

cannot be surpassed. We freely endorse every word which she utters, and hope she will yet bear the honored title of the female emancipator of America. We, the women of this glorious country, will hail with joy unpeakable the day of freedom, and our friend and advocate, Mrs. E. C. Stanton, shall be crowned with laurels that will never fade.

MARY W. STRIDER.

From the New York Independent.

When people who have once been radicals suddenly turn aside from the army of progress, and join that backward-moving multitude whose faces are toward the middle ages, there is no telling when and where they will finally bring up. For instance, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, hitherto a crisp and sparkling "free-trader," is now editing a journal in this city whose prospectus is violent for a tariff. "Foreign Manufactures Prohibited," it says. This contradiction has elicited the following note from one of our correspondents:

"New York, June 10, 1868.

"To the Editor of the Independent.

"I observe with unfeigned regret that my radical friend, Mrs. Stanton, is at present editing a journal devoted to the advocacy of protection, and negro-hating democracy. This is the more surprising to me because I have long known her to be an enthusiastic supporter of free trade, as well as the freedom of men and women. Surely, 'Revolutions' do go backward, sometimes.

"I. H. B."

Yes, our correspondent is sadly right in saying that "THE REVOLUTION" is going backward. Mrs. Stanton's notions on free trade or a tariff are of minor importance; but what our correspondent calls her "devotion to the negro-hating democracy" is one of the lamentable signs of the times. Think of an old-fashioned abolitionist becoming a Tammany Hall democrat! Think of a Woman's Rights journal willing to admit the southern states without negro suffrage! Think of the editorial columns of "THE REVOLUTION" arguing that the negro soldier ought to be denied his elective franchise until he can pass a district school examination in elocution and penmanship! Alas! Elizabeth Cady, farewell!

If Tammany Hall democrats believe in our political creed, free men, free speech, free press, and free trade, citizen suffrage, black and white, male and female, the duty of Congress to establish a republican form of government in every state of the Union; if they repudiate a financial system that makes the rich richer, the poor poorer, why we give them the right hand of fellowship. A democrat that believes all this (and we know some who do) is far better in our estimation than a republican who believes in "state rights," "manhood suffrage," or "gold for the bond-holder and paper for the laborer," "tariffs" and "protection."

We cannot imagine with what kind of spectacles Mr. Tilton reads "THE REVOLUTION."

In the above extract he travels so far out of the record that we have come to the conclusion that this is his playful way of giving us an advertisement. As such we accept it, and tender him our hearty thanks. We hope that closing "farewell" does not signify that he will do no more for us in that way.

We feel, however, that it is a little remarkable, while in every part of the country the press, both republican and democratic, is so very complimentary to us that all our old friends should be so hostile. While all the city papers quote from us, and kindly call the attention of the public to our columns, the *Anti-Slavery Standard* has treated us with sullen silence and contempt; and the *Independent* from the day of our birth has uniformly pointed its pen with a sneer, and that, too, while these papers claim to be the most radical in the country on the Woman's Rights question. If black men had started "THE REVOLUTION" we wonder if these radical gentlemen would have been so hypercritical with them. However, "THE REVOLUTION" is to live in spite of sneers and contempt,

and to be a power in the building up of the nation on the solid foundation of equal rights to all. We may have made some blunders in starting in matters of minor importance; but whoever publicly impeaches our principles, without one quotation from our columns, is not only unjust to us, but untrue to himself.

E. C. S.

SUFFRAGE FOR WOMAN.

From the New York World.

A MEETING of the Union League (colored) of America, No. 23, was held last evening at the hall in Cottage place, near Bleeker street, to discuss the questions of universal and impartial suffrage.

W. C. H. Curtis (colored), President of the League, occupied the chair, and stated that the object of the meeting was the discussion of suffrage and other questions relating to the coming fall campaign.

Wm. P. Powell (colored) offered a series of resolutions declaring "that American native born citizens seek for nothing but what is right, viz., equal suffrage without any qualification other than manhood."

Mrs. S. F. Norton moved an amendment, that suffrage should be conferred on all citizens irrespective of sex or color, and that the words "or womanhood," be added to the resolution.

Miss Susan B. Anthony said they ought to feel grateful to the colored men of New York City, that they had so soon inaugurated the discussion of this great question of suffrage—the only question that is worthy of our full and hearty consideration. It is the question that underlies all other questions. We are now at the end of a revolution. And what was the cause of the war? Simply the violation of the great fundamental principles of republicanism and democracy. Simply depriving a portion of the people of their inalienable rights. You may say that was done by enslaving them. Yes, but there was a crime, a far greater crime, back of their enslavement—and that was the crime of their disfranchisement. No class having the ballot in their hands could possibly have been enslaved. Therefore, the work of this hour is to make sure that we shall never again have cause of disturbance by the violation of the fundamental principles of republicanism. The hour is come when these principles must be carried to their legitimate conclusions. Republicanism is either a lie, or a truth. If it is the truth, it should be applied to all, without distinction. And that is what the women demand—that is the demand of the hour. The women helped the anti-slavery movement to the best of their ability, and were admitted to prominent positions in the organization. Their rights were acknowledged. But when the war broke out, they, for the time, ceased their Woman's Rights Conventions in order to help the cause which then commanded itself to the feelings of the North; promising themselves that as soon as the object of the war was accomplished, and the black man was rescued from slavery, and placed on an even platform with the most wealthy and cultivated women of the country, they would make common cause with him. But when the close of the war came, we found our abolition friends unwilling to help us. They said, "before the women seek for enfranchisement we must obtain enfranchisement for the negro"—in other words, we, who had worked, must waive our demands for justice. But then Mrs. Stanton and myself, who stand as the representatives of this factious set of women, said to Mr. Phillips, "Nay, this is the hour for all. If you ask the ballot for the black man, demand it also for the woman. Either suffrage is a right or it is not. If it be an inalienable right, it is as much the right of the black woman as it is of the black man. And you can't ask it for any class of men, without asking it for all the women who are deprived of it." And I told Wendell Phillips, "Unless you make demand for all, you will lose all. You cannot urge the principle with force and power, unless it be on the ground of absolute right." But no, Phillips and the republicans said they could maintain the government without the woman's vote, but not without the vote of the black man. That was political maneuvering and management. That was expediency. That was working for an end, and not for justice towards all the inhabitants of the land. And so they managed at Chicago. The South must be compelled to give suffrage to the negroes, because the republican party wants their votes; but Connecticut and New York may vote the black man away from the ballot-box just as long as they please. We find that after all this discord they still propose to leave this question of the vote open to the control of the states; and if the Southern rebels can get a majority they can vote the

ballot out of the hands of the negroes precisely as it is done in New York. And therefore, unless the democratic party does what it seems hardly possible it can do—really arrives at the conclusion that General Jackson is dead; and that it is necessary to make a platform in accordance with the events and necessities of the day—and if they want to win they will do it—unless they do this, what becomes the duty of the people? Are we to accept either party? Or are we, according to a fallacious principle, out of two evils to accept the least? Or shall the people assemble themselves together, and declare that the one grand idea of this hour is universal suffrage—the right of all to a voice in the laws under which they live—the right to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President? Now, I think, every true man, black or white, will refuse to go with either party which denies these rights. The right to the ballot inheres in the individual without regard to color or sex. It is not inalienable to man only, but to woman as well. And if this question is left without settlement you leave a question which brings back all the troubles and corruptions of former years. There must be another party, a National party of New America. It is a young party as yet, but nevertheless, it is going to be a great party. The National party takes the ground that no class of people in the state government, or in the federal government, has a right to sit in judgment upon its neighbors and decide who is to have a voice in the government and who is not. It is not a question to be discussed. Nobody has a right to say another shall not vote. It is a question settled by the very fact that we are human beings. My right to vote is as inalienable as any man's, and the men who call themselves the government, are an usurpation. This American government has been nothing but usurpation from its commencement. While the slaves were dragging their chains, you could see it. But while the women, while seven-twelfths of the population are deprived of their political rights, our government is as much an usurpation as it was five, ten, or fifty years ago. And therefore, I say this is the time for the people to gather themselves in strong force, to form a genuine republic, a pure democracy. (Applause.)

There was a further discussion upon the resolution, in which Dr. J. D. Moore, Aaron M. Powell, Mr. Butler, and others took part, after which the meeting adjourned.

Mr. Powell counselled the colored men not to trust the democratic party, no matter what their platform or who their candidate. He told them, while the republican's were greatly at fault, corrupt and unworthy, it was not wise to form a third party, for it could not be successful—hence, virtually told them to "choose the least of the two evils," meaning Grant and Colfax, as against Chase.

Mr. Butler said he was just from the worst state in the Union—Kentucky—and he wanted to tell them a few things about how matters stood down South. Said he, the colored people distrust the honesty of the republican party. They told us if we would work and vote for them, they would stand by us. But how is it. I stumped for them all through the last campaign, and I know what I say. The colored people are outraged and killed for no crime but helping the republicans—and though Congress pays an immense army, they are not protected—their failure, to say the right word, at Chicago, makes us still more suspicious of them. And I tell you, up here in the North, if the democracy do pledge themselves to *universal suffrage*, and nominate Salmon P. Chase, he'll be elected—the colored men down South will go for Chase solid. Here there were hisses—but Mr. Butler again repeated, that he knew things down South better than they did here—and if the democrats did nominate Chase they'd win.

WOMEN IN OFFICE.—The Massachusetts Legislature couldn't give woman one vote for right of suffrage, but a good many women there are getting appointed to office. Gov. Bullock has just called Rachel Howland of New Bedford, Elizabeth Fisher of Lancaster, and Mary A. Fay of Worcester, to be the Advisory Board to the Trustees of the Industrial School for Girls, at Lancaster.