

# The Revolution.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, } Editors.  
PARKER PILLSBURY, }  
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, Proprietor.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 24, 1868.

## MISS BECKER ON THE DIFFERENCE IN SEX.

JUDGING from the London and Dublin journals, a great furor must have been created in England by a speech of Miss Becker, on the identity of the sexes in mind, delivered at Norwich, before "The British Association for the Advancement of Science." As the speech contains many admirable points, extremely well presented, we publish it, with extensive comments from English papers, on another page.

Some editors hint that although the speech was a good one, it was not legitimately brought before a scientific association; but we think it was a good move on the part of Miss Becker to take this long-debated problem of woman's sphere entirely beyond the control of popes, poets and politicians, of Bibles, belles-lettres and Blackstone, into the realms of pure science, that thus the daughters of Eve may at last come to a clear understanding of their nature and destiny. Man, thus far master of the situation, can form no idea of the astonishment that seizes every woman's soul, when she first awakes to the frauds that have been practiced on her sex from the beginning. And when she comes to the conclusion, as on examination every thinking mind must, that this has been a scheme on the part of selfish men for her subjugation, for which God is in no way responsible, we need not wonder, that with one simultaneous outburst of indignation, woman throws the twaddle of six thousand years to the winds, and boldly rushes to the fixed sciences to find some solid ground on which to base an argument.

The London *Standard* thinks "it is singular that it should have been left for philosophers of the present day to determine the place of woman in Nature." It is not nature or her laws, good sirs, we are discussing, but man's assumptions. Nature made woman the mother of the race, a proper object for love, honor and respect; but she did not fix her political status, nor place her in the Turkish harem, within the limits of a Chinese palace, on the funeral pile of a Hindoo husband; nor with paupers, lunatics, idiots, criminals, minors, negroes and peasants, in the constitutions of England and America. We have grown too wise, gentlemen, to be hoodwinked any longer with the belief that man and nature are co-workers in this matter. As all the world seems to be occupied in discussing the place of citizens under government, why is it more singular to determine the place of woman than of American negroes, English peasants, or Russian serfs? Woman's place on the footstool has always been so puzzling a question to man, that he should be released from any further consideration of the question, for all his efforts, thus far, have been alike unsatisfactory to both woman and himself. Though it was well for Miss Becker to betake herself to the scientists, by way of escaping the children of cant and superstition, yet, the opinion of any society of men, on the true condition of woman, is of no more value, than would that of Southern slaveholders be on

the true condition of the negro. In answer to what we demand, it matters not whether women and men are like or unlike, woman has the same right man has to choose her own place. The fact that man has always had his heel on woman's neck, is no more proof of superiority than the fact that the mass of men have been governed by their animal appetites, proves the superiority of the animal nature to the moral and intellectual. Just as in the subordination of the higher to the grosser nature, man has been robbed of his godlike powers, so in the subordination of woman to man has the whole race through her been degraded. Because woman is the mother of the race, is surely no reason why her sons should close against her the colleges and universities, the trades and professions, all the profitable and honorable posts of life, but the very reason why, "bat in hand," they should reverently stand aside and let the Queen of the moral universe choose her own rightful throne. If marriage and maternity are incompatible with education, with all the higher pleasures of thought, with dignity, independence, self-respect; if to be a wife and mother is to be a mere satellite of the cradle and the dinner pot, a mere upper servant in an establishment, to work without pay, to have no hopes, interests, or aspirations, outside the golden cage or mud cabin in which her lord has placed her, many women might not choose that position. Men uniformly degrade marriage and maternity when they show that it is incompatible with all knowledge of the practical affairs of life, and thus educate ambitious minds to a distrust and aversion to the holiest of all human relations—the relations that all right-minded men and women desire to dignify and exalt.

According to man's idea, as set forth in his creeds and codes, marriage is a condition of slavery, and maternity is heaven's curse for sin. It is a fitting question for a scientific society to consider, whether woman's present condition is in harmony with the laws of nature. It is the most momentous question of the century, for until the true nature and position of woman is understood, all things will be inverted, and discord, disease and misery be the heritage of the human race. We do not blame man for his injustice to woman, more than our baby for upsetting the inkstand on a valuable manuscript, they are alike ignorant of what they have done. So long as woman supposed herself made for no higher purpose than to be the toy or drudge of man, how could man possibly know any better himself? Self-respect is the first step in securing the respect of others. The chief concern of the *Dublin Express*, as well as the *Standard*, and most of the American commentators too, on Miss Becker's speech, seems to be that the advocates of Woman's Rights will ultimately abolish all distinctions of sex, make woman man, that the marriage relation will be annulled, cradles annihilated, and the stockings mended by the state; as if conjugal and maternal love depended on the puny legislation of man; as if taking the word "male" out of the constitutions, and securing to woman her political and civil rights, would change her natural affections. Is a man necessarily a worse husband and father because he has the right of suffrage. Because some politicians are selfish and ambitious, and neglect all their domestic duties, would it be wise to disfranchise all men? Suppose the "powerful influence" woman now exerts on politics should be used to pass a law, that no married man should

own property or hold office. How many men, think you, would enter that "holy relation?"

On what principle does one party in this partnership sacrifice everything, and the other nothing? The London *Times* speaks of Miss Becker's speech as "a carefully prepared and very able paper," and compliments "the sex" in general; but the editor thinks the chief difficulty in way of Miss Becker's demands is, that man, having possession of the universe, which is nine tenths of the law, cannot be made to give it up neither by persuasion, argument, or threats. We do not think so. The *Times* little knows the depths of generosity, chivalry and self-sacrifice that slumber in the soul of man. If we had to create a sense of justice, of tenderness, of respect for woman, we should have little hope, but all the nobler sentiments already exist in man, and all we have to do is to call them out by eloquently pleading our cause before him. The moment man knows that woman is weary of her isolation in the clouds, and that she desires to come down and walk beside him on the earth and share in his knowledge and possessions, there is no doubt he will meet her half-way and gladly welcome her to a place in all the profitable and honorable employments. But the *Times* is especially troubled at the idea of educating the sexes together! One would suppose, Mr. Editor, you had passed your days in Turkey or China, where women are shut up in palaces and harems, never permitted to talk, walk, or dance, with men, nor to see them even, without masks and veils. The danger of the sexes reading Greek together, or meeting at the black-board to solve a geometrical problem, might be startling in those countries, but in America and England, where men and women meet everywhere, at the balls, the operas, and the church, on Broadway and Regent street, in our parks, railroads, steamboats, on the throne, in the halls of legislation, in "The British Association for the Advancement of Science," in political meetings, both as speakers and hearers, it is no great step to open all the schools and colleges in the land to girls. "Pretty girls" in our colleges would not be in half the danger they are in the streets of London and New York at midnight; nor in the House of Commons on five dollars a day, than as they are, penniless waiters on distinguished members at their hotels. Better debate principles, on equal ground, with men in parliament than sacrifice your principles in private for bread. Men never seem to trouble themselves about the purity of women so long as they remain in menial positions, their humble servants. We hear no protest against "pretty girls" being waiters in drinking saloons, or working with men in vineyards, hop fields, factories and mines; but when they ask for a place in the colleges, or a voice in the government, then all England and America is in arms, lest woman's purity should be endangered. If men and women, boys and girls, can live together in all the intimate, unrestrained relations of home life without detriment, they can with equal safety be educated together. If what men tell us is true, that these colleges are "sinks of iniquity," then the safety of our sons requires that their sisters go with them as protectors. The question might be put with great pertinence, if male students are so gross that no young lady can enter the college halls with safety, are such young men fit to enter our homes, to be husbands and fathers, to preach the gospel, to heal the sick, or administer justice in our courts? If our colleges real

are in so deplorable a condition, they need women there to purify them, for the difference of sex has ever a most restraining and elevating influence.

It must have been rather humiliating to London editors to record the fact that after Miss Becker made her speech, no man could get a hearing, and that the whole Association were so interested in the scientific analysis of woman, that it was impossible at that session to press any other subject on their consideration. Well, it is a consolation to know that philosophers are so much interested in women, even if they do think they are inferior to themselves.

Miss Becker laid down three propositions for the consideration of the Association, but as all turn on the first, we will confine our remarks to that alone. She said, 1st. "The attribute of sex does not extend to mind. There is no distinction between the intellects of men and women correspondent to and dependent on the special organization of their bodies."

In Miss Becker's argument on this point she confounds difference with inferiority, and this idea naturally enough suggests itself to all women, because the moment we admit to man a difference he makes it at once in his favor, and concludes that his is the superior sex. We started on Miss Becker's ground twenty years ago, because we thought, from that standpoint, we could draw the strongest arguments for woman's enfranchisement. And there we stood firmly entrenched, until we saw that stronger arguments could be drawn from a difference in sex, in mind as well as body. But while admitting a difference, we claim that that difference gives man no superiority, no rights over woman that she has not over him. We see a perfect analogy everywhere in mind and matter; and finding sex in the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms, it is fair to infer that it is in the world of thought also. To us it is a beautiful idea, that as there is just that physical difference in man and woman necessary to the preservation of the race, so there is just that spiritual difference necessary to the vitalizing of thought. It is a low idea of sex to suppose it merely physical. Those that have known the joys of a true love and friendship, feel that there is sex in soul as well as body. The higher orders of being are drawn together by the sexual attractions of mind and spirit, just as the lower are by those of passion. Yes, there is a marriage of souls as well as bodies, and it is this true union humanity sighs for to-day. If a difference in sex involves superiority, then we claim it for woman; for as she is more complicated in her physical organization, fills more offices than man, she must be more exalted and varied in her mental capacities and endowments. But when men argue this difference, in order to defend themselves for denying woman equality of privileges, they travel outside the record; for if a difference in the physical does not prevent woman from suffering and enjoying the same animal wants that man does, why should a difference in mind prevent her from enjoying all that man does in the world of thought? Although men and women differ in body, yet, they sleep, eat, sicken, die, run, walk, laugh and cry alike, so if they do differ in mind, they may feel joy and sorrow, love and hate, deliver a Greek oration, or solve a mathematical problem alike. And yet, with all, we recognize a marked difference in the sexes. Well organized fathers and mothers love their children, and willingly sacrifice themselves for their good, and yet we see a difference in their love. It is not uncom-

mon for fathers to refuse to speak even, to dissipated sons or daughters that marry without their consent, often turning both out of their homes, penniless on the world; but how seldom a mother's love is thus at fault. The more unfortunate the child, the more depraved, hopeless, forsaken, the nearer she presses him to her heart. A father's love is based on pride, and grows in proportion as his son reflects glory on him; the mother's on pity and protection, and strengthens as the child needs her support and attention. Thus far, the world has been governed by the masculine element, hence war, violence, fear, stern justice without mercy, governments and religions, alike based on force and fraud, on the aristocratic idea, which legislates for the few, establishing jails, prisons and the gallows for the many, which sends a few saints to heaven, and the masses to everlasting hell, which makes one man God's Vicegerent on the earth, and paves the highways of hell with the skulls of new-born infants. If the feminine element had asserted itself from the beginning, these governments of force and religions of damnation, would have been modified long ago, mercy would have tempered justice, and love banished superstition. Hell, capital punishment and war, could never have emanated from the mother soul; for woman knows the cost of life better than man does, and it is ever her impulse to save it. It matters not that one can quote cruel, vindictive, ambitious women, who have been the terror of their day and generation, we simply say: that as slaves and subordinates, the mass of women have been nothing heretofore but reflections of men, we have had but few true women, for by frowns and ridicule men have moulded them to their own idea.

The feminine element has but just begun to assert itself in art, science, literature, religion, and government, and the world already feels the harmonizing influence. Our governments are growing more democratic, religion more hopeful, literature more exalted, science more practical, and art more refined. Men are leaving the chase and all brutalizing amusements, to share with cultivated women the higher pleasures of thought, music and conversation, and in proportion as the sexes assimilate with each other, we shall have higher types of manhood and womanhood, and a brighter day for the race.

E. C. S.

#### REPUBLICAN HONOR AND HONESTY.

GEORGIA, in expelling the colored members from her first legislature under the Reconstruction, has sounded the key note for all the states. And being now restored as a loyal state to the Union, of course the excluded members have no redress at the hands of Congress or any Federal Authority. The Springfield (Mass.) *Republican* tells how it was done in a way most damaging to its party's honor and integrity, as follows:

The original draft of the present constitution of Georgia contained an article making all qualified electors eligible to office. This was struck out on motion of John Harris, now a radical candidate for Congress, by a vote of 126 to 12, the 12 being white men. Afterwards an article was adopted declaring the Georgia code and all laws adopted since January, 1861, in full force, except as to slaves, and by this code negroes are excluded from office. *The negroes in the convention did not know what they were about, of course, but the white men did, and ex-Governor Brown soon after referred to these proceedings of the convention in a public speech, as evidence that the radicals of Georgia did not intend to establish negro supremacy. The white radicals who were in this little game thought*

it a very shrewd thing thus to cheat the negroes and catch conservative votes. So far as they are concerned the result is a righteous retribution. By excluding the negroes, they throw the state back into democratic hands, and go out of power themselves with the negroes they have betrayed.

The negroes did not know neither what the Republican Convention at Chicago was about last spring, but the party did; nor what Congress was about in passing the 14th Article of Constitutional Amendments; but they will learn to their cost in due time.

#### THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE CANDIDATES.

##### THE CANVASS IN ENGLAND.

NO. II.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA is canvassing with great zeal for re-election in Ireland, accompanied by the leading Roman Catholic clergy.

Thomas Parry is once more in the field for the representation of the borough of Boston.

Tamworth borough has again brought forth John Peel, and has pledged to support him. At the hamlets of Fazely and Wilneecote the Liberals have also determined to work for his return.

John Stuart Mill, the leader of the Woman Suffrage party in Parliament, is again before the electors of Westminster.

The *Times* thinks no candidate will disturb C. R. M. Talbot in Glamorganshire. We hope so.

Thomas Barnes, who has represented his borough (Balton) sixteen years, has once more asked for its suffrage.

We are sorry to state that John R. Yorke has retired from the borough of Tewksbury, but hope his successor will stand as firmly on the woman question as his predecessor. Mr. Yorke was complimented with a vote of thanks, on retiring, for past services.

The borough of Reading has honored itself by re-supporting Sir F. H. Goldsmid.

The Hon. Geo. Denman has decided to stand for the borough of Tiverton.

The *News* says, Mr. Thomas Bass, who is before the borough of Derby, will no doubt be returned to the new Parliament by a large majority. We hope the *News* is correct.

Jacob Bright, though not one of the seventy-three who sustained Mr. Mill, is one of the harvest of Woman Suffrage advocates; and, in his address to the electors of Manchester, proclaims, that if elected, he will support this question. How many of our Congressmen, who tell us they believe in Suffrage for women, have the courage to announce it to their constituents, prior to "taking the stump?" Not one.

In the borough of Newark, Grosvenor Hodgkinson is running for re-election.

Among the three candidates in Dunham City we see the name of John Henderson.

SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN IN GREAT BRITAIN.—The registration of voters for the forthcoming Parliamentary elections, which will commence about the 13th of November next, is being prosecuted with great diligence throughout the British Isles. At many places women formally demanded that their names be placed upon the lists of voters, on the ground that they possessed the property qualifications prescribed by the Reform bill; and the legal aspects of the question, as well as the extent of the movement, have excited much public interest on the subject. Over six thousand claimed the right to be registered in Manchester alone, and their demands were urged in an able speech before the registering officials by Miss Lydia Becker. After argument on both sides, the claim was disallowed. Similar proceedings took