

who confessed that she had not even believed in woman's right of suffrage at all, until almost up to the hour of the holding of the Convention. And with these stand the best of the politicians of all parties, the press, the people, the colored people even, and of course the pulpit and the church, all impatient for reconstruction on a policy that disfranchises and degrades one-half the nation, and that the most moral, virtuous, and intelligent too, on account of its sex. And under such a policy the nation dares pray, let us have peace!

An eight years war and revolution made the white male citizen free. The Declaration of Independence itself was made to mean no more. Another war, the most disastrous and bloody in history, has added the black male to the proud lists of sovereignty with the white. Is it ever to be in blood that the triumphs of freedom and justice must be secured? Men boastfully tell women, "If you vote, you must fight." Do they not mean rather that if they vote, they must fight first with them for the right to vote? "Cut your way to the ballot-box through us, as we men did through British tyranny, and then your right will no longer be questioned." Is not that what they mean?

All these multitudes rebuke the democracy, and not unjustly, for continuing slavery and seeking to extend it. But their own course in regard to woman is no less cruel, no less criminal. In the present blaze of light and knowledge on human nature, its needs and rights, it is ten thousand times more unjustifiable.

Before the war of the last seven years began, the abolitionists were the light of the land. But in its first blaze and thunder, most of them were blinded and deafened, and threw off the armor which for thirty years had made them invincible; thereby adding dreary years to the length of the war, and mints of money to its cost; with incalculable griefs, woes and rivers of unneeded blood. They blindly thought the American army was commissioned to do their work, and sent their sons even while the government was declaring "the war would not change the status of a single human being," and Col. Benjamin F. Butler, and Gen. McClellan were pledged to the slaveholders to use those sons, if needed, to suppress insurrection that might arise among the slaves.

Now most of those same abolitionists, under the leadership of Garrison, Phillips, Frederick Douglass and others, have proclaimed their faith in the republican party as henceforth the Shiloh of national salvation. General Grant says, "let us have peace," and the people cry peace, peace, from ocean to ocean!

But what kind of peace can be purchased at such a price? Over woman's prostrate form and rights the colored man must march to liberty. "This is the negro's hour." Woman must not urge her equal claim, lest it prejudice the negro's cause; for "this is the negro's hour!" The fable of the goat and the fox was never more pertinent than here.

The peace purchased at such a cost, is indeed no peace. It will be a curse to all womankind, and a greater curse to men who thus buy it. In the old Lutheran conflict there were two schools of Protestants. One claimed that "peaceful error was better than boisterous truth." But the nobler class responded, "peace if possible, but truth, if the heavens fall."

The foremost political reformers, Mr. Garrison and Mr. Phillips among, or at the head of them, hold that the party in power has saved

the country, and is entitled to public respect and gratitude. If colored male suffrage be secured, though paid for in woman's still protracted sorrow, it is a triumph over which we are to be glad and keep this day a thanksgiving to God!

In the Mexican war the whigs justified themselves in fighting its battles on the ground of standing by their country. "Our country, right or wrong," was one sentiment drank at a fourth of July dinner. "Our Union, however bounded," was another. On such morality was Texas stolen from Mexico, by and for the slaveholders, the north aiding and abetting, annexed to the Union, and paid for afterwards in millions of money and multitudes of men. But how many, many times, in those fearful days, did the walls of old Faneuil Hall shudder at the angelic eloquence of Phillips and of Garrison, as they boldly rebuked such doctrines of devils, in the face of their guilty and oppressive nation! Alas, where are their mighty voices in this not less fearful hour?

For even colored male suffrage is not secured by treason to principle, any more than slavery was abolished when the abolitionists postponed their anniversaries, discontinued their newspapers, withdrew their agents from the field and went or sent their sons to fight for a Union with slaveholders, to whom all old guarantees for slavery were assured, and new and more terrible ones promised, would they but lay down their arms and return to their allegiance. Grant's largest majorities are some of them in states that hate negro suffrage at home with inextinguishable hatred. Missouri gave him a large majority, but voted male colored suffrage down by nearly twenty-five thousand. Kansas, Colorado, Wisconsin, Connecticut, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Michigan have since the last election of President Lincoln voted down negro suffrage with a unanimity that would be wondrous in any other country, and, with one or two exceptions, would do the same to-morrow.

Gen. Grant, who was the candidate of one party only to keep him from the other, has most unequivocally signified his personal hostility to the measure. He would accept it were it the will of the people, or, as he wrote Judge Pierpont, would force it on the South, as was emancipation, should it in like manner become a necessity.

But a vast majority of the people, even of republicans, do not desire colored suffrage. The Chicago platform conceded that question to the states. Judge Chase holds it as belonging to the states, though personally in favor of the very largest liberty. And the states, with a few exceptions, behold how few, north as well as west and south, have, by overwhelming majorities, decreed against it to any but the white male citizen!

Here is the national peril. The nation is blind. Its light is darkness. In the midnight light of this nineteenth century it stumbles as it did in the darkest, dreariest night of slavery. "Our country, right or wrong!" "Our Union, however bounded!" "The war will change the status of no human being." "This is the negro's hour." "To press the claim of woman now will prejudice the cause and claim of the colored man." Colored male suffrage, right or wrong! Colored male suffrage forced on the south where the black is ignorant, denied in the north where he is, in intelligence and virtue, too, the peer of the white. "Let us have peace." Can we have it thus? Ought we to have it thus? As righteously could Mr. Lincoln have made

peace with the rebellion by making slavery perpetual, and the Fugitive Slave law "irrevocable" as he himself proposed!

It is not the church and pulpit now as formerly that are the accepted and recognized conservators of the public conscience, the guardians of the national morality. It is those abolitionists who, for more than thirty years, saw, foretold and warned the nation of the impending danger from slavery and its abominations, and who, in the fear of God, the love of justice and of man, endeavored to keep their own conscience void of offence, though at the cost of reputation, right of suffrage, political, social and religious friendships and affiliations, property and life. These now have become compromisers of justice and right as regards the cause of woman, and would add two millions of colored voters to the power that already opposes her. Will this bring peace? "First pure, then peaceable," was long ago established as the order of nature, of God. Be justice done though the heavens fall. Wendell Phillips once said, "God did not send me into the world to abolish slavery, but to work justice and righteousness; in a word, to do my duty." Many remember it well. It was an inspiration of the Holy Ghost. But neither did God send him, or send any of us, to establish colored suffrage, but to do justice and right: to trample down all compromise of principle; all injustice, whether black men or all women be the victims: to demand equal and untrammelled freedom for all men and all women, though to establish it should melt down the skies; should burn up the earth, and dry up all the seas. Unless this be done faithfully, fervently, our danger is even now, infinite. Whoso readeth let him understand.

P. P.

BARBAROUS PUNISHMENTS.

THE WHIPPING-POST AND THE PILLORY.

NEWCASTLE, Del., Nov. 21, 1868.

TO-DAY in the jail yard seven persons, convicted of various petty offences, were tied to the post and whipped. One of these was a man seventy years of age, who received twenty lashes upon his bare back. He cried bitterly during the whole ordeal. Two boys, about twelve years of age, were flogged with twenty lashes each for petty offences. One man was placed in the pillory until he was totally helpless from the cold, and was then whipped with twenty lashes. Each of the criminals, after receiving the barbarous punishment, was returned to prison to remain there six months, after which they will also have to wear convicts' dress in public for another half year.

A noble woman sends us the above, and asks, can anything be done to end such barbarity?

Yes! place the ballot in the hand of woman. Never until the mother soul is represented in our legislation will war, violence, and fiendish punishments like these give place to love, mercy, justice, and peace.

Men talk of reconstruction on the basis of "negro suffrage," while multitudes of facts on all sides like the above show that we need to reconstruct the very foundations of society and teach the nation the sacredness of all human rights. We call on the women of Delaware to draw up a petition at once to their legislature to pass a law forbidding these cruelties, on feeble old men and trembling children. If there is one woman in that state that has a soul to feel, let her make herself heard at the Capitol. It is a disgrace to every man and woman in Delaware that such atrocities are permitted. Where's Senator James A. Bayard? He is generally loud in his denunciations of "Radical rule." What can he say of things like these in a demo-