building of this battleship and these cruisers, if you desire America to cooperate not only in negligible limitation, but in actual reduction, if you wish us to act upon Great Britain's proposal to abolish the battleship, you will write to your Senator, you Congressman, your President, or better, telegraph him and protest our proposed action. You Congressman, your Senator, your President, may perhaps not frame your letter or your telegram and preserve it among the archives, but if your Senator, your Congressman, and most of all your President, receive one thousand letters protesting against the building of the battleship and cruisers --- against ignoring McDonald's proposal, and asking that America live up to her sworn obligation under the Kellogg Pact and lead the way to actual disarmament, as compared with ten letters demanding that we continue to shake the mailed fist and threaten the world with our might and power, your letter will have its weight in the final result. Surely the proposal to construct these ships as made by our naval delegation at London does not represent the American people.

I am aware of the cogency of the statement so often made that in order to establish world peace we must build an international mind and must teach the thoughts of peace in the school and in the church and in the home. This is essentially true. However, in the ultimate conclusion, wars are made by the acts of government. The act of the Kaiser in declaring the German Empire in a state of war was an act of government. Wars are made by acts in government; and in addition to cultivating tolerance and amiety in international viewpoints, with reference to his own government and its foreign policy, the citizen rests under a positive obligation of militant action. If he does demand that his government act in accordance with the spirit of the Multilateral Treaty to Renounce War, he will himself be a partner in the fatal results when the government commits some which tends inevitably towards war.
It is peculiarly essential that the citizens express themselves upon these questions, because we have just solemnly pledged ourselves to condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and to renounce it as an instrument of international policy. We have agreed with practically all of the civilised world that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or whatever origin they may be which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means. As Arthur Henderson, Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, has just stated: (Quotation omitted).

Hall, whose masterly work on the International Law has just been quoted and relied on by the United States Supreme Court in one of its decisions, says international law recognizes war as a permitted mode of giving effect to its decisions. He also states that international law has "No alternative but to accept war, independently of the justice of its origin, as a relation which parties to it may set up if they choose." This quotation throws into sharp light the legality of the war system since the upgrowth of nations the prerogative of the sovereign either expressly admitted or tacitly recognised by every writer on international law as it actually exists.

If now, having entered into this solemn covenant, we proceed upon the old plane, if we juggle, as the London Times has said, with the "mathematics of parity, category or category"k we fail to grasp our unique opportunity to infuse life-blood into the Kellogg Pact. It is no longer logical to consider disarmament in terms of scrapping one or two battle-ships and to pile unto that a billion dollar program for new building, when we have all registered a common renunciation of a resort of war.

If the individual citizen speaks his mind upon this subject, the President's program will be fulfilled. Only by the same irresistible pressure which we exerted to secure the ratification of the Kellogg Pact can President Hoover succeed in his firm intention actually to reduce armament. When the fathers and mothers of this country demand that the revenue of the country be expended upon the school children, upon the roads, upon public health, upon the disabled veterans of the World War, instead of upon floating steel citadels which are obsolete at birth, which can be paralyzed with a single bomb from a single airship, and that whatever defense we make be sensibly employed in the direction of air defense, then the great burden of tax-paying for those useless purposes will be lifted, the black throat of war will be dissipated like the fog before the sun, and we shall begin actually to realize the perfectly feasible dream of the prophet, that "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."
Some years before the Declaration of Independence was made famous by receiving the open and public support of the rebellious colonies of Great Britain in America, a young man named Bacon was executed in the Colony of Virginia for promulgating the same ideas of freedom and justice declared in the Declaration. Bacon has gone down in history as a rebel hanged for treason but so powerful are the ideas which he espoused that in less than one hundred and fifty years they have swept the globe and changed the nature of every existing government. Under their influence new energies have been released in mankind and America, under the invigorating power of their freedom, has thrived like a child brought from the slums of a medieval city to the clean air of the country. And like a fast-growing youth her career has been headless. She has rushed headlong, seemingly unaware of the great ideas to which she owes her vigor and forgetful of the men who released the principle and the power which are in her life-giving heritage. America nods only to be reminded how black was the night from which they set her free, and to be warned of the danger inherent in departure from those same principles.

Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin broke for us the bondage which had held Europe for ages to the conception that a king rules his people by divine right, that whatever he did was right because he did it, that "a state could do no wrong." England had just said to her colonies in effect, "You belong to me therefore whatever I do to you is beyond question, it is right because I do it." And the founders had retorted, "If you believe that the laws of eternal righteousness can not be abrogated, then the ultimate righteousness of law and justice is supreme over the state itself." Thus they defied the old dogma "The state can do no wrong" and they enunciated the new doctrine of the state responsible to its subjects, a state bound by ethical principles, a state whose purpose is to do right and justice. They said, "Hereafter, the state shall do no wrong. The state shall do right and justice."

And if the doctrine of state morality was good doctrine for the correction of kings, it is good doctrine today for democratic governments. "The state shall do no wrong." From highest executive to least deputy, officials shall do no wrong.

There have been many successful revolutions in history, other nations have had their birth in freedom from older nations. America is distinguished in her founding but not by her successful rebellion but by the doctrine she enunciated. Here a people made a covenant binding themselves to do right and
and justice. They framed the idea of righteousness into the very fabric of government and dedicated a whole people to a moral purpose.

When the modern writers find occupation for their busy pens in declaring that the "democratic experiment has failed", or in writing derogatory biographies of the founders, they miss the main point, the real significance of their work, which is this, that the first step in regeneration of individual states is the intent to do right. America began by declaring it to be her intent to do right, secure justice for all men. Never before had any nation so declared for no nation had ever so intended. Hitherto governments had existed for the welfare of the few and begrudged justice to the many. The unshakable understanding of fundamental right held in the clear minds of a few powerful men started this nation on a new path in the history of the Western World.

To intend better things is the only way to begin better things in government. The founders did not believe that they had secured the millennium but they knew, as Lincoln said, that they had set a "stumbling block for tyrants".

Their derogatory biographers so far fail to comprehend what happened, so completely miss the import of their work and they are satisfied to set them down as "men like us". They were men like unto us only as a giant resembles a dwarf. What counts in taking their measure is the distance they travelled beyond us. A man six feet three inches tall is distinguished by the last three inches of his height not by the six feet! They were intellectual and moral giants compared with their little modern detractors. In a few years America will regret the empty books written during this sallow period before she has attained the height necessary to survey wisely her own national figures and affairs.

When Lord Bryce examined our institutions about thirty years ago he was puzzled by our political rings. He found, he said, that their leaders were not wicked men. "But", he said, "they only see the door open to wealth and they walk in. The obligations of patriotism and duty to the public are not disregarded by them for these obligations have been never present in their minds." It seems strange that America should breed unworthy inheritors of the great ideas, men with no conception of the real purpose of government, men whose conduct is lower in the scale of motivation than that of the mediaeval tyrants. Lord Bryce might have prophesied that the corruption existing in that day would spread, but he could not prepare us for the present state of things. The ring politicians of today can no longer be called naif and innocent. In the early days this government "of, by and for the people" was held in greater respect than now. Men elected to hold office in that new government, conceived in liberty were not
marked only by their ability but by their integrity. Unfaithfulness in office was unheard of. Today a critic might be forgiven for saying that government for the people has become government "of the officials, by the officials and for the officials."

Two decades ago, the word politician took on a derogatory connotation and leading citizens and whole communities directed their attention to other things, to education, to better housing, to the building of public libraries and museums, beautiful boulevards and parks. But we withdraw our attention from government at our peril. Corruption does not cease because we disregard it. During the period of inattention elections were held as usual and silently the element of lower took control. The story of the efforts of the cities to recover their governments and their varying degrees of success and failure are well to the fore at present in some of our leading cities.

Eternal vigilance is different and difficult, it makes demands on our finest but our most reluctant characteristics. Liberty and democracy and honor can not be handed ready made by one generation to the next. A man does not secure his education by deputy, nor delegate another to eat for him, nor his relation to Democrat is just as personal as his relation to food and to education. Democracy will not work unless the people work it. Its very nature, the essence of its meaning are released by through individual action and responsibility.

Our development as a nation has been determined largely by outward stimuli, the call of the frontier, the unexplored West, the location of mines, the demands of new industries. Our growth has passed and self directed activity, reasoned conduct should take the place of headlong enthusiasm. There is very little of Europe left in America and we face an unsurmisable future. The Arctic explorers prepare for the unknown by taking care explicitly and exactly of the known. They study the fundamental needs of man. And so must America facing the unknown remember fundamentals, stay near great truths. Lincoln—in his passionate faith in the fundamentals of the Declaration of Independence—guided his principles and beliefs, inspired in his life and flowed in his Gettysburg speech. Under their inspiration he recast this nation. The pure democracy of Lincoln would kill out corruption today, it would triumph as man thinking must triumph over ignorant man, as man functioning through conscience must eventually overcome man functioning through greed for self, as man impersonal towers over man the partisan.

There may be only a little democracy in the present government, there may be only a trace of the original great intention carried out. The existing order may be as false an imitation as our critics would have us think; still even a forgery argues
an original, and in imitation proves the existence of its model. Our spasmodic exercise of the democratic principles may serve to keep alive the knowledge that government "of, by and for the people" does work until at last we achieve the level of Lincoln's conception of public duty.

Even the best-meaning of us have so weak an intention in the right direction that our conduct as citizens is unaffected by our pale principles. We are those lukewarm creatures whom "the Lord Spews out of his mouth." Compare the eager interest of the Greek in Plato's day with ours. A pupil of Socrates came at night to tell him that Protagoras had arrived in the city, and pupil and teacher talked together of the philosophy of Protagoras until daylight and then hastened to the house where many others had already gathered to discuss the "guess what, not the latest banking device or the newest fortune, but to analyse the fundamentals of courage, to ask, "What is justice?" and "What is a man's duty toward the state and how is it best expressed?" Many Americans are interested in better government, they are not indifferent to justice, and they enjoy the idea of honor, but they do not get their chief satisfaction out of fostering such things. They seek first the Kingdom of Midas and expect better government to be added unto them. A paraphrase of Emerson's line, on the great state would remind us that we must be servants as well as lovers of that which is just, "and straightway every man becomes a center of a holy and beneficent people which he sees to include all men in its law, like that of Plato and Christ," a state can do no wrong.