

that Mr. Julian had made another move. Imagine, then, my astonishment to find that all the men in the country did not know that the next amendment in order was the enfranchisement of woman!

It seems a body of christian gentlemen have met at Pittsburg, demanding an amendment of the preamble to the constitution to read thus:

We, the people of the United States (acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, and His revealed will as of Supreme authority, in order to constitute a Christian government"), etc.

Now, if we are going to amend the preamble, let us begin with the first line, and decide who are included in "We the people." The best possible recognition christians can make of Jesus is to do justice to his disciples. The amendments of the constitution that emancipated and enfranchised the African race were far higher testimonials to our faith in God, than the above verbiage could have been without them. Another stronger proof of like faith would be a sixteenth amendment that should secure the right of suffrage to every citizen of the United States without distinction of sex.

Let no man, or body of men, presume to move anything else but this for a sixteenth amendment. They have passed fifteen amendments without woman's consent or consideration. Now we want a word to say in the next one. To these christian gentlemen we would say, first, do justice to your wives and mothers, and then follow Christ; "if you love not woman whom you have seen, how can you love God whom you have not seen?"

On the object of this Pittsburg convention the *Post* comments in this wise:

The question which the proposition immediately suggests is, What is the object of the movement? "To constitute a Christian government," replies the preamble. But this is vague, and provokes two other questions. 1. Have we a right to constitute such a "Christian government?" as will virtually exclude Hebrews and Rationalists from office? 2. Will putting these words into the fundamental law make this a Christian government?

If we compel all office-holders to swear that they believe in the Deityship of Jesus and in the infallibility of the Bible, will they be less likely to indulge in superfluous swearing afterwards? Will they be less likely to break the fourth commandment, or the seventh, or the ninth? Will they be less likely to lie for the interests of the party? Will they be less likely to partake of public plunder?—to barter votes for railroad stock or town lots?—to sell cadetships?—to fall into drunkenness? It is easy enough to summon spirits from the vasty deep, but will they come? Will calling this a "Christian nation" make it a Christian nation in any improved sense? Or would it rather, as Beecher says, affect its real character about as much as engraving the name of Jehovah upon a cannon would affect its aim?

I see in the Illinois Constitutional Convention there is a motion to modify their divorce laws. One member moved to forbid divorce for any cause. As they have adjourned for one month, the women of Illinois had better speak out in all their daily papers. Here, surely, is a question in which both sexes are equally interested. I think it would be showing a becoming modesty if these gentlemen would let the divorce code alone until the women of the state have the right to vote, and then we shall find out if virtuous, refined, educated women desire to be indissolubly bound to men who are gamblers and drunkards, who are licentious, passionate, ill-natured, who swear, smoke, chew tobacco, in whom the animal forever triumphs over the spiritual and intellectual nature. Do kind mothers wish to have their young and lovely daughters held through life in such gross associations? If not, express your opinions.

Last night I sat up late, reading "Hedged In," by E. S. Phelps. It is a thrilling tale of the lives of our unfortunates, our young, innocent girls, who, through poverty and temptation, are drawn down, down, down, where there is no eye save God's to pity, no strong arm to help. She sets forth, in vivid colors, the selfishness, hypocrisy, hard-heartedness of those who, in happy homes, "have all the rights they want," and never dream that they have duties, in the haunts of vice and crime, where many noble ones are pining for love, and help, to lead a better life. In the conduct of her Margaret Purcell towards Eunice Trent, the heroine, the author clearly marks out the duties of christian women towards the unhappy and the unfortunate of their own sex, and shows the Pharisaism of those people who are ever fearing contamination from poverty and vice. As I finished the little volume, and contemplated the beautiful character developed in poor Eunice, who had tasted the depths of human misery, I thought of what Victor Hugo says in his *Les Misérables*: "As the debris of sewers have been found to possess those chemical elements that can alone restore the worn-out lands of the old world, so from the very dregs of society, from the depths of poverty and vice shall come up the noblest virtues of heroism and self-sacrifice that can alone redeem the race. The one great defect in your story, dear Mrs. Phelps, is, that it ends too soon." E. C. S.

### SOROSIS.

The Woman's Club held its second Anniversary at Delmonico's on Monday of last week, and had an exceedingly good time. From the report of the Executive Committee we make the following extract:

In the list of members of Sorosis are thirty-eight engaged in literature, six editors, twelve poets, six musical artists, twenty-five authors, two physicians, four professors, two artists in painting, nine workers in art, nine teachers, ten lecturers, one historian, one author of scientific works, and three known philanthropists.

Mrs. Celia Burleigh resigned the office of Corresponding Secretary, on account of the pressure of other duties, and presented a report which included these remarks:

"What has Sorosis done?" is a question that has been repeated again and again in every tone of taunt and incredulity, but I assert unhesitatingly that it has done much—all that it could reasonably have been expected to do, and more. I believe that if those of us who assembled here at the first meeting could have looked forward and taken in our status to-day, the feeling would have been one of surprise, not that so little, but that so much had been accomplished. By existing we have demonstrated our right to exist. We have made good the hitherto untried experiment of a Woman's Club; have proved that women can work together; that they can tolerate differences, respect devotion to principle, and meet on higher ground than that of mere personal liking or identity of social clique. It has demonstrated that men and women can dine together, and neither be the worse for the experiment; that a woman may speak to a sentiment, propose a toast or sing a song without being unwomanly; that the clouds of tobacco smoke, excessive drinking, and stories of questionable delicacy are not the indispensable concomitants of a successful entertainment. During the two years of its existence, Sorosis has done, in public and private ways, a large amount of beneficent work, and in this connection there is one feature of the club to which I wish to call special attention, namely, its consistency. In its circular letter, issued early in its career, it set forth with a frankness that gave offence to some persons, what we and what were not its objects, and on the platform announced at that time, it stands firmly to-day. As an organization it has steadily refused to be identified with any especial reform, while it has cheerfully given countenance and support to individual members in any field of labor to which they felt attracted. It has been the

inspiration of a number of organizations having for their object the improvement of women, but while recognizing and welcoming every such enterprise, it has carefully avoided entangling alliances, and adhered steadily to its original idea. It has felt that Sorosis standing as the friend of woman—the champion of womanhood was strong, many-sided in its capacity for good: Sorosis committed to a specialty would be weak, the partisan of a class, helpful only in a single direction.

The retiring President, Mrs. Croly, delivered the Annual Address, in which she congratulated the Club on having outlived prophecy, and become the parent of many similar organizations.

Alluding to the difficulties which stand in the way of women accomplishing any work, she said:

The absence of a recognized public function is another obstacle in the way of women who wish to accomplish a definite purpose. I do not propose now to enter into the question whether this function should take the form of Suffrage or not, but simply to state my own conviction that the great error of a republican form of government is, that it makes no provision for the employment and incorporation of women in some department or other of state or national affairs. Monarchies recognize the female right of succession, and create a privileged class—the honors, emoluments and duties of which woman share. A republic is the only form of government which does not in any way recognize the existence of woman except as a creature to be punished; and it is therefore, and must be in the nature of things, imperfect, as the dual element enters into everything that has permanent and perfect being. There is one way, however, in which Sorosis and kindred societies can help to make up for the lack in the form and administration of our government: and that is by creating a system of rewards, of recognition of merit in women, as an offset to the now exclusive system of punishment. Every boy born in America looks forward to the possibility of personal distinction. Industry, application, and, still more, cleverness and tact, are sure to bring honors and rewards. But women have nothing of this sort to anticipate. The household is their only acknowledged sphere, and in it there is neither reward nor promotion. The more strictly and conscientiously a woman fulfills her duty, as laid down, the more narrow and contracted her life becomes. Marriage does not alter this condition of things. It is the refuge of some, but it has been the grave of many clever women—especially of those who have married clever men.

The election was an open one, and excited much interest and some amusement. Slips were distributed containing the printed designation of the different officers to be elected, and upon these, members wrote the names of their candidates. A two-thirds majority of the entire number of votes was necessary to secure election. The result was as follows:

Mrs. C. B. Wilbour, President; Mrs. Celia Burleigh, Mrs. A. J. Davis, and Mrs. Mary Kyle Dallas, First, Second and Third Vice-Presidents; Mrs. J. C. Croly, Chairman of the Executive Committee; Miss Kate Hillard, Corresponding Secretary; Mrs. Lizzie Harland, Recording Secretary; Miss Josephine Pollard, Treasurer; and Dr. Anna Densmore, member of Executive Committee. The time consumed by reports and balloting compelled the postponement of the election of the three remaining members of the Executive Committee, and also of the Auditor and Custodian.

Among the guests present were Mrs. Governor Fenton, Mrs. Phelps of the Woman's Bureau, Miss Lillian C. Edgerton, the new woman orator (who has already received notice in *THE REVOLUTION*); Mrs. Allen, of Jamestown; Mrs. Hilliard, of Brooklyn; Mrs. Harriet Lane, of Boston; and Miss Mullany, the President of the Working-girls Union in Troy, who was invited to present their scheme for a co-operative manufactory, and did so briefly. It was 6 o'clock when the ladies separated, tired out with excess of enjoyment, and well satisfied with the day's proceedings.

E. H. Heywood has changed his residence to Princeton, Mass.

REV: MARCH 31, 1870