

THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.

VOL. I. CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH, 1869. No. 10.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF REV. FATHER HECKER'S LECTURE, DELIVERED AT LIBRARY HALL, IN CHICAGO, JAN. 9TH, 1869, ON THE "RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY."

BY W. THIRDS.

We shall be obliged to use a synopsis of Father Hecker's Lecture, as published in the *Chicago Tribune*.

"He commenced by calling the attention of his hearers to the two tendencies that are now at work in the world, which were day by day gaining strength and straining in opposite directions—the one leading to Rationalism, the other to Romanism. All efforts to find a standing point between the two were unavailing; that the alternative was really not between Rome and Reason, but between Rome and Rationalism; between, in fact, Catholicism and Infidelity. He maintained that in this country Protestantism had every opportunity to spread and develop itself; that it had possession from the first, that it had held it uninterruptedly ever since, and that the results should tell their own story. New England was a fair example of what he intended to prove, of a country degenerating beneath the very baneful influence of Protestantism; the people were honest, enthusiastic and not wanting in intelligence. No one thought much of Boston, and yet if any one wished to know what would be thought by Protestants ten years hence, he should go to Boston and learn. The people of New England had lost all hold of the positive doctrines of Christianity, as an anecdote would show. In a New England town the population consisted of Unitarians and Episcopalians; a church was needed, as none existed; each denomination was too poor to build a church alone; what

could they do? They agreed to combine and build one, leaving the choice of their religion to a majority of citizens; the election was made and the Episcopalians triumphed by a majority of four. And thus it was determined that a majority should decide their religion. That the Unitarians, who deny the divinity of Christ, should offer worship to me, who was in their opinion a *man*, and so fall into idolatry. Another proof that the doctrines of Christianity were not deemed essential, was that the three denominations most opposed to Christianity are now most popular in New England, Universalists, Unitarians, Spiritists, and that these three are compelled to coalesce to maintain a church at all; and, worse than all, that New England, once renowned for religion, had fallen into Paganism, Rationalism and superstition.

“Father Hecker then read several extracts from the *Christian Examiner*, for Jan., 1868, referring to the different views arising from the reaction produced by over restraint, and deduced from them the fact that not only was Protestantism the destruction of Christianity, but even the author of Atheism. He read a sermon by Rev. B. Hinsdale, of Detroit, a Baptist minister, who said that in Cincinnati the number of communicants was less by 2,000 than it was twenty years ago, while the population of that city was growing every day; and added, on his own authority, that Protestantism in New England has lost its hold and does not keep pace with the population; that the cause was simply thus; that Protestantism was based on an exaggeration of the supernatural, and a corresponding neglect of human reason; that it ended in making redemption so great as to annihilate human co-operation, and made salvation depend on election; and lastly that it exaggerated the torments of hell; that the natural reaction was assertion of free-will against Puritanism; that man in New England was now the opposite of what he was fifty years ago; where they used to tremble at the horrors of hell, now they were singing of the good time coming; where women were burnt as witches, scarcely one can be found who has not dealings with disembodied spirits!

“He attacked the Protestants for denying the truth of tradition as an authority divine—and for yet accepting it, as in the observance of Sunday any more than Saturday; in infant baptism, and in other instances; ridiculing Martin Luther’s reason for amending

the passage in one of St. Paul's epistles by the addition of the word "alone," thinking *Voluntas non pro ratione stat* a poor excuse for altering the Bible; condemned the judgment which declared St. James' epistle one "of straw," and told an anecdote of the German nobleman who found he had erased every word in the Bible on the same principle. That whereas family was the foundation of society, Protestantism as the mother of Rationalism was the destroyer of the nuptial tie by depriving it of its sacred character; and so was the enemy of society. Phillip of Hesse, who applied to Martin Luther for leave to marry a second wife, his first being yet alive, demonstrated to the world by Luther's countenance of the deed, the principles of a religion that permitted polygamy. The ratio of divorces to marriages in New England was 1 to 8, and he predicted a speedy extinction of American citizens in that part of the Union. A thousand agencies were at work to accomplish that end, and the causes were easier to learn than the remedies, and these causes were not the war, pestilence or famine. He averred that Revelations never stood in the way of thought, but was to it as the telescope to the astronomer, and that it no more quenched the light of reason than the telescope quenched the astronomer's eye. The authorities of the Church of Rome were true; written as the Bible, unwritten as tradition and internal authority, afforded to every man; the obedience to the Church was not degrading but ennobling. The Pope, the Priest, the Church, were not regarded but as the exponents of the divine authority which they themselves obeyed; that as the Church was a witness of the truth, so were Popes and Priests the witnesses of the truth; the assertion that the Church proclaimed as a new dogma the "Immaculate Conception" in 1854 was as true as that which ascribed to the Convocation of Nice the doctrine of the Trinity. In contrast with the destructive social effect of Protestantism, he declared that Romanism was protective by its recognition of matrimony as a sacrament; an instance of the unswerving fidelity of the Church was its refusal to grant the divorce of Henry the VIIIth from his wife Catharine. The advantages of Romanism over Protestantism, he summed up as these: Its spread, its unity of purpose and the solid front it showed against invasion. In conclusion, he wished to relieve his hearers from the fear that

Romanism would stand in the way of freedom, of intelligence and of enterprise; and thought that one thing alone was wanting to form this people into a mighty nation, and that was a universal religion. The energy which wedded the Old World to the New with the cable, that joined the Atlantic and the Pacific, needed but an object to sway the immensity, to the author of a glorious destiny; the question was pressing on the American mind what their religion should be, and at no distant day it would proclaim itself Catholic."

We shall make our comments upon the above in a general way, but in a manner, we trust, that shall meet the points which the learned "Father" labors to establish.

There is one phase of human life which attracts our particular attention whenever we enter upon the domain of the religious theories of mankind. That is, the surrender of human reason to tradition, or the abandonment of the intuition or judgment to the wildest phantoms or stories which the imagination of man may invent. Men of sound judgment and good common sense on all other things pertaining to the ordinary affairs of life, will often become monomaniacs upon some religious dogma that sets reason at defiance, and laughs the plainest deductions of science to scorn.

It is common for Protestant Christians to decry and laugh at the Catholics for the absurdities in their faith or modes of worship, and, *vice versa*, when each stands upon the same basis, namely, tradition, miracle and special providences—knock these props from under them and they fall to the ground, a shapeless mass of rubbish. We can just as readily believe in an immaculate conception as we can in a miraculous conception. It is no greater stretch of credulity for us to believe in the spotless purity of the Virgin Mary than it would to believe that Jesus was born without a father. Just as easy to believe in transubstantiation as to believe that the blood of a man or of a God possesses any purifying qualities of a moral or spiritual character. So, when we come down to the rationale of the matter, we ask, What is the difference between the two systems? If there be a difference, it is practically in favor of the Catholic. The

Protestant churchman first declares for a divine principle, the right of private judgment; then ignores and tramples it beneath his feet, by declaring, "Believe, or be damned!" The Protestant is just as much a slave to tradition and church creeds as the Catholic. If a man possesses the absolute right of private judgment, why should he be damned for an honest exercise of it? As Father Hecker intimates, a Protestant hell is a far more intolerable institution than a Catholic hell. The Roman Church is one of the most compact, unitary institutions in the world. Its theories and practices are in accordance with each other. It openly declares itself a despotism, and reduces its doctrines to practice wherever it can. Protestant churchianity declares for freedom, yet denounces all dissenters as deserving victims of the "wrath of God"!

If we look into the history of the Reformation under the leadership of Martin Luther, we will find that it commenced in the Northern States of Germany, and carried its conquests thence over North-Western Europe, and was, at one time, making rapid progress in the South, toward the Mediterranean Sea, threatening the whole Catholic world with total annihilation. But by timely reformation in the Mother Church, and the herculean labors of its clergy, the flood-tide of conquest by the Reformation was at length stayed. A reaction took place; the Roman hierarchy recovered its aggressive energies, and, at one time, it seemed likely to obtain its lost possessions. It did win back a large part of them. Then, in turn, Protestantism was threatened, and was in danger of total extirpation from the soil of Europe. If we look carefully into the causes which produced the contest, we will have no difficulty in accounting for it. *First*, It was the intolerable despotism and corruption of the Mother Church which gave birth to the Reformation. *Second*, The devotion of the Catholic leaders, and their opportune reform of Church abuses, saved it from destruction. *Third*, The leaders of the Reformation falsified their pledges and ignored the basic principles of Protestantism. They started out as the champions of religious toleration and freedom of conscience. It is true that, in their process of reconstruction, they lopped some of the excrescences of the old Church; but in the new organization, the root, or fundamental principles, of

the Mother church still remained undisturbed and in full vigor. So, in turn, they became dogmatic and intolerant, so much so that they did not hesitate to propagate the new religion by the old appliances of persecution and physical force. It is true, their wars of propagandism were not conducted on so extensive a scale as were those of the Catholic Church, under the auspices of the Popes, of Charles Vth of Germany and Phillip IId of Spain. The reasons were obvious. Catholicism was a compact, or organization, acting as a unit; while Protestantism was divided into factions. The Catholic world was homogeneous. The Protestant world was heterogeneous, with just enough of the "infidel" element in it to keep alive the embers of a genuine Protestantism, or the pure principles of civil liberty. But the people were yet so encumbered with superstition and ignorance that they were not prepared to assert their rights, and secure their complete enfranchisement in the great truths which first gave life and efficiency to the Reformation. The people merely changed masters, without any perceptible amelioration of conditions.

But, after all, the Reformation gave a new impulse to thought, and laid the foundations for a mighty revolution, by the annunciation of one of the grandest truths that ever moved the hearts or shaped the destiny of the human race: *The absolute right of every human soul to its own thought; to form its own conclusions; to worship God, or the Gods, as to it seems good.* This right of private judgment is either true or false. If false, as Father Hecker would have us believe, then we may as well return at once to the loving embrace of our Mother, the Roman Church, kiss the great toe of the "Holy Father," the Pope, and be, henceforth, submissive to his will. But if true, as we have no doubt it is, then the Protestant and Catholic theologians are alike at fault; and Father Hecker's positions concerning the "Condition of the Country," are true, so far at least, as Protestant churchianity is concerned. We acknowledge, however, that Protestant Christianity has done a great, an essential work in the world. We also believe that the Roman Church has subserved a useful purpose in the world's history.

Father Hecker's first proposition is unquestionably true, viz: That there are two tendencies at work in the world, "one leading

to Rationalism, the other to Romanism." "All efforts," continues the Rev. "Father," "to find a standing point between the two are unavailing. The alternative is really between Rome and Rationalism."

So we believe. Romanism represents absolute authority in the Church and State. Rationalism absolute freedom, independence from any Church. Father Hecker's statement that Protestant Christianity is on the decline, running out into Rationalism, or "infidelity," especially in New England, is no doubt true. The causes are apparent. If human society was predisposed to stagnation and fossilization, as Catholicism contemplates, then we might look for an eternal monotony in the social and religious world. But this is not the rule. Action, or change, is the eternal law of nature. Life and death, the positive and negative forces, are the immediate agencies of all development or growth. When the chicken matures to a certain point it cracks the shell and escapes its bonds. So, under the operations of Protestant Christianity, when a man outgrows his creed, he breaks loose from its trammels and secures his freedom. This process is now rapidly going forward in New England. This age is evidently a transitional one. Nothing can stop the disintegrating forces now at work, until important advances are secured in political, social and religious life. There can be no doubt of the fact, as Father Hecker believes, that the seeds of dissolution are perceptibly at work in the "Evangelical" churches. Ultimately, and we believe at no distant day, the conservative element in them, will gravitate to, and find rest in the Mother Church, while the liberal element now in the churches will become absorbed in the great revolutionary movements of the age. Rationalism, or the Harmonial Philosophy, now looming a mighty power in the land, being advocated by a host of learned men and women who are shedding a marvelous light upon the nations in art, literature, science and philosophy. Their influence is working, silently, perhaps, in some cases, but surely, into every part of civilized society.

If Father Hecker will take the pains to look into the standard works on political economy in this country or Europe, he will find it an axiomatic truth, that wealth and refinement have a direct tendency to retard a natural increase of population. The poor

are more inclined to marry than the wealthy, and they have larger families of children. This is irrespective of forms of faith or religious views. Moreover, divorcees are more common in educated and enlightened communities than in those of an humble character. The Catholic city of Paris will serve as a conclusive evidence of our positions on this point.

The learned "Father" assumes the final ascendancy of the Catholic power in this country. The superior fecundity of the Catholic population over the Protestant is one of the main grounds for his assumption. This may be true to a certain extent; but it should be remembered that a considerable part of our Protestant population are as prolific in reproduction as the Catholic, namely, the German and Scandinavian emigrants. The gentleman seems to have overlooked one very important fact connected with this subject. A large majority of the emigration to this country for the last eighty or ninety years has been Catholic. It is evident that if the Catholics have had a greater natural increase among themselves, and had retained it in the church, then they would now have greatly outnumbered the remaining population of the States. The facts are otherwise. They make up only about one-ninth of our population. This reveals to us another important fact; that is, our free institutions have a wonderful effect upon the posterity of the original Catholic people. The tendency is unmistakably toward their liberation from the dogmas and superstitions of the Mother Church; hence, they are continually recruiting the ranks of the opposition. How long it will take at this rate for the Roman Church to gain the numerical ascendancy in this country we will allow Father Hecker to determine.

The learned "Father" assumes that Protestantism is destructive in its social effects, and that Romanism is ennobling and consistent with reason, and promotive of freedom, civilization, etc. Fortunately for our cause, we have only to look at the practical effects of the two systems, in countries where they have worked out their legitimate results, to decide the question. Just cast your eye over the map of Europe, on either side of the line dividing the Catholic from the Protestant communities. On one side we find Spain, Italy, France and the Austrian Empire. On the other, Northern Germany and North-Western Europe. Be-

hold the contrast! France is somewhat an exception; but she occupies a position upon the dividing line between the two sections, her ultra-Romanism has long since faded into a semi-Rationalism, mixed with a modified form of Catholicism, and the Pope's influence there is but nominal. Then cross the Atlantic to Protestant North America. Note the difference between it and the South American Provinces and Mexico.

In Italy and Spain the Pope's authority has been complete, both in Church and State, for fifteen hundred years. In those countries Romanism has molded political and religious institutions, given character to the moral and intellectual condition of the people. In ages past, when all Europe was Catholic, art, in some departments, was cultivated in Italy, and carried forward to marvelous degrees of perfection, and the Catholic Church produced a few men of eminent attainments in science, such as Galileo—no thanks to the Church for that. But since the advent of the Reformation, from what sources have come the great lights that have illuminated the world with the trophies of art, science, philosophy, poetry, history, invention, and, in fact, all the enterprise and appliances for human development? It is unnecessary to descend to particulars, for the well-informed student will comprehend the truth at once, that Protestant Germany, England, Scotland and the United States of America, have led the way up the Mountain of Progress, in material development, public improvement, science, mental and moral attainments and refinement for the last two hundred years; and that in spite of the uniform opposition of the Roman Church.

Father Hecker is pre-eminently a specimen of petrified conservatism, the chief characteristic of which is blindness. Like all old fogies of his type, he seems incapable of "discerning the signs of the times." And, notwithstanding, Popery has been stricken with a chronic spinal paralysis which has gradually reduced its vital energies for the last two hundred years, until the head of the Church has been reduced from a position of almost unlimited power, political, financial and ecclesiastical to bankruptcy and pauperism; still the "Rev. Father" hugs the delusive hope of arresting the rising tide of human events, and of the re-enslavement of the human race to the insane behests of a Priestly

despotism. Vain hope! Nature's forces never retrogress, but are continually elaborating higher from lower conditions.

True, temporary reactions often occur; but measure historic records of past time by cycles and we will find that progress is an eternal law. Man might as well attempt to control the imponderable forces of nature as to establish one eternal monotony in human institutions of any kind; and the conservative, like the donkey, if he will not move forward voluntarily, must submit to a propelling power outside of himself, and be pushed up the hill of progress, notwithstanding the horrible grimaces he may make on his journey.

Protestantism in its essential ideas has done a great and mighty work for the human race; but its mission is not yet fulfilled. Its destiny is onward. In spite of Church, or Priest, or Pope, it will yet work out a glorious deliverance for the oppressed peoples of the earth from all forms of ecclesiastical despotism, or Priestly domination.



The world's reformers are not confined alone to those who go about making a great noise. Such persons have their work to do, but they represent only the noisy carpenter who constructs and rears the external portion of the edifice, which requires many heavy blows and much loud noise. The finishing touches, which give the structure its glowing beauty, are put on by the silent movements of the painter's brush. No one hears or observes his movements, yet his work is equally important with the noisy builder. The edifice would not be complete without his labor.

So, likewise, in the formation of all our institutions, the finest and most beautifying mechanics are those who go silently about their labor, and do not attract the attention of the world by their noise. We are much inclined to think that those who are making the loudest din are doing the most work. It is just as desirable to be a fine painter as to be a boisterous and ear-deafening architect.

LINES FROM A FRIEND IN THE SPIRIT LAND TO
MRS. NELLIE E. W. PARKS.

THROUGH THE MEDIUMSHIP OF MARY J. D'WOLF.

Dear Nellie, you would like to know
Both what you are, and whither bound.
The mortal shell is left below,
A tombstone guards the grassy mound.

And this is all that mortals see,
Though still they feel the end is not.
When from earth-ties the soul is free,
They hope to find a blissful spot,

Far, far beyond the mystic river ;
Far, far beyond earth-cares and strife,
There to live in peace forever,
A beautiful, immortal life.

But still, they lack the evidence,
Unless their Spirit friends attend ;
And Superstitions, dark and dense,
In some earth minds with Truth contend.

Your Spirit friends are ever near,
They ever linger at your side ;
While in the rudimental sphere,
Your footsteps, they will strive to guide.

My darling Nellie, but believe
That when your earthly life is o'er,
Kind friends your Spirit will receive,
And bear it to the Angel shore.

For, Nellie dear, Death's rolling river
Can never keep dear friends from you—
About you then will stand forever,
The good, the beautiful and true.

Dear Nellie, this is from a friend
Who loved you while bound down to earth ;
And loves you more than ever now,
Since her bright, glorious, Spirit birth.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE—THE GREAT QUESTION OF THE AGE! No. 1.

BY W. F. JAMIESON.

“’Tis coming up the steep of Time,
And this old world is growing brighter!
We may not see its dawn sublime,
Yet high hopes make the heart throb lighter.”

Yes, this is the time foreseen by the gifted reformer-poet, Gerald Massey.

For more than ten years I have publicly advocated Woman's equal rights with man in all the relations of life. It affords me inexpressible joy to witness the rapid progress of the Woman Suffrage Movement that has been made in a few years. Oh, how glorious are the signs of the times! “This old world *is* growing brighter.” Howl on! partizan editors and conservative priests. Pour out your abuse and misrepresentation from pulpit, and through press. Brave work this, to use your power to prevent women from exercising the same right to be *free* which you claim for yourselves! The contest has fairly commenced in earnest. There has been more or less skirmishing for the last twenty years; now the battle in behalf of Woman's enfranchisement is fully inaugurated. The agitation of the suffrage question will yet cause this nation to be shaken to its very base, as it ought to be. Despite the sneers of politicians, the whining of cowardly priests, the opposition of weathervane editors—who say that they fear that the agitation of the Woman suffrage question will destroy the present political parties—justice will be done woman by her enfranchisement.

No slavery is so debasing as that which renders its victims unconscious of their degradation. This is precisely the condition of that large class of women who say, “We have all the rights we want.” Such women need educating. The agitation of this question will reveal to their astonished gaze the clanking chains which have served to bind them in the foulest, darkest, most damnable form of slavery that ever cursed this earth. African Slavery was heavenly freedom compared with it.

Men arrogate to themselves a right to legislate for women. Who gave them such a right? Where did they receive it? The conservative priests who will be arrayed in opposition to this movement will quote, in answer, the authority of a Jewish God, the same authority to which they appealed to sustain the "sum of all villainies." His supposed words have been quoted against Republican institutions, and in favor of the right of kings to rule the people; against the abolition of slavery, and in favor of the slave-owner; against science, and in favor of superstition; against humanity, and in favor of despotism—religious, political and social. Such a God is a myth. The most bitter, relentless opposition to woman's enfranchisement will be waged by the priesthood, sustained by the authority of a mythological God. I do not mean that there are no ministers who will espouse this cause. Some of the noblest, most philanthropic, progressive men of this age are clergymen. But to one such there are a score of whimpering bigots, who are a disgrace to their profession; unfit to impart to others a truly religious education; incapable of grasping a great moral truth, if it is not found in their Bible, or creed. The liberal-minded portion of the clergy will be found battling bravely in behalf of *human* rights. No matter what the religious differences may be, one can work heartily with such large-souled men—ministers of various denominations—when it comes to humanitarian work.

At Chicago on the 11th and 12th of February two Woman's Suffrage Conventions were held, one at Music Hall, the other at Library Hall. Unable to be present in accordance with the kind invitation of the Sorosis, at either, I nevertheless felt that every man who believes in, and is not ashamed to be identified with, an unpopular cause should express himself unequivocally. I accordingly indited the following letter, which was read by the president to the Convention, and published in the *Chicago Times*:

"HAVANA, Ill., Feb. 9, 1869.—To the members of the Chicago Sorosis in Convention in Crosby's Music Hall: It would have afforded me unfeigned pleasure to have accepted your kind invitation to be present as one of your speakers. I trust that our great State of Illinois may be the first in the Union to do justice to

woman by placing the ballot in her hand, thus laying the foundation of true Government. Never will we have just laws until woman is an equal law-making power with man. Never will our nation be republican or democratic in fact, until she is possessed of all the rights of citizenship that man claims for himself.

“The enfranchisement of woman is the grandest, most important question that ever agitated the minds of the American people. Woman in possession of the ballot will bless the nation. Her enfranchisement is the basis of true reform. Her sacred influence, which blesses and sanctifies the domestic hearth, is needed in public life to purify politicians. Her counsels are required in congress, and in the cabinet, to ennoble man, to enlarge his mental vision, and to make him a better and purer statesman. When women become voters, as they certainly will, intemperance, the most powerful foe of the human race, will receive its death wound. The outcast will be reclaimed, and the social evil be swept from off the face of our beautiful earth. Aye! The enfranchisement of woman is inevitable. The love of justice, liberty, and equality, swelling the American heart, will decree it. Let no man claim for himself the exercise of a right which he denies to his sister, mother, wife. Man should not be alone anywhere, then let no man be elected to office who is opposed to Woman suffrage.”

“Yours, in behalf of equal rights, W. F. JAMIESON.”

One clergyman who claims to be a true friend of progress (?) also wrote a letter to the convention as follows:

“FEBRUARY 9, 1869.—Mrs. D. L. WATERMAN—MY DEAR MADAM: My sympathies are with every movement of real progress. I am free to say that I am not wholly assured that universal suffrage is a desirable result. I am more and more tending in the opposite direction, but I trust I am open-minded, and shall probably attend the convention as an inquirer.

“Be assured of my sincere, fond wishes. Some day I may be eye to eye with those who seek to extend the ballot to women. I am sincerely afraid that at present it would not be a law of liberty but a yoke of bondage.

“Respectfully,

ROBERT LAIRD COLLIER.”

This gentleman seemed to be in a great quandary. He stumbled into both conventions, as the following remarks made by him in the Music Hall meeting will show :

Rev. Robert L. Collier, being present, was called upon, and spoke as follows :

“I received a note from Mrs. Waterman, requesting my attendance here, and stated, in reply, that I should decline to be present or address the convention. I came down soon on business, and was detained, and went into the other convention, and came from there here, with no expectation, on leaving home, of being present. I think the call of both conventions is unfortunate. The call for the convention at Library Hall was in the interest of female suffrage, and should have been confined to that.

“The call for this convention was for universal suffrage, and should be confined to that subject. I am not in sympathy with either of the calls, am not in sympathy with the objects of the convention, and have not come in here this morning to be a cause of contention; and I hope no one will enter either of these conventions with such intention; and I beseech you to be persuaded by friendly feelings, and with entire sincerity. I endorse everything tending to human progress, but decline this morning to address the convention.”

There is another Collyer in Chicago, who is also a Unitarian minister, but one of the foremost among practical reformers.

After Robert Laird Collier made his little speech in Music Hall he probably wended his way to his home. On Friday morning the Chicago papers teemed with reports of the two Women's conventions. After reading the proceedings of the day before, an irresistible influence impelled him to again visit one of the meetings. In the forenoon, at Library Hall, Miss Susan B. Anthony read the following resolutions, and asked for their adoption :

“*Resolved*, That a man's government is worse than a white man's government; because in proportion as you increase the rulers you make the condition of the ostracized more helpless and degraded.

Resolved, That as the democratic party cry of a white man's

government creates an antagonism between the Irishman and the negro, culminating in the New York riots of 1863, so the republican cry of 'Manhood suffrage' creates an antagonism between the black man and all women, and will culminate in fearful outrages on womanhood, especially in the Southern States.

Resolved, That, by the establishment of an aristocracy of sex in the District of Columbia by the introduction of the word 'male' into the Federal Constitution in article 14, section 2, and by the proposition to enforce 'manhood suffrage' in all the States of the Union, the republican party have been guilty of three successive arbitrary acts; three retrogressive steps in legislation alike invidious and insulting to women, and suicidal to the nation."

They were laid upon the table, and, in the afternoon, taken up and discussed. During the discussion Robert Laird Collier appeared upon the stand, and was vociferously called for by the men who occupied the rear of the hall and the galleries.

Mr. Collier, after whispering with the chairwoman, said, "This is a free fight in the affirmative."

Mrs. Stanton remarked that gentlemen showed so much sensitiveness, that it seemed to her a confession that they are in the wrong.

The chairwoman, Mrs. M. A. Livermore, remarked that "the trouble is that the resolutions under discussion criticise both political parties; I hope the convention will take a high moral position, and steer clear of politics; we will want to start a party of our own by and by."

Miss Anthony—"We mean to." [Laughter.]

Miss Anthony, in response to a demand, here read the resolutions again.

Mr. Booth—"They mean, if they mean anything, that an aristocracy is better than a republic, and a despotism still better." [Laughter, and "That's so."]

Mrs. Colby, a lady who had not attained the pre-eminence to be invited to the platform, stood up in the rear of the hall, and asked whether the committee could not submit some resolution that would admit of more harmony.

The chairwoman explained that it is agitation, and not, especially harmony, that is needed. Agitation is an educator.

After some further discussion, the resolutions were tabled by a preponderance of male votes. Then there were calls for Rev. Robert Laird Collier. The calls were vociferous, as if it were a political meeting, and Mr. Collier was the pet of the audience. It was evident, however, that the callers possessed bass voices, and that they comprised about half of the audience. The hall was crowded to its full capacity, many ladies standing in the aisles and on the platform. Mr. Collier did not immediately respond; but, after some apparently excited communication made to the chairwoman, in a whisper, he came forward and said:

“LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I had no invitation to be present at this convention. I have now every reason to believe that the call for the convention was utterly insincere; that it was not meant, from the beginning, that any one opposed to woman suffrage should speak on this platform. [Sensation.] I was in the house yesterday, when other gentlemen were invited by Mrs. Livermore to take seats on the platform. I was not invited by Mrs. Livermore.”

Mrs. Livermore—“I beg your pardon. But I will say that I met Mr. Collier yesterday in the rear end of the hall, and asked him to come up with us, and he declined. [Laughter, applause, and hisses.] I also beg to remind Mr. Collier that yesterday we spent one long hour in listening to the strongest arguments that could be made against woman’s suffrage, by Mr. Hammond.”

Mr. Collier—“I wish to repeat, ladies and gentlemen, that Mrs. Livermore did not invite me to the platform. If she were not a lady and I a gentleman, I should insist, with great emphasis, that I have not lost my memory.” [Hisses; “Put him down,” “Put him out.”]

Demonstrations of dissent prevailed for some time, Mr. Collier in the meantime waiting for their subsidence.

Mr. Collier—“My friends will hear all I have to say.”

The chairwoman, with emphasis—“Mr. Collier has the floor.”

Mr. Collier—“I regret the treatment Mr. Hammond received at

your hands yesterday. I have read his address, and I must say that he was not treated well."

A voice—"I call the gentleman to order."

A second voice—"I second the motion." [Cries of "Go on;" "Go on!"]

Mr. Collier—"All I have to say I can say in ten minutes."

The chairwoman—"Mr. Collier has the floor, and no one must interrupt him."

Mr. Collier—"Whatever elevates woman, elevates me, elevates my household, educates my children and saves my nation. If I can believe that putting the ballot in the hands of women would bring about these moral results, heaven knows my heart, that I would be the last man who would do anything in any wise to hinder the coming of this event. [Applause.] It is because I believe, and sincerely believe, that women are not taking their necks out of yokes, but putting them on [great applause] that I ask you to let man work through the mire of politics, and woman to remain where I can love her in my affections." [Applause and hisses.]

"Ladies and gentlemen, I have not yet heard a single logical argument produced on this platform in favor of woman suffrage. [Applause and hisses.] It has been repeatedly stated in this convention that the franchise is an inalienable right. It is no such thing. [Tremendous applause from the men and hisses from the women.] It is purely a political right, and is to be determined by the observation and wisdom of statesmen. As the gentleman from Wisconsin said that a legislator of that State told him he voted for female suffrage because his wife wanted him to do it, so it may be said that it is not the ostensible powers of this world that bring about the greatest results; but secret, hidden, unseen forces. Whenever my wife takes her stand by my side and persistently contends against my will in the exercise of my duties, then her femininity and domesticity is destroyed. [Hisses.] The franchise will not aid woman, it will only hinder her. When I can be persuaded that our laws will be purer by woman's legislating, I will favor it; but I defy any one to show that it will. [Prolonged masculine cheers and feminine hisses.] History will indorse the statement that men have, politically been just as pure as women. [Masculine cheers.] I believe furthermore that the

prostration of her femininity, the bringing down from the pedestal of her higher and purer nature, and mixing in these necessary duties of a republican form of government, will only make her the deeper in intrigue and more unfeminine, and therefore the more corrupt." [Applause and hisses.]

Rev. Mr. Hammond desired to say that he did not think he was badly treated as Mr. Collier believed. On the contrary, he thought he had been treated with the utmost courtesy. [Applause.] So far as he knew, it was courtesy unprecedented in any convention. [More applause.] He was almost converted, like Felix of old, but not quite. He could not give up his Bible, and to believe in woman suffrage, he must. He could say, however, that since he had seen so many noble women together, he could report progress.

Rev. Robert Laird Collier said he had only read the report in the papers; but if he had been treated as it was reported that Mr. Hammond had been, he should have felt that he had been treated very badly.

Mrs. Livermore—"The trouble with Mr. Collier is that he has not attended the convention." ["That's so," and laughter.]

Mr. Collier—"So far as logic is concerned, I have not been very favorably impressed since I have been in the convention."

Rev. Robert Collyer replied to his brother minister, whom he called the "totherest" Collier. He was sorry to see his brother get so confoundedly out of temper. Robert Laird had but recently been converted to his own present religious standpoint. He would by-and-by be converted to woman suffrage. He ascribed his own conversion to the cause of woman suffrage to reading a copy of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," which convinced him that women were capable of something more than household duties.

Mr. Robert Laird Collier disclaimed being out of temper. Mrs. Livermore certainly never invited him to take the platform. That she thought she did he had no doubt.

Mrs. Livermore explained that she had not taken special pains to invite Mr. Collier, because she supposed that he was opposed to the movement.

Rev. Robert Collyer said he had not intended, on the preceding day to treat brother Hammond with discourtesy.

The *Tribune* reporter said that on Friday morning "Anna

Dickinson occupied a seat among the audience, but, beyond the manifestation of interest and attention, took no active part in the proceedings."

This was not the case in the afternoon. It was not because she did not feel a deep interest in the subject, but for other reasons, as will be seen by her speech. This noble-souled young woman has done more to vindicate the cause of human liberty than perhaps any other person of the present day. She is the "Joan" of America.

Frequent and loud calls were made for Miss Anna Dickinson, who occupied a seat on the platform. She came forward and spoke as follows:

"MRS. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: There is a letter published in to-day's or yesterday's papers, I believe, written by me, to the effect that as I was under a positive business engagement in which dollars and cents were concerned, where other people are interested, that I had no right, without their consent, to come before this audience before discharging my regular business engagement of this evening. But it is impossible for me to continue in my seat after so kind and cordial a call from this house, and I thank you for the pleasant and friendly feeling you have shown. I have but a word or two to say. Start a woman's tongue and you do not know where the end is. I had gone out of the room, not because of the discussion, but because it was too warm and the atmosphere so stifling, when I was recalled by hearing something to this effect, that there had not been a single logical argument urged upon this platform in behalf of woman's suffrage; that woman is abundantly represented by some man of her family; that when a woman lifts herself up in opposition against her husband, she lifts herself up, if I properly and rightly understand the declaration, against God; that the Bible, or that the inspired assertion, is that the husband is the head of the wife. Oh! but Mr. Collier forgot to say that the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church. In my observation, and it has not been a limited one, I confess, though I am not an unprejudiced observer, I have never yet discovered a man who is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the

Church. Furthermore, he announces that these women, being represented by men, if they lift themselves up in opposition to their husbands they lose that womanly and feminine element which is so admirable, and pure and beautiful, and nothing can preserve them from the contamination of politics. Woman is to lift herself against God if she lifts herself against her husband (?) and woman is abundantly represented (?) by this same husband, or by some man in her own family. There are a multitude of women who have no husbands. [Laughter.] There are a multitude of women who will never have any husbands. [Renewed laughter.] There are a great many women who have no men in their own households to represent them, either for their wrongs or their rights. Mr. Collier, I suppose, however, is talking about women who have husbands. He says the woman loses her purity, her delicacy, her feminine attributes when she lifts her voice and sentiments against the man whose name she bears. We will say then, look across these western prairies to Utah. If the women there dare to say to this Congress of the United States, 'Amend this Constitution, that we women of Utah can have but one husband, and that the husband can take but one wife;' that when these women demand decency in the marriage relation, demand justice for themselves, demand purity for their body and their mind, that they are lifting themselves against the laws of womanhood, the laws of purity and the laws of God. Every woman represented by her husband is to lose her purity, her delicacy, her refinement, if she dares to lift her hand against him and his will. You have here, within the limits of your State of Illinois, a hundred thousand drunkards. Every woman who dares to lift her hand, cry out with her voice, 'Give me the ballot, that I may offset the votes of these drunkards at the polls, and save my children from starvation and myself from being put into the work-house'—this woman is lifting herself against the laws of God and womanhood. That is not all! Last summer this question was being tested in Massachusetts by votes. I went from town to town—my engagements taking me all over the State at that time—and said my say upon this question of woman's suffrage. In whatever city or town I went, before the season was over, by reason of the experiences which I passed through in each one of

those cities and towns, I stood with bowed head and feeble voice, unable to speak what was in my breast. Women bowed down with grief, who desired to preserve their womanhood, their person from blows and abuse, their sons from going to gambling hells and rum shops, their girls from being sent to houses of abomination, came to me and said to me, holding my hands and skirts: 'Anna Dickinson, if you are a woman, speak and use your influence for our cause.' Women who have drunken husbands, whether they lived in Beacon street or at the North End, whether they lived in luxury or in hovels and cabins, these women came and said, 'For the sake of womanhood, for the sake of motherhood, for the sake of all things good and true in the world, lift up our hands and voices, through yourself, to protest against these men whose name we bear.' Ah! that Mr. Collier could have seen these drunkards' wives, standing with tears streaming down their cheeks, and begging for power, begging for the ballot to save their homes, and themselves and their children. Do you tell this audience—do you tell any mother or daughter here this afternoon, that she shall protest against the purity of womanhood and lift her powers against the laws of God? Pardon me for taking this much of your time. I had no right to speak, as I said before. I will simply add a thought. This is the cause of purity. This is the cause which is to strengthen young girls, which is to give them self-reliance and self-respect, which is to make them to be no longer as a twisted vine to the stem of man. [Laughter.] This is the thing that is to put these girls on their feet; it is to say that you are an independent being; that you are to earn the clothes that cover you, and allow you to walk with steady feet through rough places. This thing which is to give these women such power, certainly will be strengthening to them by making them more independent and self-reliant. The ballot is to save womanhood and save purity, which he says is in danger—the feminine element of dependence and weakness and tenderness, of clinging helplessness, which he so much adores. Let justice be done. Let us have this thing, and say, 'Here is the power to defend yourself when your rights are assailed; when your home is entered. Here is the authority to stand at the door and tell the spoiler to stand back; when your sons are being brought up to wickedness and your daughters to

lives of shame; here is the power in the mother's hand which says these children shall be taken from the wrong place and put in the right one.' I do not say this or want it for the sake of political power, that women may go into the White House. It will take six generations of decent men to make it respectable for any woman to enter. [Laughter and applause.] I do not say it for the sake of going to Congress. I can safely venture to put the ruling of this convention to-day against that of the Vice President of the United States the other day in the House of Representatives. [Applause.] But I say it for the sake of the purity of womanhood; for the sake of the rights of mothers; and let us allow, from one end of this State to the other, as well as from one end of the country to the other, first, every black man in America to have the ballot; second and speedily, every man and woman, black and white, to go to the polls to defend their own rights and the rights of their homes."

At this point the excitement was intense, for the audience seemed to expect that Mr. Collier would reply. Loud and continuous calls were made for that gentleman; while the chairwoman endeavored to allay the excitement. The audience-room, as was before stated, was crowded to its fullest capacity. The platform, too, was crowded, and the audience was an extraordinary one, consisting of many of the ripest scholars of the city, and very many of its most cultivated women. These all listened with the deepest attention, for it was apparent that this was to be no ordinary battle; but that it was an intellectual conflict that would, at least, in the minds of the auditors, settle the claims of woman to intellectual equality with man.

In my next article I will give Collier's retort to Miss Dickinson's splendid speech, and the continuation of their discussion. He concluded he could not frighten her, and seemed very anxious to withdraw from the conflict, fully conscious, no doubt, that he had met more than his match in the debating arena.

In the evening Miss Dickinson gave an address on "A Struggle for Life," in Library Hall, under the auspices of the Young Men's Library Association, before one of the finest audiences that ever assembled in Chicago. The *Chicago Tribune* says: "The

splendid effect with which she had appeared in the afternoon session of the Female Suffrage Convention, together with the certainty that the evening discourse would touch upon the question of woman's rights, had brought out an immense gathering of people, who were scarcely able to find accommodation in the large auditorium. A few minutes after eight o'clock the fair Anna appeared upon the platform, in company with Charles H. Reed, Esq., President of the Young Men's Library Association." She was greeted with hearty applause.

"SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE IS SAUCE FOR THE GANDER."

BY JOHN F. HOLLISTER.

The readers of the *ROSTRUM* have lately had served up to them some strictures on "bad women," by Bro. M. H., and in reply, some animadversions on "bad men," Bro. H. included, by Sister L. H. K. Bro. H. (by implication) holds the women as most guilty, while Sister K. deems the men the "worse" half.

Bro. H. makes his broad allegation against the women, then immediately follows it with such strictures upon the very large class of men who "live on whisky, beer and tobacco," as to exculpate the women from the greater guilt in the criminality of prostitution. For, can "whisky, beer and tobacco" be made fit food for anything but the debauchee? And can he whose body is reeking and rotting with such nastiness be anything but a lecher? "Man grows like what he feeds on." "Habit grows with his growth," and gains the mastery. If the Brother's statements about that class of men are correct, and all enlightened experience confirms them, he should make thorough work with all the mischievous agencies and institutions, such as saloons, groceries, drug stores, nostrum shops, etc., etc., (all of the "self-same spirit," all of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism,") which furnish the wherewithal to pamper and deprave the appetites and passions, and besot the senses, till men become fit only for the asylum or the pest house. In view of these facts and conditions, the crimes and stains of the "painted courtesans" lose their deepest dye, and we pity more their follies.

On the other hand, the Sister deprecates the dolorous meddling

of the masculine *saviors*, and prays to be "let alone." I think myself, that the men might let the women alone much more than they do, and all parties would be the better for it. But when the social machinery wabbles and creaks along so badly as it now does, something should be done to improve its conditions; and "who is sufficient for these things?"

Men have come nobly forward and built asylums—witness the one at Binghamton—to soothe the griefs of the *helpmeet* sex, and redeem them from their thrall: now let the women "quit themselves like men," come up to the rescue, build asylums—houses of refuge—and gather into them from the slums and cesspools of prostitution, all these craven "lords" who "live on whisky, beer and tobacco," who cannot say "no" to the "painted courtesans;" wash them clean, purify them of their plagues, nurse and cherish the still lingering spark of Divinity within them, till they can stand upright and alone in their redeemed and manly independence. Let them do this, and all good men will praise them for their labors of love.

SPIRITUAL CIRCLES.

BY J. SWAIN.

I do not wish to encourage any unprofitable lightness in carrying on our circles, neither the opposite extreme of a long-faced, sanctimonious exterior, than which nothing is better calculated to destroy the good effects of a circle; but rather a cheerful and happy state of mind, desiring above all things to be benefited ourselves, to benefit our fellow beings in the mundane sphere, and also to aid and bless those who have passed the gateway of death. What a glorious privilege! to be able by our sympathy and advice to lift the burden from the sin-sick soul, who may have neglected the opportunities of this life, to rise above the damning influences of the animal portion of his being. Doubtless this privilege is ours. Holding circles, with such a glorious object in view, is profitable to those engaged in them, by bringing the higher faculties into successful operation. They are especially so to the objects of their sympathy, by convincing them that they are remembered in their low estate by sympathizing friends, who

would willingly share their sufferings, if it would in any way contribute to their growth.

Reformers are sometimes prone, when they see the abuse of some good thing, to aim their missiles at the thing itself, instead of striving to correct the abuse. Thus, the early Friends, seeing that licentiousness, idleness and depravity were often accompanied and encouraged by music, instead of making an effort to correct those abuses, they attempted, in vain, to abolish music itself. This effort has had the deplorable effect of encouraging the very licentiousness it was intended to prevent, by laying a ban on innocent amusements, an equivalent for which will be sought in criminal indulgences.

I would gladly see the talent and energy of Reformers employed in correcting the abuses of circles, instead of aiming to abolish them.



SUNSET MUSINGS.

BY SULA LEE.

Now the shades of eve' fall gently,
 Like a mantle o'er the earth,
 And the wind is hushed to murmurs,
 Like the rippling notes of mirth.
 The sun's declining, feeble rays
 Paint the clouds with golden hue,
 Ever changing lights and shadows,
 Like a panoramic view.
 The sun's most brilliant, gorgeous rays
 Paint in colors deep and bright,
 Then, as the moments glide, they change
 To soft, more subduing light.
 Softly, gently fades the tinting
 To a gray and somber hue,
 Deeper, deeper grow the shadows,
 'Till the light is hid from view.
 Thus we sit in twilight shadows
 Musing, as the day departs,
 Though the shadows deepen 'round us,
 Yet 'tis light within our hearts.

Yet, again, we look about us,
And this thought comes to the mind;
Can we not from this reflection
Gems of thought and comfort find?
Yes, we turn our eyes about us—
For the earth with lessons teem—
We view, here and there, a cottage,
Lights from out the windows gleam.
We look on the family group
Of each cot and mansion fair,
Wonder if peace and contentment
Dwell within each bosom there.
Does the angel's love and mercy
Dwell with justice, side by side?
Or, are hearts as dark and cheerless
As the somber hues outside?
Are the cottage windows emblems
Of the hearts that dwell within?
Do their rays shine in the darkness
Giving light to crime and sin?
Does their light illumine the pathway
That each erring soul may see,
And be led by good example
To the paths of purity?

Now, I turn my eyes to heaven
And a lesson meets my sight,
There are stars, like gems of beauty,
Shining in the darkest night!
Then I see each star may differ,
Giving more, or lesser light;
Some may faintly gleam and flicker,
Others shine more clear and bright.
Thus it is in human nature
As with stars in darkest night;
All may shine, yet some may glitter—
Never were two stars alike.
Then, I think, the stars are speaking
To each tired and aching heart:
Though our talents may not glitter,
Yet in life we have a part.
Though our rays be never as bright
As the glorious, golden sun,
Or yet like stars of greater light,
Still we'll twinkle, twinkle on.

A WORD TO MEN ABOUT THE DESIGNS OF WOMEN.

On Friday morning, Feb. 5th, a call appeared in the *Times* for a convention of all those in Chicago who favor the cause of female suffrage. This call was signed by Mrs. Livermore, Mr. Wallace W. Corbett, and some others. It invites all who favor the extension of suffrage to the women of Illinois, to meet in Library Hall on the 11th and 12th days of the present month. This is one call.

There is another call which is issued to those who are in favor of universal suffrage. The signers of this call favor, not particularly women's rights, but what they term human rights. All people, therefore, who are favorable are invited to meet in convention to institute the proper measures to advance human rights.

We particularly desire to invite the attention of the male sex to the fact that there is a conspiracy on foot against their power and vested rights. This conspiracy consists in a movement having for its object the wresting from man of his prerogatives, and the abasing him to the level of—women. By abasing, we mean, of course, a political abasement.

Let us look candidly at the matter. Man now is the ass, the pack-mule, the beast of burden, upon whose sore back are loaded eleven-twelfths of all the burdens of life. He has to be shot in case of war, and hung in case of murder. He pays the taxes. He chops the wood; he delves in the mines; he perspires at the forge; he grows swart under the glare of summer suns, and he freezes under the frost of midwinter. He is liable for his wife's debts; he must pay her fines at the police court; he must fight her battles if insulted. For her, he ploughs the raging main; to gather gold to fling into her lap, he climbs dizzy mountains, he descends into the awful chasms of the earth, he chases the wild beast into the recesses of the wood, and grapples with the monster in the depths of its own cave.

What is man doing everywhere? Working, toiling, dying for woman. He goes out at daybreak, and returns not until the gloaming, in order that he may purchase her smiles with gold. He embarks in rash enterprises that he may win greenbacks with which to buy her favors. Ask the young man who, banner in

hand, is hastening, through the cold twilight, up some steep and dangerous mountain side, Whither away? and his reply may be, *Excelsior*; but it is certain that *Excelsior* is forever and forever only some lovely woman. The toilers of the sea sail, and tack and beat up, and come about, and grow stiff, and die young, and all for no other purpose whatever save that their venture may profit some woman,—that their argosies may go out, and come back laden with rare jewels for her ears and fingers, and rich stuffs wherewith she may robe her beauteous form.

In fine, all that man does, he does for woman. For her, he mounts the rostrum and the scaffold; for her, he goes into battle and the penitentiary.

For these perils, and labors, and cares, men have enjoyed but a single privilege,—that of the ballot. Doing the fighting, to them has belonged the selection of leaders. Themselves the victims of law, they have enjoyed the poor privilege of selecting their judges. Alone liable to the scaffold, they have exercised the moderate advantage of being permitted to select their own executioners.

What is it that these women wish? It is that they may usurp the few barren privileges which men have reserved to themselves in view of their superior sufferings, their great labors, their infinite endurance. Can anything be more appropriate? Was there ever an insurrection more groundless? Could there be a usurpation more ungrateful? It is one which proposes to continue man not only the beast of burden which he now is, but to deprive him even of the poor right which he now possesses of choosing his own pastures, and the paths along which he shall toil.

Down with the ingrates! should be the cry of every true man at this critical moment. It is now the preservation of such liberty as we now enjoy, or it is something worse. We are Lears, and our daughters, to whom we have given our kingdom and our treasures, now wish to deprive us of what little we have not given them.

The capacity of these ambitious women to govern is seen in the fact that already have they quarreled over the anticipated division of spoils. Already is there a turning up of noses, and a showing of claws where the world has hitherto seen only the downiest of velvet. What sort of a government would there be

among women who thus quarrel over the fruits of a victory before the battle is fought and while the result is yet uncertain? Fancy a female *regime* in which Mrs. President Livermore terms Mrs. Secretary-of-the-Treasury Leonard "A Puss"; and Miss Collector Branson terms Mrs. Revenue Inspector Waterman that "Ojus Creechur." Fancy the winks and sneers of a cabinet meeting; the delightful harmony of a female caucus; the sublime unity of a convention.

Let men take due warning. *Verbum sapientis.*—*Chicago Times.*

NOTE.—We publish the above editorial from the *Times*, by request, for the purpose of giving our readers both sides of the question. A perfectly Independent Journal should keep its columns open for the free discussion of all subjects pertaining to human interests. We claim to be publishing such a Magazine, and we wish to prove that we are sincere.—EDS.

VERY HANDSOMELY STATED.—The editor of the San Francisco *Bulletin* has just passed unscathed through a trying libel suit. He does not, in the hour of his exultation, turn upon his enemies, but extends to them his hand, and in substance says:

"Gentlemen, your efforts were in vain. You cannot stop history-making, you cannot muffle truth. The press is the organ of thought in the body politic. If you cannot bear its power, stand from under. You cannot stop its wheels. This victory is not mine, or I might vaunt myself and taunt you. It is simply a step forward of journalism. It is the shaking off of a parasite which might have disturbed, but never could have choked up, the avenues of free expression. When impotent men and swindlers learn these great truths, black-mailing attempts on journalists will gradually cease."

There are four beings born on earth and two die every second of time, from natural causes; but accident, wars, disease and pestilence, sweep off additional millions every year. People are, therefore, arriving in the Spirit World at the mean rate of not less than 3 in every second of time, 180 a minute, 10,800 every hour, 259,200 every day, and 94,600,000 every year.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

MOSES HULL & W. F. JAMIESON, EDITORS.

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

MAN'S TRUE BIBLE.

For many centuries the world has been harangued with eulogiums on certain Jewish manuscripts which antiquarians have collected, bound into a volume, transported from Asia, and labeled "Holy Bible." Now, I have not the slightest objection to all this. This volume contains many fine sayings, terse proverbs and beautiful psalms, yet when I am called upon to make it, or any other book written by *human hand*, the rule of my life, I "respectfully decline."

Nature makes no mistakes. She has infallibly written the rule of the life of every thing she has made upon the thing itself. As well think of the birds and bees going to the productions of human brains to learn when and where to fly, when and what to eat, as to think of man going to a book, written long before he was born, to tell him the wants of his nature. True religion, true manhood, true appetites and desires are developed from within, and not taken from a book and put into the human soul. Let man learn to read the lessons engraved indelibly upon his own soul, and he is a successful reader of *his* only Bible.

Supposing the Jewish and Christian Scriptures to have been all right in their day, are they therefore a proper guide to persons living in the nineteenth century? As well think of living on the manna and quails which the Hebrews ate in the wilderness! Was Moses a man? So am I. It is not enough that God spoke to Moses on Sinai! What matters it to me that Jesus held council with the Deity? I demand a Revelation to myself. How do I get it? Where is it? Reader, do you consult your Bible or your stomach to find out when you are hungry? How do you ascertain when you want a drink of water? Do your feet and hands tell the truth when they say "we are cold"? Or do you consult

your Bible to find out the temperature of your physical system? One more question; Is the spiritual department of man's nature the only department which cannot find out its own wants? How strange that the author of the soul should make such a mistake as to make it so impotent that it cannot intuitively feel its own needs! If this be a mistake it is the only one in the kingdom of Nature.

The truth is, the world has been humbugged with the idea that Nature and God, or Nature and Religion, are at war with each other. The only warfare has been conducted by a set of Priests who have been afraid to let the people turn to the open volume of Nature and read its pages, lest, as a result, they might be compelled to quit the ministry and resort to a more honest means of obtaining a livelihood.

Henry C. Wright has been cursed for saying, "Man's natural demands are God's only commands;" but the saying is "as true as preaching," every word of it! God speaks through Nature—no where else. He has written upon the human organism the demand for labor, repose, etc. No one thinks of consulting any other Bible than his own weary self, to know when to take rest and sleep. In such matters books made by men must yield to the handwriting on the physical and spiritual system.

It may be objected that man sometimes has abnormal desires. Granted—but how did man get an unnatural appetite? In no other way than by a violation of the "Higher Law," through obedience to man-made institutions; or, perchance, some outside force turned him temporarily out of the path Nature made for him,—but let him alone, give him rest and repose, and Nature will bring all things to rights. A strife with God's law to conform with the customs society has made, for even the unfortunate one who has violated, will only "add fuel to the fire," and put things worse out of joint.

For myself, I know of no better way than to try to properly interpret and obey the Bible given me. I am weak—do not know what I can do, but, after due deliberation, I have resolved to *try* thus to live. I may, in obeying the voice of God, disobey some man made institutions. What boots it? "*Mene, mene, Tekel,*" is written on all of them. They will soon give place, but God's

laws are imperative, and "there is no discharge in this warfare." I dare not risk myself in their violation, though in doing so, I go with the multitude. "Though hand join in hand the sinner shall not go unpunished," is re-written every day in God's book.

I humbly ask the powers beyond and *within*, to lend grace that I may read aright, and *obey* the Bible kindly given me.

"There is a book, who thinks may read,
Which heavenly truth imparts;
And all the lore its scholars need,
Pure eyes and willing hearts."

—"Like birds and streams and flowers,
The life that moves you is divine!
Nor time, nor space, nor human powers,
Your God-like spirit can confine."

M. H.

P U Z Z L E D .

"MARRIAGE.—In the January number of the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM, on marriage, we find this singular statement: 'The only way in which a man and wife can live together in harmony is to become *totally* blind to each other's imperfections.' This sentiment we believe is calculated to breed discontent in families, and holds up a false view of marriage. We never yet were *totally blind* to our own imperfections, and yet have no idea of separating from ourself, and we never saw that person in whom we could see no imperfections. All are imperfect in this rudimental state, and any one possessing common sense can see it, who is not the miserable dupe of self-conceit. That the married should be patient with each other's foibles and forgive and still live on as they can, if truly married, we believe; but let none expect that even marriage, heavenly as it is, is a state of perfection here, for it is not—nor do we believe that it requires any one to be blind to the truth."—*The American Spiritualist*.

Our worthy cotemporary, we hope, will find a great many singular statements in the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM. We expect to publish a great many that we trust nobody will believe. We think the

ROSTRUM is read by men and women of intelligence, who are fully capable of deciding for themselves what to believe, and what to disbelieve. Give Truth and Error an open field, such as the ROSTRUM, and a fair fight, and we never have any misgiving as to the final triumph of truth over error.

Will *The American Spiritualist*, when quoting anything contained in the ROSTRUM, give the name, or initials of the author? The ROSTRUM teaches no such doctrine as the *Spiritualist* quotes. J. C. G. did advocate it. There have been half a dozen different views of marriage given through our magazine, and "still there is room."

Among the many "singular statements" that have been published in the ROSTRUM are a few, as follows:

"How easy to pervert, and then to ridicule our own folly."—*Elder Clendenan.*

"Any ism that will seek to cloak itself under the shadows of midnight darkness, and refuse a single ray of light, proves its own falsehood."—*.*

"Blessed is the woman who has found her heart's idol in the person of her husband. For her there is peace, tranquillity, rest. Happy the man who can see in the person of his wife, what perhaps other eyes cannot see, beauty, grace, sweetness, all crowned by love. For such the agitation of the social question will have no terrors."—W. F. J.

"Elevate woman socially, put her on the plane that her genius and talents have made for her. Give her something to do and pay her well for doing that something, and you have saved her. Save her and she has redeemed the race."—M. H.

"Wicked women are often the effect of man's guilt."—L. H. K.

"I do say things that you will neither believe nor like."—*Rev. Robert Collyer.*

"Never mind what I do not like. It may be that which I do not like is truth, and that when I become better acquainted with it I will like it better. The earnest desire on the part of Mr. Hull and myself is to know the truth."—*W. F. Jamieson.*

We know that a perfectly independent journal is a novelty, hence even some of our most liberal cotemporaries do not know what to make of it.

NEW BOOKS, PERIODICALS, ETC.

THE GOSPEL OF GOOD AND EVIL: IN THREE PARTS. By *Joseph S. Silver*. Boston: Wm. White & Co., 158 Washington Street. 1869. Pp. 360. Price, \$1.50. Postage, 20c.

Having carefully perused this book, we have no hesitancy in pronouncing it the best written work that has been placed before the public for the past century. It embodies more grand and sublime truths than we have met in one small book during our whole lifetime. The principles of Good and Evil are so logically and reasonably compared, and their uses so plainly set forth, that every reader, whose mind is open to receive truth, will wonder why he or she did not see the analogy before. We consider the book worth its weight in gold. Every man, woman and child should read this work, commit it to memory, and reduce it to practice in their every-day life. Could this be accomplished, it would do more to set the world right, and produce more real happiness than all the preaching and praying that have been done during the past two thousand years.

UNDERHILL ON MESMERISM, WITH CRITICISMS ON ITS OPPOSERS. By *Samuel Underhill, M. D., LL. D.* Chicago: Published for the Author by the *Religio-Philosophical Publishing Association*. 1868. Pp. 273. Price, \$1.50 post paid.

We have just received a copy of this little work. From the hasty reading we have given it, we find it full of very remarkable statements, the truth of which we cannot vouch for. Being printed in very large type, we would recommend it to the notice of those who are afflicted with failing eyesight.

The subject of mesmerism is treated of in all its different phases, and instructions given how to apply it in the healing of disease. The subject of clairvoyance is also treated of in quite an elaborate manner, and many very remarkable events are related in the book.

THE FUTURE LIFE: AS DESCRIBED AND PORTRAYED BY SPIRITS, THROUGH MRS. ELIZABETH SWEET; with Introduction by Judge Edmonds. Boston: Wm. White & Co., 158 Washington Street; New York: Branch office, 544 Broadway. 1869. Pp. 403.

A copy of this excellent work has been placed on our table. We have not had time to give it a thorough reading, but from the partial sketching we have given it find much to commend. The introduction, by Judge Edmonds, in which is given a brief sketch

of the development of the author, is very interesting. The Judge was intimately acquainted with Mrs. Sweet, and is therefore qualified to speak knowingly of her as a medium.

She has been in the Spirit-World nearly ten years, and the present book is compiled from the records of communications given through her, as written by Judge Edmonds and her husband at the time they were uttered. The work contains much that is interesting and useful.

A FEW WORDS TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We feel under lasting obligations to our patrons for the liberal and generous support they have given us since we commenced the publication of the *ROSTRUM*. We stated in our last issue that it had been self-sustaining thus far, which is a good omen for its success. But it is self-evident that we cannot continue to publish it for any length of time on this basis alone. It must begin to return us something for our time and labor which we are obliged to bestow on it in order to bring it before our readers each month. Thanking you for what you have already done for us, and the cause, we would ask that each of our subscribers appoint him or herself a committee of one to canvass for the *ROSTRUM*. If you will turn out some afternoon, or evening, and get us one subscriber each, it will double our list at once, which will be a great help to us at present. This is a small task for you to perform, yet the result to us would be great. Who will try it? Let all who feel an interest in the success of a perfectly Independent Magazine take this matter in hand at once, and you can, by one or two hours labor, set us where the gates of hell cannot prevail against us! Liberals must support liberal papers if they receive a support!

EXPLANATION.—In justice to Bro. J. R. Robinson, and the Society meeting in Library Hall, over which he presides, I will say that Society was not referred to in our article on a "Speakers' Protective Union," published in the February number of the *ROSTRUM*.

M. H.