

Constitutional Liberty & the Preservation of the  
An Address, Delivered by Mrs. Elizabeth  
Scott Dunning of Oregon before the Honorable  
Members of the Illinois State <sup>in Representatives' Hall,</sup> Legislature, Jan.  
19<sup>th</sup> 1877., Secretary Harlow in the Chair.

Mr. President, Members of the Legislature, Ladies  
and Gentlemen.

In standing before you at this time, after so  
long an absence from my dear native State  
that I find the young people of my time grown  
old, the children arrived at years of maturity  
and care, and the aged, who were ~~were~~ a quarter  
of a century ago, to greet me, gone from your gaze  
and mine, I realize fully the mutations of human  
life.

In the years long gone, while I was yet a little  
child, there arose within the borders of this Prairie  
State men of honor and renown, whose names  
have become interwoven with the Nation's life,  
whose wondrous works and words took deep root in  
my heart, and inspired me, while yet I knew it not  
with the broad, undying principles of Constitutional  
Liberty.

There are those before me who have listened,  
many a time and oft <sup>to</sup> inspired utterances of a  
Ferguson, a McDougall, a Douglas, a Baker, a  
Lincoln. And now, as I stand with my head  
reverently bowed in presence of the mystic  
and yet tangible memory of the mighty dead,



until now.

3

It is needless to here reiterate what every school boy and school girl has ~~learned in school~~ <sup>learned in school</sup> concerning the independence of these States. I cannot call the government a Democracy, or even a Republic, for that would be a misnomer.

Your government, gentlemen, is an aristocracy — an aristocracy of sex. From the justice of the Peace to the Supreme judge, from the Mayor to the President the government is masculine, and it is <sup>against</sup> the injustice of this <sup>and the consequent wrong it imposes,</sup> ~~system~~, that I, as a mother of men, come before you most respectfully and earnestly to plead.

If it be asked why, if the political rights of women are to be considered now, they were not so considered when this aristocracy of sex was formed, I have only to answer that the time was not yet. There was a time when your government did not exist, <sup>gentlemen.</sup> There was a time for severing the ties between the ~~British~~ colonies and the mother country; there came a time <sup>your</sup> for the formation of a government <sup>which</sup> had not existed hitherto. Everything in its order is the law of the universe, and that the higher laws of progression come latest is an accepted, self-evident truth. As it has ever been man's province to go before; to fell the forests, hew the timbers, build the bridges, erect the habitations, tunnel the mountains and till the soil.

while ~~the~~ woman <sup>4</sup> ~~is~~ destined in her sphere of help-meat <sup>power</sup> to embellish <sup>the</sup> and purify <sup>the</sup> with her presence and intellect; so it has <sup>ever</sup> been man's province to go before and erect the citadels of government, ~~which~~ the joint possession of which belongs of right to both sexes, for "it is not good for man to be alone".

The history of all stable governments that have existed hitherto, ~~or~~ that now survive, is a history ~~proclaiming~~ woman's eligibility to the highest privileges that such governments have afforded. I might cite you Elizabeth of England, Catherine, of Russia, Isabella of Spain, and Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Empress of India, in proof that the central ideas of the best known forms of monarchical or imperial government are not based upon an Aristocracy of Sex, but of circumstances.

But I will not linger among historic facts pertaining to European or Asiatic dynasties; rather, let me hasten to a consideration of the subject before us, as it relates directly to the conditions of this government, which is even now trembling upon the very verge of a Revolution, the like of which <sup>it</sup> hath not entered the head of man to conceive.

The central idea of ~~the government of~~ our forefathers was that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed".

I hold in my hand <sup>3<sup>d</sup></sup> the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of these States; the former the most sacred ~~instrument~~, <sup>Divine and human</sup> evidence of Inspiration since the days of the Sermon on the Mount; the latter an odd admixture of old-time usages and inspirations of Liberty, which, notwithstanding its vaunted perfection, men of later and wiser era have had cause to improve with fifteen wise Amendments.

When this Constitution was formed, the inspiration that always springs from the presence of a mighty danger was fast, and in its place had come the <sup>abandon</sup> selfishness of conflicting interests, which always assert themselves in times of comparative security. Men were no longer fighting for their lives, and as so on <sup>the</sup> principles of Universal Liberty were partly sacrificed to the exigencies of expediency; <sup>and selfishness</sup> I do not say the work was not as well done as, under the circumstances, men could have done it; but, to suppose that it was finished for all time, with no room for or need of improvement, no opportunity for its further adaptation to the growth of human intellect, and the consequent increase of human necessity, is manifestly absurd.

It may seem to you irreverent in me to undertake to so paraphrase the

Declaration of Independence, as I make you clearly understand its spirit, since in and of itself, I claim that it is as perfect, in a political sense as the most devout evangelist has ever claimed the Sacred Word to be in a religious sense; yet the practice, that man has reared as a superstructure <sup>Constitutional</sup> ~~of~~ of Liberty, upon the eternal theory of the Declaration, is so widely at variance with the theory itself that I ~~reside~~ <sup>accept</sup> for the time, <sup>the charge of</sup> what you may deem reverence, to consider the different clauses of this document that ought to apply in practice as well as in theory to one half of the citizens as well the other half.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

I do not deem it necessary to remind this audience by informing you that the generic term men includes women. You are all ready to admit this fact when a woman breaks one of the laws you deny her a voice in making!

"That among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights - mark you, to secure, not to confer them, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

7  
"Prudence, indeed will dictate that govern-  
ments long established, should not be  
changed for light and transient causes;  
and accordingly, all experience <sup>has</sup> ~~has~~ <sup>disposed</sup>  
shown that mankind are more ~~likely~~  
to suffer, while evils are sufferable,  
than to right themselves by abolishing  
the forms to which they have been ac-  
customed. <sup>x</sup> <sup>x</sup> <sup>x</sup>

"Such has been the patient suffering  
of [the women of] these States, and such  
is now the necessity which constrains  
them to [appeal to you] to alter the  
present system of government.

"The history of the present [Aristocracy  
of sex] is a history of repeated usurpation  
all having, in direct object the establish-  
ment of an absolute tyranny over [one  
half of the people] of these States.

"To prove this let facts be submitted  
to a candid world;

"[This Aristocracy of sex] has refused  
its assent to laws the most wholesome  
and necessary for the public good."

Let us, for a moment, consider some of  
these: [It has denied individuality & wife-  
hood, proclaimed "The husband and wife  
one, and that one the husband"; has  
robbed woman of her earnings, during

convention, so-called, and has denied to  
mothers the inalienable right to the  
custody and ownership of their own  
minor children, ~~and~~ unless illegitimate,  
thereby placing a premium upon crime,  
and <sup>and</sup> ~~passing~~ marriage at its foundation:

It has succeeded in passing, as at St Louis,  
and <sup>has</sup> attempted to pass, as in Boston and  
San Francisco, acts for the punishment  
of a nameless crime, and ~~vested~~ <sup>implied</sup> the  
full share of penalty <sup>upon</sup> the dependent  
and weaker party to the crime, leaving the more  
powerful, <sup>and guilty</sup> offender to go scot free.

It has passed laws, and continues,  
against our protest, to sustain them,  
that debar one half of the people, and  
the more moral and conservative  
half, from all opportunity to compete  
<sup>with</sup> ~~against~~ <sup>liberty</sup> for places of emolument  
and trust.

It robs the widow of two thirds of  
the estate at the time of the husband's  
death, and allows the husband, if  
he be the survivor, the untrammelled  
control of the joint earnings of the  
marriage copartnership.

This "Aristocracy" has refused to  
pass laws for the accommodation  
of large districts of people, unless

They would relinquish the right of representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants, only.

Once, in a tenement, not far from my home in Portland, a man who had come to the house brutally intoxicated, kicked his weak and unresisting wife till he rendered her speechless and insensible.

This aristocracy of sex, which I am here by your courtesy to arraign, had made and sanctioned the laws by which this man ~~was~~ was protected in his right (!) to become drunk, and had also made a law to punish <sup>by fine</sup> men for committing deeds of violence while drunk.

As soon as the wife was sufficiently recovered to be able to speak coherently she besought the officers of this aristocracy not to take her husband away for trial, as she was not able to pay his fine! They were "deaf to the voice of ~~affinity~~ <sup>justice</sup> and consanguinity".

They took the man to prison, kept him over night and fined him fifty dollars, with costs, <sup>the next morning</sup> after which, he was turned loose upon the streets, to be subjected again to the same temptations; and

to pay his fine! the poor washerwoman, his wife, and the mother of an infant babe, was robbed of her last earthly dollar!

<sup>taxed and</sup> The unrepresented class for whom I plead brought the aristocracy of sex to pass laws for the accommodation of such oppressed specimens of the subject-gated sex, but were refused a hearing before the Legislature, in an official capacity, unless they ~~would~~ relinquish all prospect of representation in such Legislature, "a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants, only".

This aristocracy has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing to admit [the subject-gated class] to judicial privileges; and has further subverted the principles of a free government by holding this same class amenable to laws in which they are denied all ~~voice in making representation.~~

In your own State resides a woman Mrs. Myra Bradwell, wife of Judge Bradwell, who is editor and proprietor of the Chicago Legal News, a journal which many of the foremost lawyers of that metropolitan and cosmopolitan city have assured

one, is as good an authority in legal decision as is Kent, or Blackstone, and yet this lady is denied the opportunity to reap the reward for her labors that her attainments merit, only because, not being a member of the aristocracy of sex, she is refused admission to practice what she so ably teaches, ~~and~~ before the Supreme Court of this State <sup>and of the United States</sup> of masculine sovereignty.

Leavina Goodell of <sup>Wisconsin</sup> ~~Illinois~~, Phoebe Cogges of Missouri and Selva Lockwood of the District of Columbia are other well known examples of this grievance and the list might be multiplied indefinitely.

This aristocracy has made us dependent on its will alone for the tenure of such offices as ~~it~~ it has seen fit to grant us, and the amount and payment of our salaries.

Need I cite you to the one or two lady clerks in your own Legislature for example, gentlemen?

This aristocracy has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent forth swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out our substance.

Shortly after the termination

of the war, and <sup>12</sup> while the United States  
Internal Revenue Law was in its  
fullest force, I was engaged ~~for~~  
~~ten~~ ~~years~~ in a millinery and  
manufacturing business, <sup>in Oregon,</sup> for the  
support of my invalid husband and  
six small children. The "swarms  
of new officers that harassed me, and  
ate out my substance" in the guise  
of "income tax" which was principally  
used to support <sup>extraneous</sup> "collectors" in ~~the~~  
idleness, will not be soon forgotten.

"How imposing taxes upon us without  
our consent."

Have we, I mean the unrepresented  
taxpayers for whom I plead, have  
we not read of Boston Harbor, and can  
we forget Bunker Hill? Have we not  
learned, in the public schools, from  
Fourth of July orations, and from the  
sentiments of liberty that are everywhere  
down broadcast by the press and  
people, that taxation without  
representation is tyranny? Can  
any sovereign who is present inform  
me of the <sup>fundamental</sup> difference between the Brit-  
ish Government's <sup>notorious</sup> "tax on tea" and  
the municipal government of Glas-  
-tounbury's ~~equally~~ <sup>notorious</sup> tax  
on cows?

If it be argued that women who are non-producers cannot pay taxes, I will answer that every <sup>woman</sup> ~~body~~ who works to rear men is a heavy tax payer, and is not a "non-producer" by any means. Every man who sits before me is within and of himself a living, breathing, animate monument of the taxation of woman. As soon as her taxation has reared him to sufficient age to enable him to give his voice and vote to deny her representation he straightway uses this self-constituted authority to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over her, yet he can give no better reason for thus denying her representation than that the Kings of Great Britain could give for his endeavor to govern our forefathers without their consent.

If it be urged here, as is often urged elsewhere, that woman does not herself desire the removal of her political disabilities, I have only to say that the assertion is not sustained by facts.

Women, everywhere, are seeking opportunity to make their appeals upon this question heard. They made strenuous efforts to be <sup>officially</sup> heard upon the Centennial Fourth of

July; and, failing <sup>14</sup> to get <sup>the courtesy of</sup> an official hearing,  
the representative women, <sup>who live under</sup> of this Aristocratic  
government, who far exceeded in numbers the  
leaders of who framed this Declaration of In-  
dependence; these Spartan women who have  
endured more opprobrium, contumely and  
persecution for Liberty's sake than ever Wash-  
ington dreamed of, placed a Centininal Post  
against Taxation without Representation in  
the hands of Vice President Gerry, who  
received it <sup>in</sup> unbarbarous silence!

Because the <sup>microphone</sup> press is mainly silent or sarcastic  
in its treatment of woman-patriots, you are  
not to ~~not~~ suppose such patriots are not  
numerous. They cannot all be leaders, <sup>and</sup>  
neither can all men be such. There never  
was a progressive movement set on foot <sup>before</sup>  
in any age, which, while yet on a weak-  
-kneed, or unaccepted power, arrived at  
half the general popularity and interest that  
this has reached.

The argument of Tories during the Revolution  
was that the majority did not desire freedom <sup>freedom</sup>  
Tina has proved the fallacy of that <sup>argument</sup> ~~logic~~,  
and has failed to prove that experience is  
<sup>always</sup> a successful teacher.

There is an organized, working force of  
Woman Suffragists in the United States  
numbering tens of thousands, which

is represented <sup>15</sup> through its officers in every State and Territory in the Union.

These women, who are lawyers, (as far as men will let them become such) physicians, (because men cannot longer hinder them) artisans, teachers, professors, farmers, ministers, wives, mothers, editors, authors, poets, painters, sculptors, bee-keepers, manufacturers, hotel-keepers, and all of them tax payers, go up yearly to Washington to hold Conventions; and to the different State Legislatures, at the behest of their constituents, who (through their pecuniary and political subjugation) are unable, to contribute funds to defray their traveling expenses, and there they legislate, as best they can in unofficial because unrecognized ways, for the promotion of Constitutional Liberty.

At ~~these~~ Conventions reports are presented from every State and Territory in the Union, urging our claims; and yet men, clothed, by accident of their sex, in a little brief authority, who have never given the subject a thought, or thinking, have denied themselves needed information, say to us "Woman does not want the ballot." When she asks for it she shall have it.

Abigail Adams, for whom I was named, wife of our President, and

16

upon Congress

mother of another, made a demand for the ballot for woman at the very beginning of the Nation's history. For a time the demand was allowed to slumber and gather needed strength; then again it was revived, and now it is in such vigorous action that there is not a village or hamlet in all the Union where ~~the~~ the plea for its acceptance is not heard.

What means the National Convention of Woman Suffragists assembled this week in Washington if women do not want the ballot? Your humble speaker was to have been there, but it was decided by her superior officers that she should skirmish along the lines with her light brigade, and let the Legislatures of Illinois and Nebraska know what the unrepresented half of the taxpayers in these States ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> demanding.

The public press pays little heed to this movement since it has survived the age of ridicule, and is no longer a target for reporters, just out of pinafore to try their unpledged journalistic squib upon. But it moves, nevertheless, and will continue to move till its aim is accomplished.

After twenty years of my life had been spent in the service of a large family

17  
of sons and daughters, I found them so nearly grown to maturity that I could take the missionary field, ~~which I did~~ and for five years I have been a great deal before the public.

After I, at the behest of tens of thousands of women, have industriously plodded my way through this vast country for a term of years, working my own way, (for the women have no money) and bearing in my hands the petitions of many thousands ~~who~~ of aspirants to the ballot who have begged me not to let their husbands know their names were down, you may judge of the sublime contempt I feel when I hear gentlemen say, "If women wanted the ballot they might have it. My wife doesn't want it!" As though your humble servant, and the thousands of other petitioners were not women, with quite as much right to ~~the~~ <sup>your</sup> fullest ~~conception~~ <sup>have to</sup> of liberty as your wife may ~~have~~. The old slave would never say to his master "I want my liberty." His subjugation had made him quite too wily a fox for that. But he took his liberty, and enfranchisement with it, as <sup>you</sup> would let him have it; and your wife will do

likewise yet, <sup>18</sup> my friend.

True, there are women who <sup>do</sup> not ask for the ballot; who are not wise enough to know they want it, because they cannot see the <sup>personal</sup> advantages it will bring <sup>themselves</sup>. There are men - and a majority at that - who, if they had never had the ballot would not yet know they wanted it. The majority never leads in anything progressive, because advanced minds are in the minority, always. But, gentlemen, because there are men thus ignorant, in spite of their advantages, would you be willing to allow them to crush out the exercise of your inalienable prerogatives, which your broader intelligence has enabled you to grasp and comprehend?

No man has the ballot forced upon him. No woman should have it forced away from her. We are not asking you to compel any woman to vote. We only ask that you take the iron heel of their ignorance from the necks of us who <sup>desire to vote</sup> ~~do not~~.

We would not abridge their rights or immunities in any degree, and will protect against <sup>your</sup> allowing them to deprive us, through your connivance, of

19 our conscientious appreciation of  
of the fullest exercise of Constitutional  
Liberty.

Let such women as want the ballot  
have the same opportunity to possess it  
that men claim for themselves, laying  
no more restrictions upon one class than  
another, and you will establish a gov-  
ernment that shall be of the people  
and by the people, which shall contain  
within itself the elements of perpetuity  
and purification which no over-seen  
government is capable of possessing.

Women wield a mighty influence in  
the government today; but it is an  
irresponsible influence; the influence  
of bad women and outlaws. They work  
behind masked batteries. Men cannot  
hold them in check because these women  
fascinate them. Every woman lobbyist  
and schemer in Washington is opposed  
to Woman's Enfranchisement. They  
know full well that if women were  
voters, they would be compelled to  
step from behind <sup>the</sup> masked batteries  
where men shield them from discovery  
or punishment through their <sup>present</sup> political  
responsibility.

"Not depriving us of the benefits of  
a trial by jury."

To be deprived of the right of a trial

by a jury of one's <sup>20</sup> peers is considered by men an absolute tyranny, second to no other usurpation, except it be "Taxation without Representation, and Government without Consent." But, in <sup>all</sup> this land, the women are denied this right, "a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only".

I know a lady who was called as a witness in one of those unfortunate cases wherein a mother was before a <sup>of men,</sup> tribunal accused of the crime of murdering an embryotic child. The husband and father, despite the aristocracy of his sex, was dissolved and improvident; the mother had already four <sup>little</sup> sons, whom she was taxed - yes, taxed beyond her strength to provide for, and with starvation staring her in the face, in her very desperation she committed a crime. Women ought to have been judge and jurors in a case like that, but the aristocracy of sex permits no such innovation upon its <sup>pecuniary</sup> ~~pecuniary~~ <sup>and otherwise peculiar</sup> privileges; and twelve stolid men, who had not read the newspapers, and were therefore considered sufficiently ignorant to be competent to judge the case upon its merits, were placed

in the <sup>jury</sup> box, and the trial began. My friend informed that the sickening details of that awful story were all made public, <sup>in her presence</sup> in a court room, crowded with men and boys. She said "I never knew before the awful tyranny of a refusal <sup>to</sup> allow a trial by a jury of one's peers." Petition for equality for woman before the law renewed then and there another signature and another man's wife wants a vote.

While I would not excuse or palliate the terrible crime of infanticide, of which no mother who understands the philosophy of human life can be guilty, if sane, I appeal to the fathers and mothers present to say if it be not a mockery of justice to allow trials for such offences to be conducted by men?

We hear of great deal about the modesty of women. What say you to the modesty of men who arrogate to themselves the monopoly of perogatives like these?

Woman cannot justly represent man because she is unable to interpret his ideas of justice from his standpoint. Man cannot represent woman for a like reason, and I am only surprised that any man should be

- 22

of the babbling and forge ~~the~~ political  
chains, if <sup>of all mothers</sup> they will, and such sons of such  
mothers are always ready to be petty  
tyrants. (3 pages missing here) X X X

Do men gather grapes of thorns, or  
figs of thistles? Can women make  
bricks without straw? Can they endow  
their sons with <sup>the spirit of</sup> Liberty when they them-  
selves possess it not?

The men of the Revolution were born  
of mothers whose mothers before them  
<sup>had</sup> imbued them with the spirit of  
Liberty, even when in embryo.

These men inhaled the inspiration  
of freedom as they gathered life from  
their mothers' heart beats, and they  
exhaled it in their manhood with  
a mighty utterance that yet speaks to  
thought their voices are still to us  
in death.

Had <sup>they</sup> left us our heritage, instead  
of a Democratic Republic, an Chris-  
-tocracy of sex, was not the fault of  
themselves or their mothers, but of  
the times. They began the structure <sup>of Liberty</sup>  
and left us to carry it to completion.

Now have we been wanting in at-  
-tention to [this Chris-tocracy of  
sex.] ~~We have warned it from~~

grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

When the parents eat some grapes need you marvel that the children's teeth are set on edge? X X (2 pages lost)

Now let us examine for a little while the Constitution of these States. Although, as I said in the beginning, it is a document born of old usage, ~~with~~ imbued here and there with inspirations of Liberty, it is remarkably, chiefly, for its adaptation to the needs of the hour of its birth.

Its amendments, one by one, have kept pace with the exigencies of ~~the times~~ <sup>progress</sup>, until now, like the Declaration of Independence, its spirit and letter are all we ask. We only protest that you do not obey it.

Chief Justice Waite has rendered a very learned decision within a few years, in which he declares, in effect, that women were not thought of when these amendments were framed and ratified hence they have no political rights under them, which men are bound to respect.

How history is always repeating itself! The majority of you can remember the decision of Chief

Justice Taney <sup>28. 24</sup> in a very similar case  
I allude to the Dred Scott decision.  
You also remember how the opponents  
of freedom for the colored man went  
up and down in this country proclaim-  
ing the vexed question settled! "The negro  
was not a citizen for the Chief Justice  
had so decreed! its though the ipse  
- dixit of any judge, or set of judges,  
were ever able to stop the car of  
Constitutional Liberty!"

Today, in spite of Justice Taney's fiat,  
which really amounted to as much as  
did the Pope's bull against the comet,  
the negro is free and enfranchised  
and unrepresented women are taxed  
by him, as well as the white man,  
to support him in a government  
where all emoluments are denied  
themselves!

In former days the negroes were rated  
with women, insane persons and idiots.  
Now, they are lifted beside the white  
man upon the pedestal of an Chris-  
-toctory of sex and women head the  
catalogue <sup>of the disfranchised</sup> in company of insane persons,  
criminals, idiots and "Indians  
not taxed". On the Pacific Coast  
we yet have the Chinaman for  
company.

Gentlemen, allow me now to ask you a direct question:

Are you not ashamed when you reflect that every ignorant mortal, no matter what his race, habits, color or previous condition of servitude, can have a voice in making the laws and taxing the women to support those laws, the only qualification required to make them voters being that their ~~sex~~<sup>gender</sup> be masculine?

Are you not ashamed to compel your wives and daughters, even with their own consent, to submit to be ruled by their former servants, whom you have placed in authority over them?

Women, are you pleased with your political status? Have you all the rights you want?

Now, gentlemen, I <sup>further</sup> declare that women are held in subjugation under your government in <sup>direct</sup> violation of ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Constitution <sup>as of the Declaration of Independence</sup> ~~and Liberty~~.

Article Fourteen, Section one of the Constitution says, "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the immunities or privileges of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive

24

Time to time of the attempts made by its Legislatures to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have appealed to its native justice and magnanimity and have conjured it by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence, and it has been deaf to the voice of justice and conciliation."

Men and Brethren, can you expect your government to be perpetuated in the name of Liberty when a long train of such usurpations as I have enumerated can only tend to ~~blow~~ <sup>even</sup> blind the sense of justice in many in his life's very inception?

Do you wonder that the evil effects of a heritage of maternal subjugation so stultified the nicest sense of honor in the sons of women that the wrong thus sown in seclusion culminates at last in high and public places in Credit Mobilier swindles, and Ford Hill Contracts and Pacific Mail Subsidies and Back Salary Grabs?

Again I ask, oh men gather

any person of life, liberty or property  
without due process of law; nor deny  
to any person within its jurisdiction  
the equal protection of the laws.

Does the woman in Chicago, who was  
fined the other day because her hus-  
-band whipped her, enjoy the equal  
protection of the laws?

Are not the privileges and immunities  
of Myra Bradwell, editor of the Legal  
News, abridged by the State of Illinois?

Article Fifteen of Amendments to  
the Constitution says, "The right of  
citizens of the United States to vote  
shall not be denied or abridged  
by <sup>the United States, or by</sup> any State on account of race,  
color or previous condition of servitude."

Clearly women belong to some race, wi-  
-thout they are not without color, and  
the array of men before me, whom they  
have reared, is indisputable evidence  
of "previous condition of servitude."

Gentlemen, these be troublous times.  
This government may be likened  
unto a mighty ship, with one wheel  
chained and idle. We look out  
upon the troubled waters <sup>of Freedom</sup> and see  
~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~ship~~ revolving the old ship  
with one wheel revolving restlessly.

with ~~chad~~ ~~(2)~~ ~~2~~ ~~2~~  
We note the gloomy clouds that threaten,  
and listen anxiously while the breakers  
roar. See: The ship is floundering, Round  
and round ~~she~~ goes in the whirlpool  
of politics! Behold! ~~she~~ is drifting upon  
the rocks— drifting upon the rocks!  
Men are plunging in the waters, trying  
in vain to control the drifting vessel!

Stranger— very strange that they do  
not see that shackled wheel! Stranger,  
if they do not know that a ship thus  
manacled cannot sail straight on!

Men and brethren, I call upon  
you to put forth your power <sup>to</sup>  
sever the chains that fetter that <sup>shackled</sup> wheel!

Give the old Ship of State the free  
untrammelled play of all her powers,  
and you will soon see that she will  
obey her helm right royally. Then,  
with sails full-rigged and the old flag  
proudly floating, she will triumphantly  
brave the waves of Revolution as she  
bears her human freight away from  
the breakers of corruption, and into  
the broad Gulf Stream of Constitutional  
Liberty.

The other day, when I was in Philadel-  
phia, I paused, in Independence Hall,  
before a table upon which were

"inscribed ~~in the~~ <sup>the immortal</sup> letters of ~~these~~ <sup>these</sup> words: 'Any government is just to the people under it when the laws rule, and the people are a part to those laws, and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, and confusion.'"  
I paged out from the sacred presence of the immortal sentiment, and wandering away, came too soon to the old ~~at~~ <sup>at</sup> abode of ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> inspired author <sup>a little building</sup> which is now an ~~inn~~ <sup>inn</sup> and grogery of the lower order.

As I stood upon the opposite side of the dirty alley, a woman, haggard, and hard featured, and as much a slave as ever was a Georgia Plantation negress, came out upon the flag stones, carrying a heavy tub of villainous slops which she emptied with a sickening splash into the stinky gutter <sup>while</sup> ~~beside~~ <sup>beside</sup> a man ~~who~~ <sup>who</sup> sat smoking at her feet, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> whom I knew to be her husband because he threatened her with imprecations which no man would dare to offer any woman who was not his wife.

If it be urged that I speak of exceptional cases I grant it. I thank God ~~these~~ <sup>such</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> exceptional cases, else there would be no reasonable hearts to whom we might appeal.

Murders are exceptional cases, but would you, because of that,

make <sup>general</sup> ~~not~~ law to ~~protect~~ <sup>protect</sup> the women  
of the commonwealth from murder  
ers;

We do not ask you, gentlemen, to give  
us more than our own. We only ask  
that to every woman in the land who  
may desire the right, you forthwith  
grant ~~to her~~ "the equal protection  
of the laws", under the Constitution.

I left the old home of William  
Penn, with its idle owner and strug-  
-gling bondswoman, and went sorrow-  
-fully back to Washington square, and  
lo! and behold! a mob of eager thous-  
-ands had gathered around the bulletin  
boards; and they were wondering who  
had been elected President! Every-  
-where there were mutterings and  
<sup>growings, and</sup> ominous forebodings of an approach-  
-ing war!

Again the immortal words of  
William Penn were whispered in  
my ear, and I saw as never before  
that the government of these States  
is not "free for to the people under  
it", for one half of them are not  
"a part of the laws that rule";  
<sup>the clouds of</sup>  
and <sup>tyranny</sup>, oligarchy and con-  
-fusion grow blacker and more  
-tentious every hour x ~~partitions~~

34 (70) ~~70~~  
Passing the motley ~~crowd~~ <sup>crowd</sup> of men and boys,  
I went again to Independence Hall, as though  
attracted by some strange, alluring spell.

Passing among a company of tourists from  
all parts of the world, who were gathered to  
view the glories of this so-called Republic in  
its hundredth year, I stood reverently before  
the old Independence Bell, and gazed in  
<sup>awe and</sup> speechless admiration upon the ~~small~~ <sup>tell-tell</sup> wondrous  
at its side.

Need I here reiterate the history of that  
grand old Bell? Need I tell you that once,  
on a never-to-be-forgotten occasion, when  
the ringer had climbed to the antique belly  
of the old State House to ring in the era  
of freedom for men, leaving woman bound,  
the old Bell, which yet felt ~~Liberty's~~ <sup>Slavery's</sup> manacles,  
broke its heart, rather than toll a lie!

Thrice hail! old Independence Bell! Some  
day, in the years yet to come, when Liberty  
to the People, rather than to an aristocracy  
of sex shall prevail, thou shalt be re-  
-emancipated, and then, clad in a panoply of  
the purest metal, shall thy round old  
heart ring out a glad acclaim of rejoicing,  
and thy long-stilled tongue shall swell the  
grand Te Deum Laudamus that will only  
be expelled among the Nations in ~~years~~

ye new centuries, when Liberty, clothed  
in whiterd raiment, shall perch unchained  
upon the banners of justice, while loud  
hoannals shall re-echo through terrestri-  
-al air the <sup>grand</sup> Gloria in Excelsis which shall  
tell that not only the United of America,  
but all the World is free!

Columbia, pride of Nations, hail!  
Backward throw thy shimmering veil,  
Revealing Beauty's magic darts,  
And Intellectuals abounding arts,  
From eyes all bright, and brow serene.  
Let man behold the glittering sphere  
Of Freedom's light. O'er all the ~~to~~ <sup>earth</sup>,  
In lands where Liberty hath birth,  
In climes where tyrants wield the rod,  
Falsely proclaiming power from God;  
In every ~~to~~ struggling human soul  
That spurns a monarch's mean control,  
O'er every ~~to~~ human home  
Where Thought can stray, or Fancy roam,  
Stand thou the starry banner high,  
Emblem of human Liberty  
And Freedom's glorious destiny.

Thy magic wand, resplendent, bright,  
That floats o'er Bunker Hill tonight,  
And flutters in the balmy breeze,

From Torrid zone to Arctic Seas,  
And shakes its white and scarlet folds,  
And field of blue over wastes and wolds,  
And plants its pure and milk-white stars  
Above its wind-tossed, streaming bars,  
Plant thou on every hoary peak

That looms above hamlets where <sup>(may seek)</sup> ~~man~~  
of habitation, Let thy name,  
Writ high on monuments of Fame,  
In diamond-light emblazoned be,  
And every child of Liberty  
Shall shroud thy glorious destiny.

[The speaker was introduced at the beginning  
by Col. S. H. Karlow, Secretary of State, in  
a neat and appropriate eulogy, and, at the  
close of her address, Senator Robinson  
of Sycemell, an old neighbor and schoolmate  
of Mrs. Durrway's, ~~made~~ who was on the plat-  
form, made a stirring response, fully  
indorsing the lady and her logic.]

The audience was one of the most appre-  
ciative assemblies ever gathered together  
in Springfield, and the lady speaker, who  
leaves, <sup>her native State</sup> in a few days for her Oregon home,  
carries with her the best wishes of her  
numerous friends.]