

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

Section 2, Pages 31 - 60

This meeting of the American Equal Rights Association was held at the Church of the Puritans, New York City on May 9-10, 1867. The organization supported voting rights and citizenship for African Americans and women. The pamphlet contains the "call" for the meeting issued on March 12, 1867, by officers of the association including Lucretia Mott, president; Susan B. Anthony, corresponding secretary; and Henry B. Blackwell, recording secretary

Creator: American Equal Rights Association

Date: May 9-10, 1867

Callnumber: K 324.3 Pam. v. 1 #1

KSHS Identifier: DaRT ID: 203960

Item Identifier: 203960

www.kansasmemory.org/item/203960

KANSAS
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

30

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY.

magistrate ; but that the parties themselves, acknowledging the religious obligation of so sacred a union, were sufficient. And in that Society, the parties were at liberty to appoint their own time and place, and to invite such of their friends and neighbors as they wished to be present ; then, in acknowledgment of the divine presence, their obligations to each other were announced, entirely reciprocal, with no assumption of authority on the one hand or promise of obedience on the other ; but entire reciprocity, and a pledge of fidelity and affection until death should separate them. For two hundred years, the marriages in the Society of Friends thus conducted, have been held as sacred, the union has been as harmonious, and the management of the children as free from complaint, as any other marriages in the community. The Parliament of England, after a time, saw fit to legalize such marriages ; and so in our own country do the laws of the several States.

In many of the States the laws have been so modified that the wife now stands in a very different position as regards the right of property and other rights, from that which she occupied fifteen or twenty years ago. You see the same advance in the literary world. I remember when Maria Edgeworth and her sister first published their works, that they were afraid to publish their own name, and borrowed the name of their father. So Frances Power Cobbe was not able to write under her own name, and she issued her "Intuitive Morals" without a name ; and her father was so much pleased with the work, without knowing it was his daughter's, that it led to an acknowledgement after a while.

The objection has been made to me—"Here you assume equality and independence. Now, I feel dependent on my husband for everything." Women in our Society do not feel dependent for anything. They are independent themselves ; and in the true relation of marriage the husband and wife will be equal. Let woman be properly educated ; let her physically, intellectually and morally be properly developed ; and then, in the marriage relation, in spite of law and custom and religious errors, the independence of the husband and wife will be equal.

I was delighted with the remarks made in our Anti-Slavery meeting by our friend Durant, that the conscience, and the sense of right in man, was the basis of law. The idea seemed rather new ; but it occurred to me that our friend Burleigh told us that, twenty years ago. We were told, too, that when the work of the Anti-Slavery Society should be finished, there would still be work to do. And although Wendell Phillips is sensitive with regard to the introduction of this question upon the Anti-Slavery platform, adhering so strictly to the Constitution of that Society that he does not want anything attached to it of the other great reforms of the day which do not legitimately belong to it, I think we shall find that he will continue to be as able an advocate for woman as he has been, and that he really does not lower our standard in any respect.



Proceedings of the First Anniversary

ADDRESS OF COL. C. E. MOSS.

31

STEPHEN S. FOSTER.—Will you give us the evidence that the statement that the women of this country do not want the ballot is not true? I should be glad to believe that; but in my experience the worst opposition to the progress of Woman's Rights has come from woman herself. The greatest indifference to the cause is to found among women, and not among men. I wish it were not so. I hope I am mistaken. But I believe nine out of every ten of our public speakers will tell you that they find more help, more sympathy from men than from women.

Rev. S. J. MAY.—I should like to have that question settled, so far as the women present are concerned. Will as many of you as *will vote* when the right is awarded to you, please to manifest it by rising.

Nearly the whole of the ladies present immediately arose. Indeed, the reporter, from the platform, could not see a single lady who retained her seat.

Mrs. GAGE.—During the last fifteen years, with the utmost industry I could use in ascertaining the public opinion in this country, I have never found one solitary instance of a woman, whom I could meet alone by her fireside, where there was no fear of public opinion, or the minister, or the law-maker, or her father, or her husband, who did not tell me she would like to vote. (Applause.) I never found a slave in my life, who, removed from the presence of the people about him, would not tell me he wanted liberty—never one. I have been in the slave States for years. I have been in the slave-pens, and upon the plantations, and have stood beside the slave as he worked in the sugar cane and the cotton-field; and I never found one who dared in the presence of white men to say he wanted freedom. When women and young girls are asked if they want to vote, they are almost always in just that situation where they are afraid to speak what they think; and no wonder they so often say they do not want to vote.

On motion, the meeting adjourned until 7½ o'clock this evening.

EVENING SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Mrs. MOTT, who introduced as the first speaker Col. CHARLES E. MOSS, of Missouri.

ADDRESS OF COL. MOSS.

I presume no one is less prepared to make a speech to-night than I, but I must confess that this is a subject upon which I have thought for a considerable number of years; and I have become fully convinced that no reason can be assigned for extending the right of suffrage to any of the male sex, that does not equally apply to the female. I believe if we are ever to establish a Republic in safety, it must be based upon the consent of the governed; and it must be the governed of the "better half" as well as of the worse half of humanity. I know that this is received with a good deal of prejudice, and that we have a great

KANSAS STATE
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

32

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY.

many objections made to such a proposition. To one of those objections, and only one, I will refer; and it seems to me that persons would be careful not to urge that objection if they reflected upon the consequences which necessarily flow from it.

I believe you will not refuse to concur with me in saying that those who assert that the discharge of our duties as citizens is too disreputable for females to be present and to participate in, are not very good friends of republican government. For if it is disreputable and calculated to injure the moral character of the female sex to participate in the right of suffrage, why does not the same apply to man? What claim has he to take part in a business which it would be disreputable for his wife to take part in? If the influence of woman is refining in every other department of life, why have we not a right to suppose that her refining influence would be made apparent in the corrupt department of politics?

When our fathers formed the national Constitution, they made it the duty of the general government to secure to every State a republican form of government. No government can be republican in form, unless it is so in substance and in fact; and that government cannot be republican in form or in fact which is not based upon the consent of the governed; or which denies to one half its citizens all participation in the government. After the troublesome war we have just passed through, we are called upon not only to reconstruct the ten unrepresented States of the nation, but to purify the republicanism of our government and make it more consistent with our professions. It is a fit time, then, to take up the subject of suffrage, and to base it upon a well-established principle. Some say that the right of suffrage is a privilege, to be given or withheld at pleasure. That does not seem to me a very safe foundation for so important a right. It is either a privilege or a natural right. If we recognise it as a natural right we have a peaceable, safe, legal mode of resistance against the disfranchisement of the people. If we admit it to be a privilege to be granted or withheld, no man and no woman has any legal right to interpose any objection to his own disfranchisement. But I see that our friend has come in who was expected first to address you, and I will not take up more of your time.

ADDRESS OF PARKER PILLSBURY.

The resolutions just read refer to the comparative longevity of nations and of individual men, and of their respective performance, while existence lasts.

Among nations, have arisen Franklins and Washingtons, Humboldts and Howards; and these have had their archetypes in the saints and sages, the philosophers and philanthropists of ancient times. But what individual nation of any period, has been the Plato or Pythagoras, the Howard or the Humboldt, the Franklin or Washington of all the



ADDRESS OF PARKER PILLSBURY.

33

rest? or has achieved proportionally, so long a life? or expired at last in sunsets of serenity and glory, and been embalmed and enshrined in the tears and gratitude of mankind? It is often said that the life of a nation is as the life of an individual; with beginning, progress, decay and dissolution. But the resemblance holds only in part. Consciousness comes to an individual, and self-respect; and from that hour growth and greatness (it may be) begin.

But with nations it is not so. Consciousness and self-respect seem not to pertain to mind in masses, more than to matter. Both may become avalanches, sweeping all before them. The world has not made the same demand of nations as of individuals, and so nothing is expected of them. Nations, hitherto, are badly brought up; have had indeed no bringing up. As yet they can be called but the primeval forests of civilization. In the light of a thousand years hence, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries will be "darker ages" than the eight and ninth are to-day.

Accepting three score and ten as the common life of an individual, a *degree* at least of honorable manhood is often achieved, both in personal virtues, and in noble performance.

The canticles of the Almanac used to run,

"At ten, a child; at twenty, wild;
At thirty, strong, if ever;
At forty, wise; at fifty, rich;
At sixty, good, or never."

But at what age has any *nation* of any period or place become wise, rich, or even strong; to say nothing of good?

The Roman Catholic Church is older than any civilized government on the globe. Lord Macaulay says, "It is the only institution left standing which carries the mind back to the time when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when tigers and camel leopards bounded in the Flavian Amphitheatre. The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday, compared with the line of the of the supreme Pontiffs, traced back in unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century, to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond stretches the august dynasty, until it fades into the twilight of fable! She saw the commencement of all the governments on the globe, and of all the ecclesiastical establishments now existing; and there is no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all!"

The world has an accepted chronology of six thousand years. Its history and experience in government reach back forty centuries.

It would be an interesting enquiry with what results governments have existed so long, especially in the later periods and among the most enlightened of the nations.

Germany in the former and Spain in the latter portion of the six-

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

34

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY.

teenth century almost ruled the world. Charles the Fifth boasted that his empire saw no setting sun. It included Spain and all her vast American provinces, over large part of which to-day wave our own Stars and Stripes.

The national escutcheon bore two globes; and the coin, the two Pillars of Hercules, the then acknowledged boundary of the Eastern world, with the motto "More beyond."

Spain, too, under Phillip Second, dictated law, learning and religion, especially religion, to unknown millions, not alone in Europe, but in North and South America, Africa and all the Indies. And now in the centre of Europe proper, and remote in its south-western corner, are all that remain there of these two mighty powers of the sixteenth century; figured most appropriately, on the map of the world they once ruled, as two little splashes of blood.

France in the eight century under Charlemagne, was another mistress of the globe. And Charlemagne was crowned by the Pope, "Sovereign of the New Empire of the West." Distant princes and potentates came to do him homage, like the Queen of Sheba to the court of King Solomon. And yet, in less than fifty years, all that mountain of magnificence exploded; and many rival nations sprang from its lava streams of blood and ashes!

A remnant, too, of France was preserved; and its history for almost eight hundred years, "may be traced, like the tracks of a wounded man, through a crowd, by the blood;" until it culminated in French revolution ("suicide of the eighteenth century," as Carlyle calls that terrible phenomenon) and Napoleon Bonaparte!

And he also summoned to his coronation the Roman Pontiff, like his great predecessor of a thousand years before. And beneath the solemn arches and arcades of Notre Dame, was crowned by Pope Pius the Seventh — "*The high and mighty Napoleon, the First Emperor of the French!*"

Plunging remorselessly into the most desolating wars, he soon astonished the civilized world with his successes. He made himself master of almost half the globe, and the terror of all the rest. He gave kingdoms to his four brothers, like baubles, his own vast possessions not feeling their loss. The earthquake that shook down Lisbon and entombed it forever, boiled the whole Atlantic like a cauldron, and stirred the waters of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence as bubbling springs. So, too, the reign of Napoleon was an earthquake, which, for fifteen years, shook the sea and the land, carrying down unnumbered Lisbons and innumerable human lives in the general cataclysm.

But he sunk at last! No triumph like his could be long. No such meteor ever flew its moment across the skies. He aspired to the very heaven of heavens in his ambitions; and his conquests were the wonder and terror of mankind. But he left France smaller, weaker, poorer and



ADDRESS OF PARKER PILLSBURY.

35

more debased and depraved than he found her. Was it not well sung of him, at his overthrow,

"Since he, miscalled the Morning Star,
Nor man nor fiend hath fallen so far!"

Of the later France—especially of its present condition, social and moral, as well as political—enough is well known to subserve all the purposes of this discussion.

Just eight hundred years ago last September, William the Norman landed in Britain and commenced its subjugation. Since that period, the history of Great Britain has not differed materially from that of other European nations. As the sun is said never to set on the British domain, so the thunder of its war-guns has reverberated almost continually in some corner of the globe.

To trace her history, however rapidly, even had we time, could give no pleasure to this audience, and would add nothing to my present argument. It is sufficient to say that, with real estate almost immeasurable, with personal property incalculable, with a wealth of material resources of every conceivable description, absolutely unknown and unknowable, she yet contrives to support her costly establishment by a system of oppressive taxation almost unparalleled in the annals of the human race.

Some of you must remember the graphic but not exaggerated description of British taxation given by Sydney Smith in the *Edinburg Review*. It was almost fifty years ago; but no less revenue must be raised in some way, still. He said:

"We have taxes upon everything which enters into the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under the feet; taxes upon everything which it is pleasant to see, hear, feel, smell or taste; taxes upon warmth, light and locomotion; taxes on everything on earth, and in the waters under the earth; taxes on everything that comes from abroad, or is grown at home; taxes on the raw material, taxes on every fresh value added to it by the industry of man; taxes on the sauces which pamper man's appetite, and the drugs that restore him to health; taxes on the ermine which decorates the judge, and on the rope which hangs the criminal; on the poor man's salt and the rich man's spice; on the ribbons of the bride, on the shroud of the corpse and the brass nails of the coffin. The school-boy whips his taxed top; the beardless youth rides his taxed horse, with a taxed saddle and bridle, on a taxed road; and the dying Englishman, pouring his medicine, which has paid seven per cent., into a spoon that has paid fifteen per cent., flings himself back upon his chintz-bed, which has paid twenty-two per cent., and expires in the arms of an apothecary who has paid a license of a hundred pounds for the privilege of putting him to death. His whole property is then immediately taxed from two to ten per cent. Besides the probate, large fees are demanded for burying him in the chancel. His virtues are then handed down to posterity on taxed marble, and he is gathered to his fathers, to be taxed no more!"

And we are told, what is doubtless true, that the enormous debt of Great Britain is the chain that binds its many parts together, and pre-



Proceedings of the First Anniversary

serves its nationality. No nation, then, ever maintained a more precarious existence. Chartism in Scotland, Repeal in Ireland, Trades Strikes everywhere, East India Wars, Irish Famines, Fenianism, Reform Leagues, Reform Riots, Bread Riots—all these attest how volcanic is its under stratum, and what dangers impend above.

In some of the gloomy gorges of the Alps, there are seasons of the year when no traveller passes but at the expense of life, on account of the terrible "*thunderbolts of snow*" that hang suspended on the sides or summits of the mountains. None can know their hour; but descend they must, by all the laws of gravitation, with resistless energy, sweeping all before them. At such times, all who pass creep along with trembling caution. They move in single file, at distance from each other, hurrying fast as possible, with velvet step, avoiding all noise, even whispers—the guides meanwhile muffling the bells of the mules, lest the slightest vibration communicated to the air should untie the tremulous mass overhead and entomb them forever.

Great Britain, with her frightful debt, her terrible taxation, her dissatisfied, restless, beggared myriads of the lower working classes, her remorseless aristocracy, her bloated spirit of caste, her enforced but heartless religion, has hung a more terrible avalanche over her head than ever leaped down the heights of the Tyrol.

Such are examples of success or failure in attempts at government, among the proudest and most prosperous nations of the Old World, in modern and what are called enlightened times.

If seventy years be the life of a man, what should be the life of a nation? Half the children born, die under five years old. But proportionably a greater mortality prevails among nations and governments. Not one nation has ever yet attained an honorable manhood. There is something rotten in the state of every Denmark.

Will you tell me Democracy, Republicanism, consecrated by Christianity, is the remedy for all these ills? Let us look, then, at the best example.

Our own nation is not yet a hundred years old, but it had behind it in the beginning, the chronicles of forty or sixty centuries, written mostly in tears and blood. At the end of an eight years' revolutionary war, our new governmental columns were reared, not, like some pagan temples, on human skulls, but on the imbruted bodies and extinguished souls of five hundred thousand chattel slaves. We had our Declaration of Independence, our war of Revolution, and a new Constitution and code of laws. We had a Washington for our first President, a John Jay for Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court, and a constellation of senators, statesmen and sages who challenged the respect and admiration of mankind. We closed that dispensation with James Buchanan as Chief Magistrate, and Roger B. Taney as Chief-Justice, with his diabolical Dred Scott Decision, and with a war of Treason and Rebellion which deluged the land in the blood of more than half a mil-



lion of men. We had multiplied our slaves to four millions, with new cruelties and horrors added to the system, and at least ten generations of them were lost in unknown graves. The new Republican President pledged his official word and honor to the rebels already in arms, that, would they but return to their allegiance, he would favor amendments to the Constitution that should not only render slave property more secure than ever before, but also make all its old guarantees and safeguards, *Fugitive Slave law and all*, forever "*irrevocable*" by any act or decree of Congress!

So were we endeavoring to bulwark and balustrade our slave-system about, in the name of a Christian Republicanism, when it was struck by the lightnings of a righteous retribution, and the world is rid of it forever.

And our old nationality went down in the ruin. Now we are divided, distracted, deranged in currency, commerce, diplomacy, with State and Federal liabilities resting on the people, the producing people, amounting to not less than six thousand millions of dollars, not to speak of current expenditures which are also appalling; with a President whose *weakness* finds no parallel but in his *wickedness*, with a Secretary of State who has become his full counterpart in both, and a Senate too cowardly, or too corrupt, to impeach the one or to seek the removal of the other!

For more than two years we have been attempting to restore the fragments of our once boasted Union. With the history and experience of forty centuries shining back upon us, so far we have failed. And under any existing or proposed policy we shall fail. By all the claims of justice and righteousness, we deserve to fail; for we are still defying those claims.

The son of Priam, a priest of Apollo, was commissioned to offer a sacrifice to propitiate the god of the sea. But the offering not being acceptable, there came up two enormous serpents from the deep and attacked the priest and his two sons who stood with him at the altar. The father attempted to defend his sons; but the serpents falling upon him, enfolded him and them in their complicated coils, and strangled them to a terrible death. Let this government beware. The very union proposed will only bind and hold us together as in the deadly folds of a serpent more fearful than all the fabled monsters of the past! And so, hitherto, republics are no exception to the general law. Rickets in infancy, convulsions in childhood, or premature rheumatisms, have brought the nations of history to untimely deaths.

Material interests may flourish, and nations grow great and powerful, make wars and conquests, and rule the world. The ancients did all this, but where are those haughty omnipotences now? Charlemagne did but little less, and in half a century his magnificence was brought to nought. Germany and Spain survived a little longer in their glory and grandeur; but now the scanty blood-splash on the map describes them well.



Proceedings of the First Anniversary

38

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY.

The United States, young among the nations, the mother earth six thousand years old at their birth, wet-nursed by forty centuries of history, and schooled by all the experience of the ages, with almost half a globe for their inheritance, with Christianity their faith and Republicanism their form of government, they survived a precocious childhood and then fell a victim to their own vices and crimes. To-day they are in the hands of many physicians, though of doubtful reputation, who seem far less desirous to cure the patient than to divide and share the estate.

My main point is this—we have had enough of the past in government. It is time to change. Literally almost, more than metaphorically, the “times are rotten ripe.” We come to-day to demand—first an extension of the right of suffrage to every American citizen, of whatever race, complexion or sex.

Manhood or *male*-hood suffrage is not a remedy for evils such as we wish removed. The Anti-Slavery Society demands that; and so, too, do large numbers of both the political parties. Even Andrew Johnson at first recommended it, in the reconstruction of the rebel States, for three classes of colored men. The *New York Herald*, in the exuberance of its religious zeal, demanded that “members of Christian Churches” be added as a fourth estate to the three designated by the President.

The Woman’s Rights Society contemplated suffrage only for woman. But we, as an EQUAL RIGHTS Association, recognize no distinctions based on sex, complexion or race. The Ten Commandments know nothing of any such distinctions. No more do we.

The right of suffrage is as old, as sacred and as universal as the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is indeed the complement and safeguard of these and all civil and political rights to every citizen. The right to life would be nothing without the right to acquire and possess the means of its support. So it were mockery to talk of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, until the ballot in the hand of every citizen seals and secures it.

The right of the black man to a voice in the government was not earned at Olustee or Port Hudson. It was his when life began, not when life was paid for it under the battle-axe of war. It was his with Washington and Jefferson, James Buchanan and Abraham Lincoln. Not one of them could ever produce a higher, holier claim. Nor can any of us.

We are prating about *giving* right of suffrage to black *male* citizens, as complacently as we once gave our compassion and corn to famishing Ireland. But this famine of freedom and justice exists because we have produced it. Had our fleets and armies robbed Ireland of its last loaf, and left its myriads of inhabitants lean, ghastly skeletons, our charity would not have been more a mockery when we sent them bread to preserve them alive, than it is now when we talk of *giving* the ballot to those whom God created free and equal with ourselves.

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

ADDRESS OF PARKER PILLSBURY.

39

And in the plenitude of our generosity, we even propose to extend the *gift* to woman also. It is proposed to make educated, cultivated, refined, loyal, tax-paying, government-obeying woman equal to the servants who groom her horses, and scour the pots and pans of her kitchen. Unfortunate beings, without property, and scarcely knowing the English tongue, or any other, are entreated to grant to women, the superior of all the queens of the old world, the right to co-operate with them in the affairs of State. Women here in New York worth thousands and hundreds of thousands in gold, and whose money is the meanest part of their real value in society, are humbly petitioning their coachmen, their footmen and gardeners, the discharged State-prison convicts, the idiots and lunatics, all of whom may and often do exercise the right of the ballot, to permit them also to share with them in making and executing the laws.

Our Maria Mitchells, our Harriet Hosmers, Harriet Beecher Stowes, Lydia Maria Childs, and Lucretia Motts, with millions of the mothers and matrons of quiet homes, where they preside with queenly dignity and grace, are begging of besotted, debauched white male citizens, legal voters, soaked in whiskey, simmered in tobacco, and parboiled in every shameless vice and sin, to recognize them also as human, and graciously accord to them the rights of intelligent beings!

And, singularly enough, in some of the States, it is proposed to grant the prayer. But the wisest and best men have no idea that they are only restoring what they have so long held by force, based on fraud and falsehood. They only propose to *give* woman the boon which they claim was theirs by heavenly inheritance. But they are too late with their sublime generosity. For God gave that when he gave life and breath, passions, emotions, conscience and will. Give gold, give lands, give honors, give office, give title of nobility, if you must; but talk not of giving natural, inalienable and heaven-derived endowments. God alone bestows these. He alone has them to give.

Our trade in right of suffrage is contraband. It is bold buccaneering on the commerce of the moral universe. If we have our *neighbor's* right of suffrage and citizenship in our keeping, no matter of what color, or race, or sex, then we have stolen goods in our possession; and God's search-warrant will pursue us forever, if those goods be not restored.

And then we impudently assert that "all just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed." But when was the consent of woman ever asked to one single act on all the statute books?

We talk of "trial by jury of our peers!" In this country of ours, women have been fined, imprisoned, scourged, branded with red hot irons and hung; but when, or where, or for what crime or offence, was ever woman tried by a jury of her peers?

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

40

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY.

Suffrage was never in the hands of tyrants or of governments, but by usurpation. It was never given by them to any of us. We *brought* it; not *bought* it; nor conquered it; nor begged it; nor earned it; nor inherited it. It was man's inalienable, irrepealable, inextinguishable right from the beginning. It is so still; the same yesterday, to-day and while earthly governments last.

It came with the right to see and hear; to breathe and speak; to think and feel; to love and hate; to choose and refuse; or it did not come at all.

The right to see came with the eye and the light; did it not? and the right to breathe, with the lungs and the air; and all these from the same infinite source.

And has not also the moral and spiritual nature its inalienable rights? Have the mere bodily organs, which are but the larder of worms, born of the dust, and dust their destiny—have they power and prerogative that are denied to the reason, the understanding, the conscience, the will, those attributes which constitute responsibility, accountability and immortality?

Or shall God give the power to choose, or refuse obedience to his law and reign, leaving the human will free as his own; and must mortal man, the mushroom of yesterday and perished to-morrow, usurp a higher and more dreadful prerogative, and compel support of and submission to laws in which the subject has no voice in making, executing or even consenting, on pain of perpetual imprisonment, banishment or death?

Must a brave soldier fight and bleed for the government, and, pruned of limbs, plucked of eyes, and scarred all over with the lead and iron hail of war—must he now hobble on his crutches up to a Republican, Democratic, yea, and a Christian throne, and beg the boon of a ballot in that government, in defence of which he perilled all, and lost all but bare life and breath, only because an African instead of a more indulgent sun looked upon him or his ancestors in their allotment of life? And then, when the claim of immortal manhood is superadded, the inalienable rights of the soul, in and of themselves, the rights of the reason, the understanding, the conscience, the will—what desperation is that which treads down all these claims, and rushes into seats of higher authority than were ever claimed by the eternal God, and denies him that right altogether!

No white male citizen was ever born with three ballots in his hand, one his own by birthright, and to be used *without restraint*, the others to be *granted*, given to women and to colored men at his pleasure or convenience! Such an idea should never have outraged our common humanity. And any bill or proposal for what is called "*manhood suffrage*" while it ignores womanhood suffrage, whether coming from the President or the Republican party and sanctioned by the Anti-Slavery Society, should be repudiated as at war with the whole spirit and genius



ADDRESS OF PARKER PILLSBURY.

41

of a true Democracy, and a deadly stab into the very heart of justice itself.

I have referred to the age of the Roman Catholic Church. Lord Macaulay, in accounting for her astonishing longevity as compared with other institutions, turns with felicitous insight to female influence as one of the principal causes.

In her system, he says, she assigns to devout women spiritual functions, dignities, and even magistracies. In England, if a pious and benevolent woman enter the cells of a prison to pray with the most unhappy and degraded of her sex, she does so without any authority from the Church. Indeed, the Protestant Church places the ban of its reprobation on any such irregularity. "At Rome, the Countess of Huntington would have a place in the Calendar as St. Selina, and Mrs. Fry would be Foundress and First Superior of the Blessed Order of Sisters of the Jails."

But even Macaulay overlooks another element of power and permanence in the economy of the Catholic Church. God, as Father, and as Son, and as Holy Ghost, might inspire reverence and dread only, in hearts that, at the shrine of the ever blessed Mary, Mother of God, would kindle into humble, holy and lasting love.

Frances Power Cobbe, though deprecating the doctrine of "Mariolatry," as she terms the worship of the Virgin, yet says of it, "The Catholic world has found a great truth, that love, motherly tenderness and pity is a divine and holy thing, worthy of adoration. * * * * What does this wide-spread sentiment regarding this new divinity indicate? It can surely only point to the fact that there was something lacking in the elder creed, which, as time went on, became a more and more sensible deficiency, till at last the instinct of the multitude filled it up in this amazing manner."

When Theodore Parker, in his morning prayer on a beautiful summer Sunday, addressed the All-loving as "Our Father and our Mother," he struck a chord which will one day vibrate through the heart of universal humanity. It was a thought worth infinitely more than all the creeds of Christendom.

What if woman should even *abuse* the use of the ballot at first? Man has been known to fail at first in a new pursuit. A maker of microscopes told me that, in a new attempt on a different kind of object-glass, he failed forty-nine times, but the fiftieth was a complete success.

The Poet of Scotland intimates that even Creative Nature herself improved at a second trial:

"Her 'prentice hand she tried on man;
And then she made the lasses, o!"

Woman might not vote wisely the first time. She might even re-elect John Morrissey to Congress though Elizabeth Cady Stanton and

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

42

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY.

Horace Greeley were both in the field as candidates. Politics sometimes make strange *revelations*, as well as strange bed-fellows.

From of old it was seen and said "it is not good for man to be alone ;" the first social sentiment ever uttered, and clearly a divine inspiration. Not a Church in Christendom would survive, made up of male membership alone. It would soon lapse into a hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.

The angels in Heaven might not have rebelled, had both sexes made up the population. At least we hear of no *more* discords there, since Eve and her myriads of daughters are swelling the songs and refining the joys.

Must we be told that woman herself does not ask the ballot ! Then I submit to such, if such there be, the question is not one of privilege, but of duty—of solemn responsibility. If woman does not desire the ballot, demand it, take it, she sins against her own nature and all the holiest instincts of humanity, and cannot too soon repent.

After all, the question of suffrage is one of justice and right. Unless human government be in itself an unnatural and impious usurpation, whoever renders it support and submission, has a natural and inalienable, imperishable and inextinguishable right, to an equal voice in enacting and executing the laws. Nor can one man, or millions on millions of men acquire or possess the power to withhold that right from the humblest human being of sane mind, but by usurpation, and by rebellion against the constitution of the moral universe. It would be robbery, though the giving of the right should induce all the predicted and dreaded evils of tyrants, cowards and white male citizens.

Be justice done though the heavens fall, and the hells arise instead ! Nay, it is only justice, reared as a lightning rod, that can shield any governmental fabric when the very heavens are falling in righteous retribution.

The past mortality must last among nations, so long as they set at nought the Divine economy and purpose in their formation. The human body may yield to decay and die, though the soul be imperishable and eternal. But nations, like souls, need not die. Streams of new life flow into them, like rivers into the sea ; and why should not the sea and the nations on its shores, roll on together with the ages ?

When governments shall learn to lay their foundations in righteousness, with eternal justice the chief corner-stone ; when equal and impartial liberty shall be the acknowledged birthright of all, then will national life begin to be prolonged ; and the death of a nation, were it possible, should be as though more than a Pleiad had expired. No more would nation then lift up sword against nation ; and the New Jerusalem would indeed descend from God out of heaven and dwell among men.



ADDRESS OF ERNESTINE L. ROSE.

43

SUSAN B. ANTHONY made an appeal for contributions to the funds of the Association, to enable it to carry on its work, especially in Kansas.

Mrs. ROSE was the next speaker, and was received with applause.

ADDRESS OF ERNESTINE L. ROSE.

Mrs. ROSE said :

After all, we come down to the root of all evil—to money. It is rather humiliating, after the discourse that we have just heard, that told us of the rise and progress and destruction of nations, of empires and of republics, that we have to come down to dollars and cents. We live in an entirely practical age. I can show you in a few words that if we only had sufficient of that root of all evil in our hands, there would be no need of holding these meetings. We could obtain the elective franchise without making a single speech. Give us one million of dollars, and we will have the elective franchise at the very next session of our Legislature. (Laughter and applause.) But as we have not got a million of dollars, we want a million of voices. There are always two ways of obtaining an object. If we had had the money, we could have bought the Legislature and the elective franchise long before now. But as we have not, we must create a public opinion, and for that we must have voices.

I have always thought I was convinced not only of the necessity but of the great importance of obtaining the elective franchise for woman ; but recently I have become convinced that I never felt sufficiently that importance until now. Just read your public papers and see how our Senators and our members of the House are running round through the Southern States to hold meetings, and to deliver public addresses. To whom ? To the freedmen. And why now, and why not ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago ? Why do they get up meetings for the colored men, and call them fellow-men, brothers, and gentlemen ? Because the freedman has that talisman in his hands which the politician is looking after. Don't you perceive, then, the importance of the elective franchise ? Perhaps when we have the elective franchise in our hands, these great senators will condescend to inform us too of the importance of obtaining our rights.

You need not be afraid that when woman has the franchise, men will ever disturb her. I presume there are present, as there always are such people, those of timid minds, chicken-hearted, who so admire and respect woman that they are dreadfully afraid lest, when she comes to the ballot-box, rude, uncouth and vulgar men will say something to disturb her. You may set your hearts all at rest. If we once have the elective franchise, upon the first indication that any man will endeavor to disturb a woman in her duty at the polls, Congress will enact another Freedman's Bureau—I beg pardon, a Freedwoman's Bureau—to protect women against men, and to guard the purity of the ballot-box at the same time.

I have sometimes been asked, even by sensible men, " If woman had

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

44

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY.

the elective franchise, would she go to the polls to mix with rude men?" Well, would I go to the church to mix with rude men? And should not the ballot-box be as respectable, and as respected, and as sacred as the church? Aye, infinitely more so, because it is of greater importance. Men can pray in secret, but must vote in public. (Applause.) Hence the ballot, of the two, ought to be the most respected; and it would be if women were once there; but it never will be until they are there.

We have been told this evening that it is not good for man to be alone. No; if it was not well for him to be alone in the garden of Eden, it surely cannot be well for him to be alone at the ballot-box.

Our rights are as old as humanity itself. Yet we are obliged to ask man to give us the ballot, because he has it in his own hands. It is ours, and at the same time we ask for it; and we have sent on petitions to Congress. We have been told that the Republic is not destroyed. It has been destroyed, root and branch, because, if it were not destroyed, there would be no need to reconstruct it. And we have asked Congress, in the reconstruction of the Republic, to place it upon a sound foundation. Why have all former republics vanished out of existence? Simply because they were built upon the sand. In the erection of a building, in proportion to the height of the walls must be the depth and soundness of the foundation. If the foundation is shallow or unsound, the higher you raise your superstructure the surer its downfall. That is the reason a republic has not existed as long as a monarchy, because it embraced principles of human rights in its superstructure which it denied in its foundation. Hence, before this Republic could count a hundred years, it has had one of the mightiest revolutions that ever occurred in any country or in any period of human existence. Its foundation was laid wrong. It made a republic for white men alone. It discriminated against color; it discriminated against woman; and at the same time it pronounced that all men are created free and equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It raised its superstructure to the clouds; and it has fallen as low as any empire could fall. It is divided. A house divided against itself cannot stand. A wrong always operates against itself, and falls back on the wrong-doer. We have proclaimed to the world universal suffrage; but it is universal suffrage with a vengeance attached to it—universal suffrage excluding the negro and the woman, who are by far the largest majority in this country. It is not the majority that rules here, but the minority. White men are in the minority in this nation. White women, black men, and black women compose the large majority of the nation. Yet, in spite of this fact, in spite of common sense, in spite of justice, while our members of Congress can prate so long about justice, and human rights, and the rights of the negro, they have not the moral courage to say anything for the rights of woman.



ADDRESS OF ERNESTINE L. ROSE.

45

In proportion to power is responsibility. Our Republican senators and members of Congress have taken unto themselves great power. They have made great professions. There is a very good maxim, "Of him to whom much is given, much shall be required." In proportion to their claims to be friends of human freedom, lovers of human rights, do we demand of them our rights and justice. When Chase, Sumner, Stevens, and Wilson talk to the negro of the importance of having the franchise, and stop short of giving the franchise to woman, I proclaim them hypocrites—I proclaim them politicians. They speak so to the newly freed slave, because he has already the ballot in his hands, and they want him to vote for them. We have not that right, and hence they do not speak one word in favor of our attaining the elective franchise. I make no difference between one party and another. All parties are alike to me so far as they are right; and all parties are alike to me so far as they are wrong. For one, I would not be bound by party if I had the franchise in my hand to-day. I would go for my own highest convictions of right, irrespective of party. Perhaps our Senators know that woman would not be such a docile tool in their hands as the newly freed slave, and hence they will not give the ballot to us. If they do think so, they do us justice, because we would not be, you may depend on that.

There are a great many objections urged against the enfranchisement of women; and one that I have recently heard is that women would not go to war. Perhaps, if women had the franchise, men would not need to go to war neither. (Applause.) And this is one great reason why I demand the franchise. War is only a relic of the old barbarisms. So long as woman is deprived of her right, man is only next door to a barbarian. If he were not, he never would go to war. When woman has the franchise she will not want to go to war, and she will not want her husband to go to war; she will not want to have her son or her brother go to war; and none of them will need to go to war. Is war necessary? Are rowdies necessary? Is it necessary for man to be vulgar and corrupt? Is it necessary to disgrace the ballot-box by rows and fightings, so that a woman dare not go within its precincts? Are these things inalienable rights in a republic? Do they belong to the ballot-box? Do they belong to this country? Do they belong to the nineteenth century? For my part, I say, No!

The ballot is a teacher. Henry Ward Beecher, in a discourse on the subject last winter, said, in regard to woman's franchise, that the ballot is a teacher. I am glad to be able to agree with a minister, which is not often the case. Yes, it is a teacher. Yet, when man alone has the ballot, it fails to be his teacher. It has not taught him the great lesson that the ballot is useless, that it becomes perverted and corrupt, when woman is kept from it.

One of the greatest Grecian philosophers has proclaimed that no one ought to be amenable to the laws of the land that has not a voice in



enacting the laws. Woman is amenable to our laws. She is punished ; she is imprisoned ; she is hung ; but she has no voice in making the law that imprisons her or hangs her. She is taxed, but she has no voice in the laws that levy the tax. She is judged, but she has no voice in the laws, or in saying who shall judge her. Woman ought to be wherever her duty calls her—at the ballot-box, on the judge's bench, in the jury box ; the lawyer at the bar to plead her own case. Millions of money have been spent, many thousand lives have been lost, to obtain for man the great boon of being judged by his peers. Who are our peers ? Are we the same that man is ? Then we have the same rights that he has. Are we not the same that he is ? Then what right has he to judge us ? How can he plead for us ? How can he understand the motives of a being so entirely different from himself ? There is no justice in it. But it is an old error, and it is very difficult to eradicate it ; it cannot be done except by money or by voices.

We have lately read in the papers, to the shame and disgrace of this civilized Republic in the nineteenth century, that the Legislature of New York took into consideration the enactment of laws against a "social evil." For my part, I never knew a social evil to be removed by force of law. Is there only one kind of social evil ? Are there not many kinds ? Is there not defalcation, deception, intrigue, swindling, defrauding—the government defrauding the people, and the people defrauding the government and each other ? Why, then, not enact laws against these kinds of "social evil ?" After you have stopped them, then you may talk about enacting laws to prevent another social evil. The prevention of that social evil must commence in the nursery. If you will bring up woman as you ought to bring up men—not as you do bring up men—acknowledging her right to live the same as men, giving her the same advantages and the same rights that men have, there will be no need to enact laws against a "social evil." It is a shame to talk about licensing a social evil. It is a shame to this Republic. It is a violation of woman's nature. It is an insult to womanhood ; and if woman has one drop of pure blood stirring in her heart, she must revolt against it. At the same time, I say to the Legislature that, if you enact laws against social evils, whatever those laws are, let them be alike for man and for woman. (Applause.) If you want to derive a revenue from the corruption of the community, let it be drawn alike from both sexes. The social evil belongs to both ; the social remedy must belong to both. Do not degrade woman more than she is already degraded. Perchance she is driven, through your injustice, to that step to maintain her wretched existence, because every avenue of emolument is barred against her ; and yet he that commits the injustice and takes advantage of her feebleness, her confiding nature, her helpless poverty, and her ignorance, enacts laws against woman and against the social evil ! I would rather give the stray lamb into the power of the wolf for protection. (Applause.) Let woman have the franchise ; let all the avenues



Proceedings of the First Anniversary

ADDRESS OF MAJOR JAMES HAGGERTY.

47

of society be thrown open before her, according to her powers and her capacities, and there will be no need to talk about social evils. Depend upon it that she will not only take care of herself, but will help to take care of man, which is more than he has ever done for himself.

Major JAMES HAGGERTY said :

It is no new thing for me to be found among Anti-Slavery people. I believe it was among Anti-Slavery people that I received my American culture. I see the old faces here upon this platform and in this house—some that I first met when I landed in this country, in 1856—Parker Pillsbury, as remorseless as ever ; Mrs. Stanton, as bold and strong for the truth as ever. I see the same uncompromising people here, and I feel that I have been as uncompromising as any of them ; for, although I have been and am identified with the Republican party in politics, no man ever heard me, on any platform, compromise with the rights of another. Woman's Rights is an idea against which my prejudices array themselves ; but my logic says, If you would be a true man, you must raise your voice for equal rights. (Applause.) I have seen the effect of the suffrage. In the District of Columbia, during the election, I saw men who had been called doughfaces walk up to black men and profess to be so much more Anti-Slavery than the best Anti-Slavery men, that I have got the idea that it will not be five years before the northern Democrat will be swearing to the black man that he has negro blood in his veins. (Laughter.)

After a few further remarks, Major H. said :

I come upon this platform to-night, then, to identify myself with this new effort. I hope you may prosper ; and so far as a dollar of mine, or my voice may go, you shall have it. I confess candidly that it is logic that drives me here, in spite of my prejudices. It is the discourses of Mrs. Stanton, of Mrs. Mott, of others that have spoken and written ; and it is coming in contact with strong womanly mind. It would make you laugh to know what I supposed Mrs. Stanton to be before I first saw her. I pictured to myself a very angular old maid, and thought she must be a very bad-looking person ; for, to associate a good-looking woman with a strong-minded woman, was to me ridiculous, and I would not do it. I leave you to judge for yourselves how great a corrective to the vagaries of imagination is the experience of actual life. If we accept the convictions that come to us, we shall be all right ; and I will do as the lady who has just spoken said that she would do—not be governed by mere party, but by the moral bearings of the questions that arise, and vote upon the side of God and justice. (Applause.)

ADDRESS OF FRANCES D. GAGE.

FRANCES D. GAGE said :

Mrs. PRESIDENT : It seems to be my fate to come in at the eleventh hour. We have been talking about the right to the ballot. Why do we



want it? What does it confer? What will it give us? We closed our argument at three o'clock to-day by a discussion whether the women of this country and the colored men of this country wanted the ballot. I said that it was a libel on the womanhood of this country, to say they do not want it; and I repeat that assertion. Woman may say in public that she does not want it, because it is unpopular and unfashionable for her to want it; but when you tell her what the ballot can do, she will always answer you that she wants it. Why do we want it? Because it is right, and because there are wrongs in the community that can be righted in no other way.

After the discussions we have had to-night, I want to turn to a fresh subject. Last evening I attended the meeting of the National Temperance Association at Cooper Institute. A great audience was assembled there, to listen to the arguments against the most gigantic evil that now pervades the American Republic. Men took the position that only a prohibitory law could put an end to the great evil of intemperance. New York has its two hundred millions of invested capital to sell death and destruction to the men of this country who are weak enough to purchase. There are eight thousand licensed liquor establishments in this city, to drag down humanity. It was asserted there by Wendell Phillips that intemperance had its root in our Saxon blood, that demanded a stimulus; and he argued from that standpoint. If intemperance has its root in the Saxon blood, that demands a stimulus, why is it that the womanhood of this nation is not at the grog-shops to-day? Are women not Saxons? It was asserted, both by Mr. Phillips and by President Hopkins, of Union College, that the liquor traffic must be regulated by law. A man may do what he likes in his own house, said they; he may burn his furniture; he may take poison; he may light his cigar with his greenbacks; but if he carries his evil outside of his own house, if he increases my taxes, if he makes it dangerous for me or for my children to walk the streets, then it may be prohibited by law. I was at Harrisburg, a few days ago, at the State Temperance Convention. Horace Greeley asserted that there was progress upon the subject of temperance; and he went back to the time when ardent spirits were drunk in the household, when every table had its decanter, and the wife, children and husband drank together. Now, said he, it is a rare thing to find the dram-bottle in the home. It has been put out. But what put the dram-bottle out of the home? It was put out because the education and refinement and power of woman became so strong in the home, that she said, "It must go out; we can't have it here." (Applause.) Then the voters of the United States, the white male citizens, went to work and licensed these nuisances that could not be in the home, at all the corners of the streets. I demand the ballot for woman to-day, that she may vote down these nuisances, the dram-shops, there also, as she drove them out of the home. (Applause.)

What privilege does the vote give to the "white male citizen" of the

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

ADDRESS OF FRANCES D. GAGE.

49

United States? Did you ever analyze a voter—hold him up and see what he was? Shall I give you a picture of him? Not as my friend Parker Pillsbury has drawn the picture to-night will I draw it. What is the “white male citizen”—the voter in the Republic of the United States? More than any potentate or any king in all Europe. Louis Napoleon dares not walk the streets of his own city without his body-guard around him, with their bayonets. The Czar of Russia is afraid for his own life among his people. Kings and potentates are always afraid; but the “free white male citizen” of the United States, with the ballot in his hand, goes where he lists, does what he pleases. He owns himself, his earnings, his genius, his talent, his eloquence, his power, all there is of him. All that God has given him is his, to do with as he pleases, subject to no power but such laws as have an equal bearing upon every other man in like circumstances, and responsible to no power but his own conscience and his God. He builds colleges; he lifts up humanity or he casts it down. He is the lawgiver, the maker, as it were, of the nation. His single vote may turn the destiny of the whole Republic for good or ill. There is no link in the chain of human possibilities that can add one single power to the “white male citizen” of America.

Now we ask that you shall put into the hands of every human soul this same power to go forward and do good works wherever it can. The country has rung within the last few days because one colored girl, with a little black blood in her veins, has been cast out of the Pittsburg Methodist College. It ought to ring until such a thing shall be impossible. But when Cambridge, and Yale, and Union, and Lansing, and all the other institutions of the country, West Point included, aided by national patronage, shut out every woman and every colored man in the land, who has anything to say? There is not a single college instituted by the original government patronage of lands to public schools and colleges, that allows a woman to set her foot inside of its walls as a student. Is this no injustice? Is it no wrong?

When men stand upon the public platform and deliver elaborate essays on women and their right of suffrage, they talk about their weakness, their devotion to fashion and idleness. What else have they given women to do? Almost every profession in the land is filled by men; every college sends forth the men to fill the highest places. When the law said that no married woman should do business in her own name, sue or be sued, own property, own herself or her earnings, what had she to do? That laid the foundation for precisely the state of things you see to-day.

But I deny that, as a class, the women of America, black or white, are idle. We are always busy. What have we done? Look over this audience, go out upon your streets, go through the world where you will, and every human soul you meet is the work of woman. She has given it life; she has educated it, whether for good or evil. She it is that must lie at



Proceedings of the First Anniversary

50

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY.

the foundation of your country, because God gave her the holiest mission ever laid upon the heart of a human soul—the mission of the mother.

We are told that home is woman's sphere. So it is, and man's sphere, too; for I tell you that that is a poor home which has not in it a man to feel that it is the most sacred place he knows. If duty requires him to go out into the world and fight its battles, who blames him, or puts a ban upon him? Men complain that woman does not love home now, that she is not satisfied with her mission. I answer that this discontent arises out of the one fact, that you have attempted to mould seventeen millions of human souls in one shape, and make them all do one thing. Take away your restrictions, open all doors, leave women at liberty to go where they will. As old Sojourner Truth said twenty years ago, at the first Women's Rights Convention in Ohio, "Leave them where God left them, with their inalienable rights," and they will adjust themselves to their convictions of their duties, their responsibilities, and their powers, and society will find harmony within itself. The caged bird forgets how to build its nest. The wing of the eagle is as strong to soar to the sun as that of her mate, who never says to her, "back, feeble one, to your nest, and there brood in dull inactivity until I give you permission to leave!" But when her duties called her there, who ever found her unfaithful to her trust? The foot of the wild roe is as strong and swift in the race as that of her antlered companion. She goes by his side, she feeds in the same pasture, drinks from the same running brook, but is ever true also to her maternal duties and cares.

If we are a nation of imbeciles, if womanhood is weak, it is the laws and customs of society which have made us what we are. If you want health, strength, energy, force, temperance, purity, honesty, deal justly with the mothers of this country; then they will give you nobler and stronger men than higgling politicians, or the grogshop emissaries that buy up the votes of your manhood.

Why is it that Republicans are so weak and wavering to-day? There is a law upon the statute book of every southern State that the child shall follow the condition of the mother. There is a law in the physical code of humanity, written by the finger of the Almighty, that never was and never will be repealed, that the child shall follow the condition of the mother. You have never taught the women of this country the sacredness of freedom. You have never called out the mother to generous action. You have never said to the motherhood of this country, "Upon you rests the responsibility of making the Republic what it should be. We invest you with the power; now assume that responsibility and act upon it, or we shall call you to account for your neglect of duty."

It has been charged upon woman that she does nothing well. What have you given us to do well? What freedom have you given us to act independently and earnestly? When I was in San Domingo, I found a little colony of American colored people that went over there in 1825.



They retained their American customs, and especially their little American church, outside of the Catholic, which overspread the whole country. In an obscure room in an old ruin they sung the old hymns, and lived the old life of the United States. I asked how this thing was, and they answered that among those that went over so long ago were a few from Chester County, Penn., who were brought up among the Quakers, and had learned to read. Wherever a mother had learned to read, she had educated all her children so that they could read; but wherever there was a mother that could not read, that family had lapsed off from the old customs of the past.

Give us education. When we have a right to vote, there will not be a school-door in the United States shut to woman. When we have the right to vote, I believe that the womanhood that demanded that the dram-bottle should go out of the home, will demand that the dram-bottle shall be put away from among men. She will say, You have no right to take poison, and make my home a discomfort, or destroy the greenbacks, which should be the mutual possession of the household, by lighting your cigar. She will tell the world, under the new regime, that it is not the Saxon blood that demands a stimulant; but in the new morality it will be as wicked for a man to be drunken as for a woman to be drunken—as disreputable for a man to be licentious as for a woman to be licentious—as wicked and perverse for a man to go down to the lower depths of iniquity and folly as for a woman. And the great law uttered upon Sinai amid its thunders, will again be remembered, and will apply as much to man as to woman. Now, it is not so. One code of morality governs the voter, another the woman. As the slaveholder enacted laws that made his own vices crimes in the slave, so men enact laws that make their vices crimes in woman. And this is why we want suffrage for woman.

I ask the ballot, not because of its individual advantage to myself, but because I know and feel that individual rights, guaranteed to every citizen, must harmonize the world, if there is any power to do it this side of heaven. And so, not quite eighty years old, as old Sojourner said she was, but standing upon the brink of threescore, having looked this question in the face from my girlhood up—having labored in almost every vocation in life that falls to the lot of womanhood, as a worker on the farm, a worker in the household, a wife, a mother, a seamstress, a cook—and I tell you, my friends, that I can make better biscuit than I can lectures—as one who has tried to study what is for the best interest of society, I ask you candidly to survey this subject in all its bearings. Why may we not take our position as human beings enjoying all the privileges which the Creator bestowed, without restriction other than falls upon every other human being in the community?

A friend of mine, writing from Charleston the other day, just after the ballot went down there, says that he was told by a colored man, "I met my old master, and he bowed so low to me I didn't hardly know



which was the negro and which was the white man." When we hold the ballot, we shall stand just there. Men will forget to tell us that politics are degrading. They will bow low, and actually respect the women to whom they now talk platitudes; and silly flatteries, sparkling eyes, rosy cheeks, pearly teeth, ruby lips, the soft and delicate hands of refinement and beauty, will not be the burden of their song; but the strength, the power, the energy, the force, the intellect and the nerve, which the womanhood of this country will bring to bear, and which will infuse itself through all the ranks of society, must make all its men and women wiser and better. (Applause.)

The Association then adjourned until Friday morning, 10½ o'clock.

SECOND DAY.

FRIDAY MORNING, May 10, 1867.

The meeting was called to order by the President, and the Secretary read the resolutions offered at the previous sessions with the following:

Resolved, That the ballot alike to women and men means bread, education, self-protection, self-reliance and self-respect; to the wife it means the control of her own person, property and earnings; to the mother it means the equal guardianship of her children; to the daughter it means diversified employment and a fair day's wages for a fair day's work; to all it means free access to skilled labor, to colleges and professions, and to every avenue of advantage and preferment.

Resolved, That Henry Ward Beecher, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Frederick Douglass, be invited to represent the Equal Rights Association in the Constitutional Convention to be held in this State in the month of June next.

Resolved, That while we are grateful to Wendell Phillips, Theodore Tilton and Horace Greeley, for the respectful mention of woman's right to the ballot in the journals through which they speak, we ask them now, when we are constructing both our State and National governments, to demand that the right of suffrage be secured to all citizens—to women as well as black men, for, until this is done, the government stands on the unsafe basis of class legislation.

Resolved, That on this our first anniversary we congratulate each other and the country on the unexampled progress of our cause, as seen: 1, In the action of Congress extending the right of suffrage to the colored men of the States lately in rebellion, and in the very long and able discussion of woman's equal right to the ballot in the United States Senate, and the vote upon it. 2, In the action of the Legislatures of Kansas and Wisconsin, submitting to the people a proposition to extend the ballot to woman. 3, In the agitation upon the same measure in the Legislatures of several other States. 4, in the friendly tone of so large a portion of the press, both political and religious; and finally, in the general awaking to the importance of human elevation and enfranchisement, abroad as well as at home; particularly in Great Britain, Russia and Brazil; and encouraged by past successes and the present prospect, we



DISCUSSION ON THE RESOLUTIONS.

53

pledge ourselves to renewed and untiring exertions, until equal suffrage and citizenship are acknowledged throughout our entire country, irrespective of sex or color.

CHARLES L. REMOND objected to the form of the resolution introduced by Mr. May, and desired that the word "colored" might be stricken out. It might be that colored men would obtain their rights before women would ; but if so, he was confident they would heartily acquiesce in admitting woman also to the right of suffrage.

The PRESIDENT (Mrs. Mott) said that woman had a right to be a little jealous of the addition of so large a number of men to the voting class, for the colored men would naturally throw all their strength upon the side of those opposed to woman's enfranchisement.

GEORGE T. DOWNING wished to know whether he had rightly understood that Mrs. Stanton and Mrs. Mott were opposed to the enfranchisement of the colored man, unless the ballot should also be accorded to woman at the same time.

Mrs. STANTON said :

All history proves that despotisms, whether of one man or millions, cannot stand, and there is no use of wasting centuries of men and means in trying that experiment again. Hence I have no faith or interest in any reconstruction on that old basis. To say that politicians always do one thing at a time is no reason why philosophers should not enunciate the broad principles that underlie that one thing and a dozen others. We do not take the right step for this hour in demanding suffrage for any class ; as a matter of principle I claim it for all.

But in a narrow view of the question as a matter of feeling between classes, when Mr. Downing puts the question to me, are you willing to have the colored man enfranchised before the woman, I say, no ; I would not trust him with all my rights ; degraded, oppressed himself, he would be more despotic with the governing power than even our Saxon rulers are. I desire that we go into the kingdom together, for individual and national safety demand that not another man be enfranchised without the woman by his side.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER, basing the demand for the ballot upon the natural right of the citizen, felt bound to aid in conferring it upon any citizen deprived of it irrespective of its being granted or denied to others. Even, therefore, if the enfranchisement of the colored men would probably retard the enfranchisement of women, we had no right for that reason to deprive him of his right. The right of each should be accorded at the earliest possible moment, neither being denied for any supposed benefit to the other.

CHARLES L. REMOND said that if he were to lose sight of expediency, he must side with Mrs. Stanton, although to do so was extremely trying ; for he could not conceive of a more unhappy position than that



occupied by millions of American men bearing the name of freedmen while the rights and privileges of *free* men are still denied them.

Mrs. STANTON said—That is equalled only by the condition of the women by their side. There is a depth of degradation known to the slave women that man can never feel. To give the ballot to the black man is no security to the woman. Saxon men have the ballot, yet look at their women, crowded into a few half-paid employments. Look at the starving, degraded class in our ten thousand dens of infamy and vice if you would know how wisely and generously man legislates for woman.

Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, in reply to Mr. Remond's objection to his resolution, said that the word "colored" was necessary to convey the meaning, since there is no demand now made for the enfranchisement of men, as a class. His amendment would take all the color out of my resolution. No man in this country had made such sacrifices for the cause of liberty as Wendell Phillips; and if just at this moment, when the great question for which he has struggled thirty years seemed about to be settled, he was unwilling that anything should be added to it which might in any way prejudice the success about to crown his efforts, it was not to be wondered at. He was himself of the opinion, on the contrary, that by asking for the rights of all, we should be much more likely to obtain the rights of the colored man, than by making that a special question. He would rejoice at the enfranchisement of colored men, and believed that Mrs. Stanton would, though that were all we could get at this time. Yet, if we rest there, and allow the reconstruction to be completed, leaving out the better half of humanity, we must expect further trouble; and it might be a more awful and sanguinary civil war than that which we have just experienced.

GEORGE T. DOWNING desired that the Convention should express its opinion upon the point he had raised; and, therefore, offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That while we regret that the right sentiment, which would secure to women the ballot, is not as general as we would have it, nevertheless we wish it distinctly understood that we rejoice at the increasing sentiment which favors the enfranchisement of the colored man.

He understood Mrs. Stanton to refuse to rejoice at a *part* of the good results to be accomplished, if she could not achieve the whole, and he wished to ask if she was unwilling the colored man should have the vote until the women could have it also? He said we had no right to refuse an act of justice upon the assumption that it would be followed by an act of injustice.

Mrs. STANTON said she demanded the ballot for all. She asked for reconstruction on the basis of self-government; but if we are to have further class legislation, she thought the wisest order of enfranchise-

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

ADDRESS OF REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER.

55

ment was to take the educated classes first. If women are still to be represented by men, then I say let only the highest type of manhood stand at the helm of State. But if all men are to vote, black and white, lettered and unlettered, washed and unwashed, the safety of the nation as well as the interests of woman demand that we outweigh this incoming tide of ignorance, poverty and vice, with the virtue, wealth and education of the women of the country.

With the black man you have no new force in government—it is manhood still; but with the enfranchisement of woman, you have a new and essential element of life and power. Would Horace Greeley, Wendell Phillips, Gerrit Smith or Theodore Tilton be willing to stand aside and trust their individual interests, and the whole welfare of the nation to the lowest strata of manhood? If not, why ask educated women, who love their country, who desire to mould its institutions on the highest idea of justice and equality, who feel that their enfranchisement is of vital importance to this end, why ask them to stand aside while two million ignorant men are ushered into the halls of legislation?

EDWARD M. DAVIS asked what had been done with Mr. Burleigh's amendment.

The CHAIR—No action was taken upon it, as no one seconded it.

ABBY KELLEY FOSTER said:

I am in New York for medical treatment, not for speech-making; yet I must say a few words in relation to a remark recently made on this platform—that "The negro should not enter the kingdom of politics before woman, because he would be an additional weight against her enfranchisement." Were the negro and woman in the same civil, social and political status to-day, I should respond aye, with all my heart, to this sentiment. What are the facts? You say the negro has the social rights bill, also the military reconstruction bill granting him suffrage. It has been well said, "He has the title deed to liberty, but is not yet in possession of liberty." He is treated as a slave to-day in the several districts of the South. Without wages, without family rights, whipped and beaten by thousands, given up to the most horrible outrages, without that protection which his value as property formerly gave him. Again, he is liable, without farther guarantees, to be plunged into peonage, serfdom or even into chattel slavery. Have we any true sense of justice, are we not dead to the sentiment of humanity if we shall wish to postpone his security against present woes and future enslavement till woman shall obtain political rights?

SPEECH OF REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER.

HENRY WARD BEECHER said:

It seems that my modesty in not lending my name has been a matter of some grief. I will try hereafter to be less modest. When I get my growth I hope to overcome that. I certainly should not have been pre-

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

56

FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY

sent to-day, except that a friend said to me that some who were expected had not come. When a cause is well launched and is prospering, I never feel specially called to help it. When a cause that I believe to be just is in the minority, and is struggling for a hearing, then I should always be glad to be counted among those who were laboring for it in the days when it lacked friends.

I come to bear testimony, not as if I had not already done it, but again, as confirmed by all that I have read, whether of things written in England or spoken in America, in the belief that this movement is not the mere progeny of a fitful and feverish *Ism*—that it is not a mere frothing eddy whose spirit is but the chafing of the water upon the rock—but that it is a part of that great tide which follows the drawing of heaven itself. I believe it to be so. I trust that it will not be invidious if I say, therefore, I hope the friends of this cause will not fall out by the way. If the division of opinion amounts merely to this, that you have two blades, and therefore can cut, I have no objection to it; but if there is such a division of opinion in respect to mere details, however important those details are, among friends that are one at the bottom where principles are, that there is to be a falling out there, I shall exceedingly regret it; I shall regret that our strength is weakened, when we need it to be augmented most, or concentrated.

All my lifetime the great trouble has been that in merely speculative things theologians have been such furious logicians, have picked up their premises, and rushed with them with race-horse speed to such remote conclusions, that in the region of ideas our logical minds have become accustomed to draw results as remote as the very eternities from any premises given. My difficulty, on the other hand, has been that in practical matters, owing to the existence of this great mephitic swamp of slavery, men have been utterly unwilling to draw conclusions at all; and that the most familiar principles of political economy or politics have been enunciated, and then always docked off short. Men would not allow them to go to their natural results, in the class of questions in society. We have had raised up before us the necessity of maintaining the Union by denying conclusions. The most dear and sacred and animating principles of religion have been restrained, because they would have such a bearing upon slavery, and men felt bound to hold their peace. Our most profound and broadly acknowledged principles of liberty have been enunciated and passed over, without carrying them out and applying them to society, because it would interrupt the peace of the nation. That time is passed away; and as the result of it has come in a joy and a perfect appetite on the part of the public.

I have been a careful observer for more than thirty-five years, for I came into public life, I believe, about the same time with the lady who has just sat down (Mrs. Foster), although I am not so much worn by my labors as she seems to have been. For thirty-five years I have observed



ADDRESS OF REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER.

57

in society its impetus checked, and a kind of lethargy and deadness in practical ethics arising, from fear of this prejudicial effect upon public economy. I have noticed that in the last five years there has been a revolution as perfect as if it had been God's resurrection in the graveyard. The dead men are living, and the live men are thrice alive. I can scarcely express my sense of the leap the public mind and the public moral sense have taken within this time. The barrier is out of the way. That which made the American mind untrue logically to itself is smitten down by the hand of God; and there is just at this time an immense tendency in the public mind to carry out all principles to their legitimate conclusions, go where they will. There never was a time when men were so practical, and so ready to learn. I am not a farmer, but I know that the spring comes but once in the year. When the furrow is open is the time to put in your seed, if you would gather a harvest in its season. Now, when the red-hot ploughshare of war has opened a furrow in this nation, is the time to put in the seed. If any man says to me, "Why will you agitate the woman's question, when it is the hour for the black man?" I answer, it is the hour for every man, black or white. (Applause.) The bees go out in the morning to gather the honey from the morning-glories. They take it when they are open, for by ten o'clock they are shut, and they never open again until the next crop comes. When the public mind is open, if you have anything to say, say it. If you have any radical principles to urge, any organizing wisdom to make known, don't wait until quiet times come. Don't wait until the public mind shuts up altogether.

War has opened the way for impulse to extend itself. But progress goes by periods, by jumps and spurts. We are in the favored hour; and if you have great principles to make known, this is the time to advance those principles. If you can organize them into institutions, this is the time to organize them. I therefore say, whatever truth is to be known for the next fifty years in this nation let it be spoken now—let it be enforced now.

The truth that I have to urge is not that women have the right of suffrage—not that Chinamen or Irishmen have the right of suffrage—not that native born Yankees have the right of suffrage—but that suffrage is the inherent right of mankind. I say that man has the right of suffrage as I say that man has the right to himself. For although it may not be true under the Russian government, where the government does not rest on the people, and although under our own government a man has not a right to himself, except in accordance with the spirit and action of our own institutions, yet our institutions make the government depend on the people, and make the people depend on the government; and no man is a full citizen, or fully competent to take care of himself, or to defend himself, that has not all those rights that belong to his fellows. I therefore advocate no sectional rights, no class rights, no sex rights, but the most universal form of



right for all that live and breathe on the continent. I do not put back the black man's emancipation; nor do I put back for a single day or for an hour his admission. I ask not that he should wait. I demand that this work shall be done, not upon the ground that it is politically expedient now to enfranchise black men; but I propose that you take expediency out of the way, and that you put a principle that is more enduring than expediency in the place of it—manhood and womanhood suffrage for all.

That is the question. You may just as well meet it now as at any other time. You never will have so favorable an occasion, so sympathetic a heart, never a public reason so willing to be convinced as to-day. If anything is to be done for the black man, or the black woman, or for the disfranchised classes among the whites, let it be done, in the name of God, while his Providence says, "Come; come, all, and come welcome."

But I take wisdom from some with whom I have not always trained. If you would get ten steps, has been the practical philosophy of some who are not here to-day, demand twenty, and then you will get ten. Now even if I were to confine—as I by no means do—my expectation to gaining the vote for the black man, I think we should be much more likely to gain that by demanding the vote for everybody. I remember that when I was a boy Dr. Spurzheim came to this country to advocate phrenology, but everybody held up both hands—"Phrenology! You must be running mad to have the idea that phrenology can be true!" It was not long after, that mesmerism came along; and then the people said, "Mesmerism! We can go phrenology; there is some sense in that; but as for mesmerism—!" Very soon spiritualism made its appearance, and then the same people began to say, "Spiritualism! why it is nothing but mesmerism; we can believe in that; but as for spiritualism—!" (Laughter.) The way to get a man to take a position is to take one in advance of it, and then he will drop into the one you want him to take. So that if, being crafty, I desire to catch men with guile, and desire them to adopt suffrage for colored men, as good a trap as I know of is to claim it for women also. Bait your trap with the white woman, and I think you will catch the black man. (Laughter.) I would not, certainly, have it understood that we are standing here to advocate this universal application of the principle merely to secure the enfranchisement of the colored citizen. We do it in good faith. I believe it is just as easy to carry the enfranchisement of all as the enfranchisement of any class, and easier to carry it than carry the enfranchisement of class after class—class after class. (Applause.)

I make this demand because I have the deepest sense of what is before us. We have entered upon an era such as never before has come to any nation. We are at a point in the history of the world where we need a prophet, and have none to describe to us those events rising in the horizon, thick and fast. Sometimes it seems to me that that Latter

Proceedings of the First Anniversary

ADDRESS OF REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER.

59

Day glory which the prophets dimly saw, and which saints have ever since, with faintness of heart, longed for and prayed for with wavering faith, is just before us. I see the fountains of the great deep broken up. I think we are to have a nation born in a day among us, greater in power of thought, greater in power of conscience, greater therefore in self-government, greater still in the power of material development. Such thrift, such skill, such enterprise, such power of self-sustentation I think is about to be developed, to say nothing of the advance already made before the nations, as will surprise even the most sanguine and far-sighted.

Nevertheless, while so much is promised, there are all the attendant evils. It is a serious thing to bring unwashed, uncombed, untutored men, scarcely redeemed from savagery to the ballot-box. It is a dangerous thing to bring the foreigner, whose whole secular education was under the throne of the tyrant, and put his hand upon the helm of affairs in this free nation. It is a dangerous thing to bring men without property, or the expectation of it, into the legislative halls to legislate upon property. It is a dangerous thing to bring woman, unaccustomed to and undrilled in the art of government, suddenly into the field to vote. These are dangerous things; I admit it. But I think God says to us, "By that danger I put every man of you under the solemn responsibility of preparing these persons effectually for their citizenship." Are you a rich man, afraid of your money? By that fear you are called to educate the men who you are afraid will vote against you. We are in a time of danger. I say to the top of society, just as sure as you despise the bottom, you shall be left like the oak tree that rebelled against its own roots—better that it be struck with lightning. Take a man from the top of society or the bottom, and if you will but give himself to himself, give him his reason, his moral nature, and his affections; take him with all his passions and his appetites, and develop him, and you will find he has the same instinct for self-government that you have. God made a man just as much to govern himself as a pyramid to stand on its own bottom. Self-government is a boon intended for all. This is shown in the very organization of the human mind, with its counterbalances and checks. It certainly will be given to all; and I am not afraid that all should have it, provided they are unbound, developed to more liberty, and made more familiar with themselves. If those who are up in the privileged seats are afraid of those at the bottom, then turn to and become school-teachers. Go to work and teach them.

For my own part, I do not despise the lowly. I thank God for them, as I thank God for those who repose on their literary laurels. My heart warms for everything God makes, whether worm or insect—whether it flies in the air, or swims in the sea, or walks upon the earth, and surely for everything that carries immortality in its bosom. My heart warms for those who have touched the summer of prosperity. They are my natural fellows; and if I sought simply congeniality, with them would I