

for a mess of pottage. There is nothing in the world so demoralizing as to run counter to the known laws of being. Such a course dwarfs every higher and better faculty; it aims a blow at the foundations of morality itself. "Thus saith the Lord" is written in the very constitution of our being, and to disobey is to degrade our whole nature.

And I charge you, my child, if you have any love of truth, to remember this, that there is just compensation for every broken law, and never can one be transgressed with impunity. Fashion ignores this; hitherto our sex have been yielding, and disliked the notoriety of being peculiar, and so we have bowed to her sway with more than pagan idolatry. Thank Heaven, my child, that you live in an era when individuality is claiming expression and woman feels that her outward life shall henceforth express her inner nature.

First of all you must understand well the outlines of Anatomy and Physiology. The day has passed when the body was despised and called altogether corrupt and vile, and all that is most natural and sweet was to be tortured till extinct. That belief belongs to the dark ages. These wondrous organs by which we perceive the outer world, and by which all sensations play upon the interior, are like the keys of some delicate musical instrument, and like those need tuning in perfect harmony from their lowest to their highest notes. But harmony means health, and that is wholeness or holiness. In perfect health every faculty has a normal use and gratification. Each one is sacred and beautiful in its true place, and in the broad fields of human existence there is room for all to play freely and grandly.

If you understand, my child, that every faculty you possess is God-implanted and presupposes a use for that faculty, you have caught fast an eternal truth. That the Divine flows through the human in all ages and races is a truth just illuminating humanity. The light streams upon fewer still who have learned how fully and sweetly it flows through woman in her true development.

Affectionately,

H. M. H. P.

#### MORE WESTERN CORRESPONDENCE.

EXTRACT OF A PRIVATE LETTER FROM ILLINOIS.

DEAR MISS ANTHONY: When I first advocated "Woman's Suffrage," I did so as a protest against "Negro Suffrage." I now look upon it as nothing more than our own just right, and I am doing all that I can to interest others in the cause. But I find with surprise that those who claim to be reformers, and are loud in their professions of respect and appreciation of women, when I come to ask them for some practical demonstration more than the general gallantries of polite society to substantiate their claims, they become suddenly indifferent, or boldly declare: "O, it is not thus that we desire to see ladies advanced and elevated!" I find in your paper clear and concise answers to every objection men offer to your position, but knowing their own weakness, they cowardly shrink from even their others; and some consider that I unsex myself, and peruse that I am a fanatic on the questions of "The Social Evil" and "Woman's Rights." I am pleased that George Francis Train can galvanize true democrats into espousing our cause. All honor, especially to him, "who never deceived a woman," whose name is without this almost universal reproach! I find our own sex after all our greatest enemies. They attack our claims with more acute ridicule and keener sarcasm than man is capable of. But enough of this. I think very much of "THE REVOLUTION," and am not willing to lose a number, as I intend to have them bound as suggested in the paper itself. I inclose a list of persons to whom please send it. Hoping that the great need of the age may be accomplished—the elevation of our sex—I subscribe myself, with respect,

Your friend,

P. W. BALLET.

#### WHAT AN IRISHMAN THINKS.

NEW YORK, March 4, 1869.

Editors of The Revolution.

I HAVE read all the numbers of your journal so far, and, am happy to state, that I have received a great deal of information from your spirited and very intelligent advocacy of the right of the slaves, everywhere. But you, like a great many other well meaning people, I am afraid, are very apt to make mistakes at the start, which may estrange a large and very powerful element in the United States from the good cause of which you are indeed the eloquent exponents.

The Anti-slavery party, from time to time, were too much given to comparing negroes with Irishmen—"drunken Irishmen"—and the party were astonished at the sensitive Irish, in not working in harmony with those who were and are in the habit of thus offending them. The Irish as a people, are not and never were in favor of slavery, but the advocates of "universal liberty;" in this country were for a long period, and are now to a certain extent; the best friends to England, the deadly enemy to the Irish people at home and abroad, and, in fact, the enemy of the human race.

Irishmen, like most American men, do not like to be associated with negroes; neither do Irishwomen wish it to be supposed, that they are to be found only in your kitchens; although there is oftentimes as much truth and decency in kitchens, as in parlors and bow-windows.

But I am happy to find that your "REVOLUTION" is truly American; not drawing any inspiration from Exeter Hall and the London Times. So much the better for the principles which you so fairly and squarely put forward; the franchise for women; protection for American industry and freedom for all people "irrespective of races and colors. God speed "THE REVOLUTION."

The right to vote is a great blessing to an intelligent and virtuous people, and to them only should the gift be extended. The ignorant, and those who are guilty of crimes against the state and society at large, should be prohibited strictly from electing men or women to any office. Women, certainly, have as good a right to say who are to make and execute the laws as men. Women are in many things equal, if not superior to men, in taste, virtue, wisdom, courage and judgment. I know two women of but average intelligence, who, after each of them had only a short acquaintance with James Stephens, C. O. I. R., pronounced the great Head-Centre a very little man; and yet, Stephens was surrounded for years by men of great minds certainly, who were convinced that the Fenian Chief was a terrible fellow entirely. And the most remarkable feature in the opinions of these two women of Stephens is, that they have never exchanged a word about the man, so far.

Fraternally yours, EUGENE O'SHEA.

#### A REPLY TO GENERAL.

Editors of Revolution:

In your No. 6 Gen. —, through Mrs. Stanton, asks: "What Alfred H. Love would have had us do in the Revolutions of '76 and '61? Would he have let the 'red coats' come in and the 'rebs' go out?"

ANSWER: I would have had you simply be men and women; and if the highest convictions of your nature and your duty, and your best knowledge, after going to school with six thousand years of history behind you, and the example and triumphs of Jesus Christ with you for eighteen hundred years, have taught you no better than surrender your manhood and womanhood, your spirituality and divinity, and accept the lowest plane with the uncertain arbitrament of the sword, you could not have done differently and you must still "reap as you sow."

"Red coats" might have "come in" and slavery have gone out, sooner and more cheaply, for in their country complexion is not the price of liberty. And the women of our land might have had decent respect and Equal Rights, for they could have pointed to Queen Victoria with more hope for the rights of ballot and office.

And had we have let the "rebs go out," we should not have had the fearful drain of blood and treasure to keep them in, and now the impeachments and arrests to keep them out.

And as for what I would have done—I did not live in '76, but did in '61, and though I counsel all the world never to hinge present action upon the grooves of the past, but to live and act in the revelation and inspiration of the moment and do better, still I put on record in '61:

What a sublime spectacle it would be to find a people willing to relinquish their artificial claims to country for the sake of peace, and carrying out the principles of Christ. There has never been a nation willing to relinquish a single inch of territory. Why not part with discordant members for the sake of the Union—which means harmony? Why not be willing to retreat and retire into such a domain as would be harmonious, and where the rights of all God's creatures would be recognized?

As there was free will in the formation of the Union, let it be maintained upon this free will policy, which has been the admiration of the world.

Secession would not then be mooted for light and trivial causes, especially if we were to make the privilege of remaining in the Union a matter of desert. Let the question be—are you good enough, free enough, patriotic enough for the Union, rather than what extent of territory or human authority will be added. Let it be known that neither geographical limits nor governmental powers comprehend and secure the highest prosperity or closest unity, and that coercion is not conversion.

1868 endorses this, and I add thereunto for "THE REVOLUTION" that the old plan has been tried and failed, and I ask to *revolve*. Millions of cannons mark cowards. This radical press and the outspoken truth that "will not serve two masters," mark the braves of the day.

With Jesus as our model and the Christ of our individual natures as our guide, we shall know neither limit to country nor end of affection for mankind; and as for "red coat" or "reb," learn to hate the sin but never the sinner. And then may we find the term "General" defined: "One high in the rank of man—impoverishing, enslaving, wounding and killing."

Inquirer, whoever thou art, resign thy commission. I honor thy noble intentions; but look higher—trust the testimonies of Jesus, "He who loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Suffer rather than cause suffering. Die rather than kill. Hopefully and fraternally,

ALFRED H. LOVE.

Philadelphia, 2d month 22, 1868.

DR. C. B. BOYNTON,

AND THE FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22, 1869.

Editors of The Revolution:

I WAS astonished to find in the last number of your spicy and fearless "REVOLUTION," a statement representing "Dr. Boynton, the radical Chaplain of Congress," as hostile to the admission of colored people to his church—that he preached a sermon to sustain his views, and that Gen. Hancock (it should be Howard), who had raised \$100,000 from Northern Congregationalists for the erection of the church edifice, had led a respectable minority protesting against the doctrine and action of the pastor.

Now, as a member of that church and society, and President of the Board of Trustees, I desire to inform you that these statements are in every material point untrue and calculated to injure the character and position of the church and pastor, all of whom are thoroughly anti-slavery and anti-caste, and would, under no circumstances, join or minister to a religious body which would exclude from the communion and fellowship any person on account of race or color.

It may be proper, however, to state that Dr. Boynton.