

overstepped the limits of God's word, and if they should have interjected, "Except, that women possess rights less than those of men".

The divine charter of human rights is found in the first chapter of Genesis (verses 27, 28). Here we are taught that God created both male and female in his own image; that he assigned to both of them the same task, - to subdue the earth; that he gave to both of them the same authority, to have dominion over the works of his hands. They were equal in dignity and co-ordinate in all the relations of life. This was the social order when God saw every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good. In the second chapter the individuality of the man and the woman was emphasized and at the same time their interdependence strikingly



illustrated. Before the final fiat that all was very good was pronounced, God said "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." After this declaration of the inadequacy of the man for the requirements of the life before him, a scene full of instruction for all generations of man was enacted; for every beast of the field and fowl of the air was brought before the man and he gave names to all of them; but among them all there was not found an help meet for him. After this object lesson to the man that no creature inferior to himself could be an help meet for him, the man was cast into a deep sleep, and God made for man an help meet for him <sup>after the Divine ideal,</sup> - a being <sup>made</sup> made in the image of God, of the same bone and flesh as the man,



but with an individuality which fitted her to assist man to achieve his achievements in all the realms of his nature to which he could never attain alone, nor with the help of all the inferior animate creatures.

In the third chapter sin enters, and the woman and the man fall into disobedience. Then it was said unto the woman "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee". In these few words was prophesied the bitterest woe and deepest degradation which sin would entail upon the human family. Henceforth, in the exact degree in which sin dominated the will of the race, the individuality of the woman would be dwarfed, her freedom fettered, and she be thrust out of her rightful dominion with man into subjection to him. The







teachings of nature can only be accounted for by the reason given in the third chapter of Genesis, that it is the universal result of sin.

Only the Jewish and Christian religions teach the equality of the souls of men and women; and even among ourselves we must confess these teachings are but partially received; for as that profound sociological philosopher, Herbert Spencer, has pointed out, the belief still dominant among us that the rights of women are not equal to the rights of men, is an evanescent form of the old belief, that women have no souls.

Christians though we call ourselves the universal blindness of heart is <sup>in part</sup> upon us also, so that we do not clearly apprehend the teachings of Scripture upon the divinely appointed co-ordination of the



7  
sexes. "The traditions of men have made  
the word of God of none effect" with  
us as with the Jews of Christ's time.  
The primal decrees <sup>concerning</sup> the primal  
social order were never rescinded,  
though sin obscured them for  
a time. For even before the penalties  
of their disobedience were pronounced  
upon the guilty pair, the gracious  
promise was given that the seed  
of the woman should bruise the  
serpent's head. Whether we regard the  
scriptural account of the subjection  
of woman as a prophecy of the his-  
torical course of sin, or as a curse  
inflicted <sup>upon the race</sup> for the punishment of sin,  
in either case we are now free  
through the redemptive work of  
Christ. The chastisement of our peace  
was laid upon him, and with  
his stripes we are healed." To this  
end was the Son of God manifested, that  
he might destroy the works of the



8

devil". It cannot be denied that the subjection of women to men is a work of the devil, fraught with miseries to men as well as women. For thousands of years the race has groaned under the woes wrought by the subjection of woman. It is time that every Christian man and woman should join as co-laborers with Christ in making a determinate warfare upon every form of sex domination. It is along this line that the spirit of Christ has worked always; for whether by the deliberate intention of his followers or unconsciously to them, with every step in Christian civilization, the advancement of women has gone on <sup>with</sup> equal pace in social consideration and legal rights, until in our day it has culminated in the claim of women to equal political rights with men.

Some of the immediate causes which



have led to this demand of women  
 are the same that have led to the  
 very great extension of the rights  
 of suff<sup>rage</sup> among men under constitutional  
 governments. There is one cause, however,  
 which affects the <sup>of woman only</sup> political position,  
 and which proceeds from the very remar-  
 kable <sup>modern</sup> industrial development consequent  
 upon the introduction of machinery  
 into modern manufactures. This indus-  
 trial period dates back less than a  
 hundred and ~~forty~~ <sup>years</sup> and one of its  
<sup>characteristics</sup> has become con-  
 spicuous only in the present century;  
 that is, the appearance of women in  
 the labor markets side by side with  
 men, and earning wages with them.  
 Woman as a wage-earner is one  
 of the striking figures in modern  
 industry, and her appearance upon  
 the scene has been comparatively so  
 sudden that even yet she is likely  
 to cast into the shade woman as a work-



er, so that the terms woman wage-earner and woman worker are liable to be accepted as synonymous in popular parlance, and both spoken of as though both had made a recent appearance upon earth. To obtain a correct view of woman as a worker, however, we must go back of any modern period, back of the Middle Ages, the Dark Ages, the Christian era, the ancient civilizations, yes, back of the first faint legends of history until we find ourselves in the very presence of those ape-like progenitors in whom Mr. Darwin engages our filial interest. We are indebted to the higher criticism for the faint gleams of light which pierce through the obscurity of the long ages in which man slowly evolved into that degree of advancement which we see in savage tribes now existent. It teaches that it is to the primitive woman that we owe those incipient



industries which were the starting point  
of the race in its upward course out  
of its all but brutish state. For upon  
the primitive man probably the fami-  
ly instincts probably made few  
more demands than they do now  
upon that king of the beasts, the  
lion, which kills the prey and then  
roars, that his mate and his young  
may come to share his feast. Upon  
the primitive woman, however,  
the more intimate and constant cares  
of motherhood made varied calls upon  
her activity and intelligence. She it  
was who first felt the need of shel-  
ter and sought it in clefts of rocks  
and caves; she developed the domestic  
uses of fire, and put in practice the  
first rude processes of cookery. She  
invented the dressing of skins, the  
manufacture of utensils of pottery,  
the needle, and weaving and spinning.  
When at last man emerges into that



degree of advancement shown by savage tribes now existent, we find a division of labor between the sexes, which broadly stated, gives to the man the employments of war and the chase, and imposes upon the woman all the rest, with slight regard to her lesser physical strength. As the race advanced, <sup>and</sup> wars became less constant and the increased population made the chase too precarious a means of subsistence, and the growing wants of civilization compelled the men to take upon themselves some of the tasks which hitherto devolved upon the women. By natural laws, they chose those which were the more profitable, and those for which their greater strength was required, and those for which the family cares of women more or less unfitted them, were also gradually forced upon them. The time and strength thus saved to women was ex-



depended in the greater variety and greater skill required in domestic employments, around which women's labor began to be concentrated. This process was hastened by the growing refinement of manners and morals, ~~and that~~ <sup>and that</sup> the protection of father or husband became necessary against the lawless rudeness of men, until at last women's labor was almost entirely devoted to household employments, either in their own families, or when necessary, in the households of others. So fathers and husbands practically became the sole employers of feminine labor, and as the women had no means of enforcing a division of the profits, the men, with large liberality, — to themselves, gathered into their own hands all the fruits of the family toil, and then, still generous in word, to themselves, "gave" to the women such portions as



seemed suitable to them. In this way  
 the women tailors of the earth became  
 known, not as wage-earners but as  
 the "supported class"; just as at the  
 present day, the busy mothers and care-  
 ful housewives are called in com-  
 mon parlance and <sup>even in</sup> official census  
 returns, the "supported class", and  
 few seem struck with the incon-  
 gruity of the term as applied  
 to the laborers upon whom the  
 comfort and welfare of the homes  
 of the people are dependent. In  
 1760, however, a series of events com-  
 menced which was to change all  
 this. It began <sup>in 1760</sup> by the invention  
 of the carding machine by James Har-  
 greaves, and four years later he invented  
 the spinning jenny for spinning cotton  
<sup>in place of the old process of hand spinning</sup>  
 yarn. It requires a vigorous effort  
 of the imagination to conceive of  
 the immensity of the changes involved  
 in the conditions of society, particular-



ly in those of women, by the introduction of machinery for the manufacture of clothing; Since man made his appearance upon earth clothing has been one of his prime necessities, and where the skins of animals were not sufficient or available, textile fabrics had to be used; and for all of these except the coarsest, spinning is requisite. The distaff and spindle are the most primitive appliances for spinning, and pictures of these are found on the earliest Egyptian monuments. The distaff was a stick on which a bundle of the prepared material was loosely bound, and which was held in the left hand or stuck in the belt. The spindle was a smaller, tapering stick, to which the thread was attached, and then, by a dexterous turn of the hand, was made to spin round while it needed, the spinner drawing out a regular stream of the <sup>between the thumb and</sup> fibers as long as ~~the~~ <sup>finger</sup> twisting lasted. The spindle was



16  
then drawn in, the new length of thread  
wound upon it, and the operation re-  
peated. By this simple apparatus the  
thread for all the clothing of the race  
was spun from the immemorial  
time recorded by the Egyptian monu-  
ments, until the first improvement,  
the common spinning wheel, was  
invented as late as 1530, it is said,  
in Nuremberg. The next improvement  
was Hargreaves' machine, in 1764, fol-  
lowed in rapid succession in 1769 and  
1779 by those of Arkwright and  
Crompton. It is said that the change  
wrought upon manufactures by these  
machines is more wonderful than  
anything in the whole history of com-  
merce; but this is a mere trifle  
to its effect upon the conditional  
women, and through them upon  
society. From time immemorial spin-  
ning had been the one prevaling  
domestic em-  
ployment of women. From the queen



on her throne to the beggar on the road-  
 side, no social position wholly exemp-  
 ted a woman from the duty of spin-  
 ning. The very word spinster was  
 synonymous with an unmarried  
 woman, and a skilful spinster  
 was not a financial burden in  
 any household. Spinning was one  
 of the last of women's employment  
~~of the last of women's employment~~  
~~invaded by men, the world's de-~~  
~~mand for clothes was greater than~~  
~~women could supply,~~ and  
 spinning had become a regular em-  
 ployment for men also. It is com-  
 puted that if the present supply  
 of textile fabrics were now required  
 to be made by the old processes, the  
 whole working force of the globe would  
 be inadequate for this single task.  
 Think, then, of the change in the in-  
 dustrial prospects of the thousands  
 and hundreds of thousands, and mil-  
 lions of women all over the world,



18  
who had always been really self-supporting, though they were not called so, when spinning their chief employment, was taken from them. Fortunately, the innovation was made gradually, and was accompanied by many immediate compensations, otherwise the social disorder and misery would have been beyond all computation. Even yet, the old processes of domestic manufacture are carried on in remote districts.

And now comes the era of women wage-earners. It was not long after the introduction of these inventions before it became evident that manufacturing could be carried on more economically if the expensive machines and the workers could be brought together under one roof. This commenced the factory system, and women and children found employment in the factories. The



wages paid to women there, at last became a criterion for the worth of women's work. But it would require a volume to trace all the agencies which have made the woman wage earner a prominent figure in the modern industrial world. We must confine ourselves to a few of them, with some of the social changes wrought, in our own country. The factory system was introduced considerably later in the American colonies than in Europe, and the first spinning-jenny was seen in America in 1775, and it was a full quarter of a century before the new system made much headway. As we have seen, for ages the employments of women had been narrowed down almost entirely to household employments, and this custom was even more strictly adhered to in America than elsewhere, so long as the principal part of the clothing <sup>of the country</sup> was of domestic manufacture, there was work enough



there for a honorable subsistence  
 for all. (Anecdote) But as manufacturing  
 began to leave the household, women  
 whose necessities required their con-  
 stant employment, found them selves  
 in enforced idleness. When the facto-  
 ries were opened women flocked in-  
 to them. But still there were insuf-  
 ficiently employed women. Not only  
 had spinning left the household, but  
 weaving and knitting also, and the  
 factory system was beginning to  
 be applied to other old household  
~~employment~~<sup>employment</sup>, such as candle, soap and  
 cheese-making. Eagerly they pushed in-  
 to every exercise to which accident  
 had given a womanly precedent.  
 For example, the ancient school-  
 dame who taught the village chil-  
 dren their A. B. C. was replaced by  
 intelligent, ambitious young women  
 who soon made teaching a <sup>decribable</sup> profes-  
 sion for the better class of young



women. And still the terrible invasion of machinery went on. In 1840, when Miss Harriet Martineau visited this country, she found but seven employments open to women - working in cotton factories, book binding, type-setting, teaching, keeping boarders, sewing and domestic service, and only four of these were conquered ground. Men began to feel what it was in reality to "support" the female members of their family, and in social economics the grim phrase "superfluous woman" began to replace the former humble but honorable "spinster". For the first time since the settlement of the country the American woman had to face that dread foe of self respect, the fear that for her no place might be found where the work of her hands would be a fair compensation for the necessities of life. For this



extremity  
 emergency, women turned longing  
 eyes towards employments which  
 hitherto had been exclusively oc-  
 cupied by men. But at every attempt  
 to enter these, <sup>the spirit of conservatism met them</sup> ~~the spirit of conservatism met them~~  
 of ~~labor~~ <sup>already in the field</sup> with the ~~crus~~ <sup>crus</sup> most appealing to their  
 feminine spirit; - unwomanliness,  
 misguided ambition, ~~discontent~~ <sup>social</sup>  
 and desertion of home duties were  
 the stupid reproaches cast upon them  
 and the echoes have not yet died  
 out. Women were not willing to  
 starve, however, to satisfy the scruples  
 of any sort of conservatism. Every  
 year saw some fragment of the  
 old industries fall away, and every  
 year saw women forcing an entrance  
 into employments hitherto closed  
 to them. The Civil War greatly hasten-  
 ed this process, because so many men  
 were drawn away into the field that  
 women were compelled to take their  
 places in many unusual employ-



ments, and when the war ended the employments remained. The process has continued, until in 1893, 53 years after Miss Martineau's visit, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, United States Commissioner of Labor, tells us that women are engaged in every branch of industry, except the army and navy. If only the principle was considered, in the freedom of women to choose their own life-work instead of all being confined to the monotonous round of household employments, irrespective of talents or tastes, were considered, the gain to human happiness is enormous. enough to justify us in regarding this industrial movement as one of the most important events since the Christian Era. But this <sup>prudence</sup> is by no means the only advance work. The educational advancement of women has kept pace with the industrial. Though public



schools were very early established in the New England colonies for boys, it was only after a protracted struggle that girls were admitted to their privileges. The first institution for the higher education of girls was not founded until <sup>in New York</sup> 1820, by the heroic efforts of Mrs. Emma Willard, assisted by the noble De Witt Clinton; and the first college, Oberlin, into which women were permitted to enter was opened to them in 1833. The many admirable institutions for women's collegiate education of which we now boast, have been established since the war; and hundreds of colleges originally intended only for men, now admit women also. Of the 345 colleges enumerated in the last report of the Bureau of Education, 215 were co-educational, and that number is being constantly increased. The social and legal position



of women has also constantly improved. At the beginning of the period of which I speak, married women had no property rights, no rights to their children, no rights to their own persons. As late as 1814, instances are on record in England of wife-selling in the market places. All these have changed with women's improved industrial position. One of the most important contributions of thought on the subject of <sup>women in industry</sup> is the address of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, in an address delivered in 1893 before the convention of the N. A. W. S. A., and published, I believe, in the Forum magazine. His long labors in the statistics of industry, and his position as U. S. Commissioner of Labor, give his opinions more weight, probably, than those of any other one person in the country. In that address he says, that the opening up of industries to women has been altogether again. Their educa-



tional and legal position has been constantly improved; and that the moral purity of the wage-earning woman is equal to that of the woman in any portion of society.

I should not do justice to all the influences which have brought about the hopeful state <sup>of things</sup> depicted in Col.

Wright's address if I failed to mention the labors of that class of philanthropists who are identified with what is best described as the equal rights movement. <sup>though they are commonly known as</sup> As at their first convention in 1848, they put forward prominently the right of women to suffrage, they are ~~commonly known as woman suffragists.~~ But before that convention they had done much to instill into the <sup>popular mind</sup> the equality <sup>ideas</sup> of the sexes in all social rights, educational, industrial and legal, as well as political, and they <sup>never</sup> have, or for one moment <sup>since</sup> lost sight of those.



objects since. It is quite common still to see in the popular prints animadversions against the entrance of women into all kinds of vocations, which the writers are fond of ascribing to the voluntary and misguided choice of women who prefer to desert the good old ways of their grandmothers; and the woman suffragists are fortunate if in the course of such remarks, they are not blamed for the discontent which has led to such a perversion of womanly ways. It ought to be patent to such carpers that woman suffragists could no more cause such an industrial revolution than they could call a mountain torrent into existence. But it is possible to guide and control a torrent which could not be set in motion. Herein lies the claim of woman suffragists to the gratitude of the world. They saw the rising



tide of women's necessity. They boldly met the clamor of conservatism, and proved by argument and example that innovation was not necessarily harmful.

claimed the right of woman to do every thing for which they had ability. They bravely met the clamor of conservatism, proving by argument and example that innovation was not necessarily harmful. They knocked at the doors of colleges until they opened and fitted women for more lucrative employments. Had they not watched at every door of hope and held out a helping hand to enter in; had they not besieged legislatures to repeal bad laws and enact better ones; had they not worded off adverse legislation by rousing English public opinion; had they not incessantly agitated and educated the popular mind to accept the idea of equal rights for women,



1

Ladies and gentlemen, and sisters of the Union; In this Bible reading there are two principles which I wish to prove; for I believe that if we once clearly apprehend them and rest our confidence in them firmly on the teachings of the Scriptures we shall find in them a much enlarged liberty to work for our great Temperance reform, and will feel ourselves justified in using some powerful means which at present seem doubtful to many religious minds. The first of these principles is that God in the beginning endowed women with absolutely equal rights with men, and that His will has never changed; the second principle is that women have clearly the right to engage in public work and in public teaching and speaking. I wish to prove these entirely from the Bible, for I am well assured, being a Christian woman speaking to Christian women, that



no other argument, however plausible, will give us full freedom to use whatever just means our hands may find as long as one lurking doubt remains in our minds that any portion of God's holy word condemns this enlarged liberty of ours.

I will now read what we may justly call the great charter of human rights, from the 1<sup>st</sup> chap. of Genesis. 26-28. Here we are told that God made both man and woman in His own image; that he assigned to both of them the same task, - to subdue the earth; and that he gave to both of them the same authority, to have dominion over the works of his hands. Now we have not the slightest indication here that the rights of the woman were not fully equal to the rights of the man, and I hope we will impress this fact well upon our minds; for ~~I suppose~~ you are all well aware that this is frequently denied; and the belief is so common that the rights of women are not equal to the rights of men that some persons who are not very careful in their



3.

reading of Scripture are actually under the impression that this passage of Scripture warrants the belief; and I remember that some seven or eight years ago a grave senator in our Kentucky legislature arguing against a bill for the property rights of married women quoted the Scripture as saying "God made man in his own image and gave him dominion". His speech was reported in a religious paper, and the reverend editors either did not observe the misquotation or did not think it worth while to point it out. I give this as <sup>striking</sup> an instance of the necessity of our studying very closely for ourselves what the Scriptures do teach; lest by any means the word of God be made void to us by the tradition of men, as it was in the days of Christ. I will read again from the second Chapter of Genesis; <sup>1-24</sup> In this second chapter we have the institution of the Sabbath; the picture of the man in the garden of Eden, which he tilled, and won his food without painful toil; and then a second account of the creation of woman, from which we may derive much instruction by a careful study. There is a



class of sentimentalists, and even of moralists, who are very fond of telling us that it is the highest duty of women to conform themselves to whatever may happen to be the ideal agreeable to the men ~~to whom they are nearest~~; <sup>to them;</sup> that it is not for them to think for themselves, to act for themselves; but <sup>that</sup> the truest woman is she who most completely effaces herself and becomes the most subservient echo of her husband; hence that her nature is necessarily inferior to that of the man, and that she does best for humanity and most <sup>perfectly</sup> completely fulfills the design of her Creator, when she holds herself to be <sup>subordinate to man</sup> an instrument in the hands of man <sup>his hands</sup> to do such portion of the world's work as he in his wisdom or his pleasure may assign to her. This is a statement of the theory in its baldest form, and may be repudiated by some when thus stripped of poetry and sentiment who really accept it; but in some degree, we must confess that it pervades all our mental atmosphere. Nevertheless, if we measure it by the standard of God's word, we find it wanting in truth and nobleness, let poets and sentiment



alists soften its coarse features as they may. When I read this second account of the creation of woman it seems to me, as though ~~the Holy Spirit~~, foreseeing that sin would come into the world and deface all the fair ~~works~~ <sup>works</sup> ~~creation~~ of God, and especially would cast down woman, the physically weaker vessel, from her high estate of equality with man, <sup>the Holy Spirit</sup> caused details of her creation to be written that might save earnest souls who diligently searched the Scriptures, from this most fatal error of all. For notice: God first declares that it is not good for the man to be alone, and that he will make an help meet for him. In this sentence we have a complete refutation of the idea so often advanced that in many important functions woman should not presume to try to assist man; <sup>Woman</sup> if she is a help meet for <sup>man</sup>, is it not the part of wisdom for him to avail himself of her aid everywhere? and the more important the duty, the more <sup>necessity</sup> ~~desirable~~ <sup>for</sup> her aid. Then the sacred account tells minutely of what nature this help-meet should be. God caused to pass before man every living creature, and man gave



b.

them all names, but among them all there was not found an help meet for man. Now it is not said particularly that man himself <sup>perceived</sup> that none of these creatures could be an helpmeet for him. Since we know so little of the nature of man before his fall, it is useless to surmise what he thought about it, but it is a fact very well worthy <sup>of our notice</sup> to be called <sup>the</sup> into notice before of this assemblage of Christian women, and I commend it to the <sup>serious</sup> attention of any of <sup>woman</sup> them who may <sup>believe</sup> consider it a womanly thing to <sup>believe</sup> consider <sup>it</sup> herself <sup>subordinate</sup> superior to man, and her <sup>a</sup> noblest aim to conform herself to what <sup>men's ideal of womanhood</sup> pleases him, that since the fall an overwhelming majority of men, even at the present time, are quite content in the companionship of women whom they believe have no souls, <sup>or inferior ones</sup> Mohammedans far outnumber all sects of Christians, and they believe women have no souls, Hindoos, who are numbered by the hundred million, and hold the transmigration of souls, believe that women by the most abject submission in this ~~world~~ <sup>life</sup>, attain the privilege of being born men in the next. In ~~short~~, except in the Jewish and



Christian religions, we find no acknowledgement  
 and a very great philosopher of our day, has pointed out  
 of any equal soul in man and woman. But our  
 God has carefully taught us that <sup>woman is equal to man</sup> for <sup>having a person</sup>  
 equal to the rights of man is an <sup>invariant</sup> form of the old belief  
 that there was no helpmeet for man in any  
<sup>that women have no souls,</sup> creature inferior to himself, he causes Adam to  
 fall into a deep sleep, and taking from him a  
 rib, of it he makes a woman, and brings her  
 unto the man; and the man says "This is  
 now bone of my bones and flesh of my  
 flesh." And God declares "Therefore a man  
 shall leave his father and his mother, and shall  
 cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one  
 flesh"; thus instituting the holy law of the  
 marriage of one man to one woman. Here, then,  
 we see the helpmeet whom God provided for  
 the man; a creature made in God's own image,  
 not made apart from the man, that he might  
 in arrogance born of sin declare that she was  
 inferior to himself, but bone of his bones and  
 flesh of his flesh; a different individuality,  
 indeed, but equal in noble endowment. And is  
 not such, my friends, the only ideal of a true  
 helpmeet? That ~~helper~~ does not give us the most  
 needed help who only obeys our instructions,  
 however faithfully and diligently; but one



who with a heart and a mind set in full accord with our own on the same attainment brings to its accomplishment different powers and different methods. If this be acknowledged, as I think it must be, then the duty of woman is not to conform herself to the ~~unexpressed~~ <sup>expressed</sup> wishes and wants of man, but to ~~devote her earnest effort to~~ <sup>strive</sup> developing her own individuality by striving to conform herself to God's holy law, as he makes it clear to her through the medium of her own spirit and conscience. Then she will become man's true help meet to conquer this world and its kingdoms for Christ. But to do this she must have liberty; for her character cannot grow symmetrically when hedged around by conditions imposed by a will no better nor higher than her own; and we have seen that God in the beginning gave woman absolute equality with man, when he gave them dominion over the works of his hands, made them the same in origin, and one flesh in marriage.

But we must turn from our contemplation of this perfect plan and consider how sin has affected it; for the serpent entered the garden and the woman and the man fell



9  
into disobedience. Then we read: 3 Gen. 16-19. "Thy desire shall be unto thy husband and he shall rule over thee." In this sentence many find justification for the subjection of women to men who acknowledge that they were created with equal rights. They quote this passage as a command from God which both men and women are in duty bound to see executed; But this is a false view; commentators, I believe, are agreed that the passage indicates a prophecy, not a command; ~~and it is a prophecy~~ that has been abundantly fulfilled in all the past history of mankind; and ~~whose~~ fulfillment has blotted all the fair promise of Eden. But, my friends, has this been in ~~accordance~~ obedience to the will of God? Has it not, on the contrary, been in accordance with that mysterious dispensation whereby God has for a time permitted his everlasting purposes to be obscured by the presence of evil? Surely this is the case; for God gave woman in the beginning equal dominion with the man, and "The gifts and the calling of God are without repentance". (Rom. xi. 29) Besides that, we know that the social order in Eden is God's will for us now, I have ~~read~~ read the institution of the Sabbath on the seventh day. Now after sin came into the world God said



to Adam. Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." But does it please God that man shall have no day of rest? Far from it; it is true that only a very small portion of mankind really possesses a sabbath; but God has reiterated his command to keep the sabbath holy both in the old and the new testaments; and it is only because men are fast bound in sin and refuse to obey God that ~~his~~ <sup>this</sup> day gift of holy rest is lost to them. We have seen, too, that marriage was instituted between one man and one woman, and we read in the 19<sup>th</sup> chapter of Matthew: (3-8) Here we have the distinct injunction of Jesus Christ to ~~study~~ <sup>study</sup> this account of the beginning for instruction in the most vital social relations, and to obey it even in the face of Moses' enactment to the contrary. In the seventh generation from the creation sin had so far done its work that woman had lost her right to be the sole wife of her husband, and Lamech had two wives; and <sup>down to</sup> ~~at~~ <sup>present most of</sup> this time, the world, <sup>outside</sup> ~~except~~ the comparatively small part called Christendom, — <sup>large parts of</sup> Africa, ~~nearly all~~ <sup>Asia</sup>, part of Europe, and even in our own fair republic one dark spot in the west, withers under the social blight of polyg-



Is this in accordance with the will of God?  
army. ~~If not~~, what condemnation of it ~~is~~ have we  
in ~~this~~ word ~~of God~~? My friends, I call your most  
earnest and prayerful attention to this 19<sup>th</sup>  
chapter of Matthew. In Christ's reference to the  
divine law of marriage laid down in the begin-  
ning we have the only direct condemnation  
of polygamy given in the New Testament,  
except the injunctions to bishops and elders  
to be the husbands of one wife. <sup>But</sup> Christ <sup>there</sup> teaches  
~~us~~ that the original divine plan is binding upon  
his followers, and in that plan the man  
and the woman are equal in rights.

It is a singular thing that the bearing of the  
curse foretold to fall upon the woman, and the  
one foretold to fall upon the man have been  
regarded in remarkably different lights, for  
though the earth was cursed for man's sake  
yet it has never been doubted that toil  
and weariness were thus entailed upon  
the woman as well as upon the man. But  
it is an amazing thing that we not in-  
frequently hear ~~expressions and arguments~~  
~~that imply~~ the opinion <sup>implied</sup> that when the God  
curse was pronounced <sup>foretold</sup> that <sup>to the woman</sup> the desire of the  
~~woman~~ should be to her husband and he  
should rule over her, ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~foretold~~ a punishment which falls



solely on the woman, while the man <sup>not only</sup> escapes suffering from <sup>12.</sup> it, but that <sup>actually</sup> the <sup>prophecy</sup> that should rule over her <sup>is actually</sup> <sup>indicated</sup> <sup>is considered</sup> <sup>as</sup> a new honor and privilege conferred upon him! Ah, my friends ~~from~~ far from the true meaning of God is such an imagination! When we have more of the spirit of Christ we shall understand that what degrades woman degrades man, as well as we now understand that what afflicts man afflicts woman. Let us strive to see clearly what this curse means, and I think we shall find that the Lord prophesies what would be the most woeful consequence of sin; for the woman would ~~be~~ <sup>herself</sup> debased <sup>and</sup> to serve the creature rather than the Creator, and the man would despise and refuse the woman as an helpmeet and should rule over her. Thus the <sup>disloyalty</sup> ~~secrecy~~ of the woman and the arrogance of the man should cast the woman down from <sup>her</sup> the high <sup>station</sup> place God designed for her, and in the train of this unholy <sup>subversion of God's plan</sup> ~~displacement~~ should follow humanity's bitterest woes, which experience has continually shown us are rooted in woman's subjection.

So sin has blighted the human race in every relation; but Christ declares "Every plant which my Heavenly Father planted



15.

God in the olden time spoke unto the fathers by the mouth of the prophets, and among these prophetesses appeared from the time God called his people out of Egypt to the coming of Christ; for Miriam was a prophetess, and the Lord sent her before the people of Israel with Moses and Aaron. Deborah was a prophetess; and she also judged Israel forty years, <sup>to do</sup> which we have no reason to suppose <sup>that she retained</sup> ~~was~~ a miraculous gift, though it has upon it the seal of God's approval. She also went out at the head of the Lord's armies with Barak, and led them to victory. Then we have the prophetess Huldah, and the mother of king Lemuel, and finally when the infant Jesus was brought into the temple, the prophetess Anna gave thanks unto God, and spoke of him to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem. We have these evidences that the public work and speaking of women were approved of God throughout the old dispensation. And under the new, Christ bade a woman tell his brethren of his resurrection, the very central fact of the gospel, and on the great day of Pentecost there was



a fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; Ye, and on my servants and on my handmaidens in those days will I pour forth of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy." Here we see that the infant church was ~~founded~~ <sup>planted</sup> in part by the preaching of women; so that it is obligatory upon Christians to hold that it is lawful for women to speak in public. There are many other allusions in the New Testament to the preaching of women; as in the mention of the four daughters of Philip, and several times of women who labored in the gospel; and there is no indication that they were given miraculous powers to do so. But against all this testimony <sup>in favor of the</sup> ~~to the~~ public work and speaking of women we have two sentences from Paul which many persons <sup>interpret as for hiding a truth which they</sup> seem to think outweigh all other authority. Let us examine them. The first is in the 14<sup>th</sup> chapter of 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 34-35. It has been well remarked that ~~Paul's epistles should be read as for the understanding of an epistle of Paul it should be read through as a whole to understand them correctly.~~ <sup>a sitting</sup> In the 11<sup>th</sup> chap. he says "Now I praise you that ye



remember me in all things and hold fast the traditions, even as I delivered them to you" and then immediately he alludes to the women's praying and prophesying without disapproval, but he <sup>desires</sup> ~~wishes~~ that they should cover their heads while doing so; <sup>Not</sup> ~~But~~ he says the churches shall have no such custom, if any man seemeth contentious. How can we suppose that Paul would give such instructions if he intended that no woman should pray or prophesy in the church? Again, in the first part of the 14<sup>th</sup> chap. Paul exhorts "Desire earnestly spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy." And again, "I would have you all speak with tongues, but rather that ye should prophesy." Can we suppose that Paul did not intend to include women in these earnest exhortations? He knew well that the Spirit had often honored women with gifts both of tongues and of prophecy, and certainly he would wish women to desire them. Did he intend to cut them off from exercising their gifts in the place where they could use them most effectively? I think a careful reading of the context will convince us that Paul did not mean either of these inconsistencies. 14<sup>th</sup> chap. 26-35. It seems Paul does



not enjoin silence upon women who have something to teach, for he had given ~~no~~ <sup>no</sup> advice how such should attire themselves in the 11<sup>th</sup> chap., but he tells those who wish to learn to keep silence in the churches and ask their own husbands at home. The whole directions to ~~the~~ women seem to be in conformity with two ~~objects~~ <sup>considera-</sup> tions, first, that of keeping order in the churches, which applies equally to the men; and secondly, that of womanly propriety, according to the customs and laws of their country; for in this manner only can we understand the words, "for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law." It has been too customary to allow this expression of Paul's to pass as a loose way of alluding to a law of God's, <sup>written</sup> ~~expressed~~ either in the Mosaic law, or in some previously well known precept of the Christian faith. But I take it that this view is wholly untenable. There is no injunction to women to be in subjection in the Mosaic law, nor in the New Testament, except to married women to their own husbands; and we know that God does permit women to speak, or else the example of all the holy women of



old goes for nothing, and their exercise of their gifts of tongues and prophecy would have been sinful without a special dispensation. But such a theory is abhorrent to Christians, and hence we are hedged in to the conclusion that Paul alludes to some secular law well known to the Corinthians, and acknowledged to be binding upon them; and which Paul held to be violated by women's entering into conversation with strangers at church, as he charges them to ask questions of their own husbands at home. We must notice Paul enjoins on women only to keep silence in the churches, and does not impose any limitations on their free speech elsewhere. And to my mind the whole object of the apostle is clear in his final exhortation, "Wherefore, my brethren, desire earnestly to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues, But let all things be done decently and in order."

The second passage to which I alluded is found in Paul's 1<sup>st</sup> epistle to Timothy, "I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness." In this text there is no ambiguity as to who gives the command. Paul says explicitly he



gives it; and all who are familiar with Paul's writings know that it is common with him to give such directions to the churches as he thinks expedient, when he has no revelation from the Lord; according to the authority which he says the Lord gave him for building up, and not for casting down. This is evidently one of those occasions, for we have already seen that God not only allows women to teach, but that also from time to time in his providential dealings with the race, he has given a woman dominion over men. Why, then, does the apostle give Timothy this instruction? Doubtless, from expediency. "All things are lawful, but not all things are expedient." Paul is writing to Timothy at Ephesus, a Greek city, and one in which the women were in an exceedingly degraded state, ignorant and despised. What we can learn of the ancient condition of heathen women convinces us that Paul was justified in thinking that the new faith would not be recommended by placing women in offices of authority in the church; for Paul writes these directions only for the church, as we see further on, when he says. These things write I unto thee that thou mayest know how men



ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." So the passage cannot be justly quoted against the secular teaching of women; but being a regulation established for the welfare of the church, and based upon expediency, the church always has the right to remove it, and as soon as those in authority are convinced that it is not longer helpful to the spread of the gospel, they owe it to women to remove this limitation on their privileges. We shall rejoice when the church ~~whom~~ gives this seal of her approbation of the faithful labors of women; and we think the signs of the times are that she will ere long do so. But let that be sooner or later as it will, in the meantime the secular public service of women is <sup>untrammelled</sup> ~~unrestrained~~ by any text, and clearly approved by the Holy Spirit. Let us stand fast, therefore, in the freedom wherewith Christ did set us free.



[Sept 16, 1894]

## W. P. GILLENWATERS' SPEECH

NOMINATING WALTER P. BROWNLOW FOR CONGRESS, MARCH 8, 1894.

We are assembled here today for the purpose of nominating a candidate for Congress. We must not forget that the power vested in us is a delegated power, and the obligation resting upon us is to so cast our vote in this convention as that the vote of each county when cast shall be responsive to the will of the majority of the Republican voters in our respective counties. Not since the memorable contest in 1864, when the fate of the American Republic hung on the election of Abraham Lincoln, has the demand on the Republican party for harmony and unity been so imperative as at the present. As a political organization the Republican party has made its impress on every page of American history from its origin down to the present time. It has been in the past and is today a grand party. The utterances of its great leaders, the accomplished facts of its efforts as embodied in legislation and the beneficial results following shine with the lustre of the most brilliant gems among the common pebbles of old ocean's bed, and as a result recognized by the civilized world, the thirty years of Republican supremacy in the National Government, are the golden links in the silver chain of American history. As it has been in American politics the party of the past, the star of its destiny today stand out in the future becoming us on to nobler and grander achievements in the great work of lifting humanity up to a higher place. We are now under the cloud of a national defeat, the first we have ever known. But the hour of panic is past, there is a silver lining to the clouds, in the light of which the lines are reforming. In November of 1893 an advance was made on the outer entrenched positions of the enemy. Under the leadership of McKinley, of Ohio, the man who is the idol of every home in this broad land; when the bread of honest toil is eaten, and the comforts of the ideal American home appreciated, and every point assaulted was carried and the captured guns of the enemy trained on their retreating columns. And now when in November next the advance is to be made all along the line, and a leader is to be chosen to lead the Republicans of this Congressional District, Hawkins County has a candidate and I am commissioned to present his name to this convention. If you had been on the streets of Rogersville during the years of 1866 and 1867, and stepped into a little tinner shop by the wayside, you would have seen, toiling at the bench a

beardless boy. His face was black with soot and dust and his garb bespoke his poverty. He was a boy thrown out into the current of a busy world, without the guiding hand of a father or the carressing care of a mother. If later, when the days work was done you had stood on the street and looked into an upper window of an humble home that gave our tinner boy shelter you would have seen him burning the midnight lamp in a tireless effort to educate and fit himself for a higher sphere in life. That boy had our sympathy then and since he has gone out from amongst us and cast his lot with others, we have followed him with a just pride because we have always thought of him as our tinner boy. We have seen him toiling in the dangerous position of a railroad engineer, lured thither by the prospect of accumulating the needed means to enable him to attain to something higher. We have seen him enter the journalistic field and there win favors championing the cause of Republicanism in a solid South. We have seen him honored by his party in being called to the chairmanship of the Congressional Committee. Later we have seen him honored by the Republican party of the State in being called to the chairmanship of the State Executive Committee; and again we have seen him honored by the Republicans of the State in being selected as our Representative in the National Republican Committee in whose council chambers the national campaigns were planned and under whose direction great national victories were won. We have seen him honored by the chosen Representatives of our party in Congress in his election to the position of doorkeeper in the lower House. We have seen him honored by a Republican Senate in his appointment to a responsible position in that body, and as a reward of merit re-appointed six times, and retiring only when the Senate was no longer Republican. In all these varied positions our tinner boy has proved himself worthy the confidence of our people, and it is a pleasure to me to stand here today as the representative of the Republicans of Hawkins County and put in nomination our tinner boy of twenty seven years ago, now known in every home of this district as Walter P. Brownlow, of the county of Washington. We do not ask his nomination on promises of what he will do in the future. His life work for the Republican party and for the people of this section running through a period of more than twenty years is the magnet that ought to and is today drawing to his support the Republican votes of this Congressional District, and we gladly rest his claims to recognition today on what he has already done rather than on any promise on what he will do, for the all sufficient reason in what he has done we have a sure guarantee of what he will do. And this is a more sure foundation of which to build than the promises of any untried man, however honest and honorable he may be, for good purposes often fail of accomplishment for want of ability, and when we rely on promises alone unsupported by past

services, on the same line the factor of ability is an unknown quantity. It is a fact that for the two years he served as door keeper of the lower House of Congress and the twelve years he served in the Senate he gave to the Government the required day service and burnt the midnight lamp in the service of the people of this district. I make the assertion and challenge its contradiction, that no man ever wrote Walter P. Brownlow a letter that demanded an answer and failed to get a prompt reply. It affords me pleasure to bear testimony to his efficient services in behalf of the surviving soldiers and the widows and orphans of the dead soldiers of my county. Brownlow's hand has unlocked the vaults of the treasury at Washington during these fourteen years of service as an employe of the Government and made glad the hearts of hundreds, and perhaps thousands, in this congressional district, who, through his untiring efforts in their behalf have secured an adjustment and payment of their claims against the Government. And I would have you remember and never forget the fact that for all these services rendered to the people of this district by Walter P. Brownlow he never demanded nor received a dollar out of any claim as compensation; out of his meager salary he met all the expenses for stationery and postage necessary to the demands made upon him by the people at whose hands he is now asking the favor of a nomination for Congress. If the action of this convention is responsive to the will of the majority of the Republicans of this Congressional District, Walter P. Brownlow will be our next Representative in the Congress of the United States. If Brownlow is nominated and elected he will enter Congress with his reputation already established at Washington. He is known, not only at home and by his own people, but he is known throughout the entire country, from Maine to California and from the lakes on the north to the capes of Florida. He has been for years the friend and associate of the representative Republicans of the Nation, and standing as he does in touch with the great leaders of the party, he can command their influence and their votes in support of any measure proposed for the benefit of our people. All who know Walter P. Brownlow can testify of him as some one did of Wellington: He is a man

"Who never sold the truth to serve the hour,  
Nor paltered with eternal God for power,"

This is the man that I am commissioned by the Republicans of Hawkins County to present to this convention. Place the banner of the Republican party of this district in the hands of our tinner boy and it will never be lowered in the face of the enemy. He will bear it aloft through the thickest of the fight, and in November, in the last grand charge, he will plant on the captured fortress of the enemy, where it will proudly wave as the signal of victory—the grandest victory ever won in this congressional district.



1893.

Madame Chairman & Ladies,

I am happy in having this opportunity to ~~present~~ <sup>speak</sup> ~~to~~ our Guild, a band of <sup>Christian</sup> women who do not turn away from the dark sides of human life, when they ~~can~~ hold out a helping hand to the weak and ~~inadequate~~, and to present to you a measure for the greater protection of <sup>the persons of</sup> young girls, which the Kentucky Equal Rights Association will petition the General Assembly at the approaching session. For years the members of the Association have had their hearts burdened with the sense that Kentucky's present law <sup>for protecting young girls</sup> is cruelly inadequate, but the task of calling <sup>the necessary</sup> public attention to this delicate subject is a difficult one, and the right women to take the lead had not presented themselves, <sup>until</sup> last convention in October, when two ladies came with their hearts stirred to the depths by their knowledge of the brutalities suffered by young girls, ~~and~~ <sup>with</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>ready</sup> willingness to take upon themselves the heaviest part of the burden of obtaining a better law. These two ladies are well known to you, at least by reputation, Mrs. Mary K. Jones, of Newport, and Mrs. Sarah G. Humphreys, of Versailles. Mrs. Jones, many of you will recall, was Miss Taylor, the granddaughter of the distinguished William Barry, whose monument







state, wherever a friend of the measure can be found to circulate them, and numbers are sent out through the mails. Every effort will be made <sup>through the press</sup> to create a public sentiment which will appeal to our law-makers for the desired legislation. But a spoken word is often most effective ~~to reach the heart~~, and my object here today is to give such information as I am able of the exact object we are seeking and the need for it, so that we as Christian women may more intelligently use our efforts for this humane measure, in signing the petition ourselves, and asking others to do so.

The law <sup>relating to what is</sup> commonly called the age of consent, or the age of protection, must not be confounded with the laws punishing rape. When violence or threats are used in <sup>lawful</sup> assaults upon a woman, the law prescribes a heavy punishment, without any reference at all to the age of the girl or woman assaulted. The women of Kentucky have no reason to complain of any lack of severity in the laws in <sup>distinctly</sup> proved cases of rape. But in the law <sup>concerning</sup> the age of consent, is based on the obvious ground that a child may be too helpless and too ignorant to offer any resistance to an assault upon her person and hence up to a certain age, the law <sup>forbids</sup> <sup>to protect children under its own protection</sup> the dishonor of their persons ~~of children under any circumstances~~ and punishes the offender whether violence is used or not.

In Kentucky, the law relating to the age of consent



is this: "Whoever shall carnally know a female under the age of twelve years, or an idiot, shall be confined in the penitentiary not less than ten, nor more than twenty years." After the tender age of twelve years, the Law imposes upon a female child the whole responsibility of protecting her own chastity against the enticements of men bold in vice and craftiness. This is a flagrant abandonment of the very primary office of law. What is law made for if not for the protection of those who are not competent to protect themselves? The law does not hold <sup>that</sup> a girl, <sup>if</sup> <sup>she</sup> is mature enough to enter into honorable marriage without the knowledge and consent of her guardians; <sup>until she is twenty one,</sup> it is a bitter travesty upon the law's protective care to put <sup>it</sup> <sup>into</sup> <sup>marriage,</sup> <sup>but</sup> to permit dishonor <sup>at</sup> twelve! The law does not permit a person under twenty one to make a legal transfer of property, or other binding contract; a proper <sup>precaution</sup> against the indiscretion and derivableness of immaturity. But just as there are selfish designers and sharpers ready by arts and tricks to defraud the young of their property, so it is equally true that unbridled lust and foul greed of gain are always seeking to make a prey or merchandise of the <sup>virtue of</sup> <sup>immature</sup> girlhood; and are setting snares and traps for the ignorant and un-<sup>over</sup> guarded on every side. Only a few weeks ago in Louisville it was discovered that an extensive business in aban-



pictures and literature was carried on by a man of the name Gink. He had managed to send the pictures all over the state, to saloons and other resorts where they were most likely to meet the eyes of libertines. A number of the faces were recognized as ~~photographs~~ <sup>photographs</sup> of young girls who could be seen on the streets of Louisville, some of known disreputable character, and others not so. Nor are we to take it for granted that all were disreputable, even if not so openly; for it is quite possible by the skill of the photographer to put the <sup>photographed</sup> face of one girl upon the <sup>indiscreetly exposed</sup> figure of another. One sentence in the description of the photographs is significant; they were pictures of girls of twelve years of age and upwards; twelve years is the age of consent in Kentucky. And so the faces of little girls of twelve, probably innocent children, certainly helpless in the weakness and dependence of childhood, were sent out to inflame the passions of libertines, and become the prey of those who chose to hunt them down under the protection of this infamous law <sup>fixing the</sup> age of consent at twelve years. For it is horribly easy to prove what the courts accept as consent after the age is passed. Any failure of desperate resistance, any evidence of yielding to cajolment or bribes, whether <sup>or not</sup> the poor victim has any adequate knowledge <sup>or not</sup> of the injury involved, is interpreted as consent, and her assaulter is safe from punishment. I have had no means of obtaining any rulings of Kentucky courts upon what ~~has~~ <sup>has</sup> been received as evidence of consent, but I will read a few from other states.



It is heart-rending to think that a vicious man, with a little cunning, or <sup>a little taste of a boy or a sweetmeat,</sup> ~~or~~ using the authority of employer or teacher, or simply the deference that childhood and youth are accustomed to show to those older than themselves, ~~may~~ beguile a young girl into secluded or compromising situations, and then, with his victim young, unwarned, bewildered, terrified, can accomplish his foul purpose and be held guiltless by the law, because she did not offer the prompt, ~~and~~ strenuous resistance of a ~~well~~ collected and resolute woman. So easy is it to prove what is called consent, that after the victim has passed the age of protection, usually the assaulter has little to fear, and proceeds in his fiendish gratifications with a boldness that at times almost exceeds belief. In another state where the law is even more infamous than in Kentucky, because the age of consent is only ten, a case developed by benevolent women was that of one negro man who had assaulted 27 little white school girls. He took the precaution to ascertain that they had passed the protected age, and then he had cunning enough to secure all evidence needed of consent; and he was safe from the fear of law on these charges. We need not flatter ourselves that that case is not approached or paralleled in atrocity in our own state. Since the



law affords no adequate redress, for evident reasons  
 secrecy is thrown around such incidents by the victim  
 and her friends, if she has any. Outrages of this kind  
 are the starting point from which many a poor girl  
 goes down into the depths of prostitution, <sup>for</sup> they tear away  
 from exposed and uncared for girls the innocence  
 and respectability in the sight of others which are  
 their only safeguards in their unfortunate surround-  
 ings. <sup>For example,</sup> Instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely,  
 for example, of ignorant girls entrapped by the vile arts  
 of the procurer into houses of ill-fame, and their ruin  
 accomplished. After this is once done, with a <sup>heart-</sup>tickening  
 uniformity such victims <sup>seem</sup> like sheep driven to the slaughter,  
 and <sup>and</sup> yield passively into the life into which they have been  
 betrayed. The law affords no hope of vindication, for if  
 it was not framed for the protection of vice, it certain-  
 ly acts that way. Their mere presence in a house  
 of vice is presumption against them, and any who  
 might testify to their resistance, are already  
 suborned witnesses. Innocence gone, reputation gone, friend-  
 less, hopeless, the law leaves them <sup>young girls</sup> the helpless victims of lust.  
 Since <sup>and</sup> young girls <sup>are</sup> hunted down like game by libertines,  
 and sold like merchandise by the infamous, shall not  
 Christian women cry aloud and cease not until the law  
 throws around <sup>with</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>weakest</sup> <sup>are</sup> <sup>inviolable</sup> shields, at  
 least until it reaches the <sup>degree of</sup> power of self-protection that  
 eighteen years <sup>of age</sup> can give it? The weakness of all girl-



hood is the rightful object of the law's protection, whether it is innocent or not. To Christian women who look upon righteousness as the supreme good, even the protection of innocence in danger of outrage or snares, is not a more solemn duty than the removal of the temptation and opportunity of sin from those who have no <sup>strong</sup> inward guardian of virtue, and no social restraints, to ~~shall for some great~~ <sup>an uncared for young girl is the most pitiful</sup> act in place of it. It is a <sup>sad</sup> truth that many girls are raised in such depraved surroundings that it is almost a matter of course that they will gravitate towards prostitution; their ~~own~~ parents are in haste to sell them for gain. It is also a cause for the gravest solicitude <sup>that</sup> ~~the way~~ which takes hold on death-haunts like <sup>to</sup> ~~deceitful~~ allurement for the giddy or wayward of a class of girls whose circumstances are hard, though not degraded, and who might grow up into virtuous women of the cloth, ~~ruin~~ <sup>while their character is still unformed.</sup> were not so fearfully easy to ~~enter~~ <sup>with</sup> the restraints of home may be irksome; an extravagant love of dress may be beyond their means to gratify, the rewards of honest labor may be small, ~~and work is distasteful to the young~~ <sup>pernicious</sup> reaching and low theatricals may corrupt their views of life, and then the temptation is ever near to <sup>exchange</sup> ~~misguide~~ <sup>all this</sup> ~~them~~ <sup>for the</sup> ~~easy life~~ <sup>of what seems to them</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>inexperience</sup> which their ~~young~~ <sup>cannot</sup> know the bitterness and despair. But nature herself has laid a protective care over the young, a <sup>upon</sup> ~~Sacred~~ ~~charge~~ ~~of~~ ~~society~~. Shall the law protect the property of those under twenty-one against their ~~subversive~~ ~~business~~, and



yet allow a girl under eighteen to throw away the priceless pearl of womanly purity, with the rashness and recklessness of youth, before she can realize what she is doing? Surely not, let us close this open door to ruin. Let us utterly prohibit this infamous traffic in young womanhood, let it no longer be easier to find wages for sin than for work. And if the monster must levy its tribute, let it at least be only from those who have had a <sup>reasonable</sup> chance to choose between vice and virtue. Let us never cease to agitate and petition until girlhood is made inviolable by law up to an age when discretion and self-reliance may make a sufficient defence. Some are afraid that such a law would not be executed even if it was made. But <sup>however</sup> Experience in other states proves that it is an inestimable protection. No law is ever perfectly executed. But the traffic in young girls becomes too dangerous for them to be received in houses of ill-fame, and libertines are frightened into caution. Some object that since girls under eighteen are in houses of prostitution, men who frequent such houses will be in danger of heavy penalties, even when they are not responsible for the downfall of those girls. Yes, they will be in danger, if they dare to touch those whom the law makes inviolable. And a man richly deserves punishment who will gratify his brutal passions, by pushing such a young girl deeper into <sup>degradation</sup> destruction, no matter where he finds



her. Shall lust be an excuse for disregarding every mandate of humanity? Shall any man be safe in forgetting mercy to the miserable, and above all to those weak ones whose sex should appeal to him by the memory of his own mother. Will has the prophet <sup>the word of the Lord,</sup> Hosea written, "Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart". The striped garments of the felon cover few hearts more stony than <sup>the hearts of the man</sup> ~~this~~, who would not willingly spare those whom the law makes inviolable because of their <sup>their</sup> feebleness. And if he will not spare for that cause let the terrors of the law make him afraid for his own sake.

Every Christian woman should join in the petition for this righteous law. Some say that legislation belongs to men, and women have no responsibility in it. But the law of God and man gives women the right to petition. When God created man in the beginning, He made both male and female in his own image, and gave to both of them dominion, <sup>at</sup> the same time he established <sup>monogamous</sup> marriage between one man and one woman as his appointed relation between the sexes. Sin overthrew the co-ordinate dominion of the woman with the man, just as it corrupted marriage and brought in polygamy and concubinage. Though all of you may not believe with your Equal Rights sisters that the <sup>God-given</sup> co-ordinate dominion of the woman with the man ought to be restored, as well as <sup>pure</sup> monogamous marriage, yet you do accept the rights given you by



man; and The inalienable right of petition is declared  
to be yours by the Constitution of the United States, and  
the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Kentucky; and  
with the right goes the responsibility of using it.  
Let us not be fearful, either, that a petition from  
women is too weak a thing to affect legislation;  
for when our Lord was on earth, knowing all  
that is in the heart of man, he taught that  
unfortunate petition for a <sup>good</sup> righteous cause is potent  
both to make the unjust judge execute <sup>righteous</sup> judg-  
ment, and to rouse the sluggish friend to give it all  
that is needed. Let us go about the work with faith, then  
by signing our selves and asking others to sign, never  
doubting that ~~whether~~ <sup>through</sup> we ~~gain~~ <sup>gain</sup> the victory this winter  
or in years to come, our labor shall not be vain  
in the Lord.



Woman Suffrage in the U.S.A.  
 Madam, President & Ladies & Gentlemen,  
 The adoption of woman suffrage  
 as a prohibition measure by the  
~~first~~ <sup>first</sup> ~~Justice~~ <sup>Justice</sup> workers is an interest-  
 ing example of the progression of  
 reforms and correlation of reforms.  
 The modern movement for temperance  
 or total abstinence is at least forty  
 years older than that for political  
 rights for women. As early as 1758  
 a ~~well defined~~ <sup>organized</sup> temperance movement  
 was inaugurated in this country.  
 It ~~soon~~ <sup>and</sup> extended <sup>thence</sup> into Great Britain,  
 while the first <sup>or</sup> definite ~~and~~ organized  
 effort of the woman suffragists was  
~~as late as~~ <sup>as late as</sup> 1848. At first the tem-  
 perance <sup>workers</sup> did not ~~advocate~~ <sup>demand</sup> total  
 abstinence. They took a pledge a-  
 gainst excess in drinking, & later  
 this various departures from total  
 abstinence at certain times, or



the use of  
 in certain drinks. About the time  
 this, however, the temperance people  
 found that total abstinence was  
 necessary, and the adoption of  
 that was the next step. Under  
 this advance occurred the wonder-  
 ful Father Mathus. movement,  
 which in the short space of  
 three years, ~~from 1836 to 1840~~ <sup>including</sup> brought  
 more than half of <sup>the population of</sup> Ireland un-  
 der the total abstinence banner,  
 multitudes of distilleries & breweries  
 closed for lack of trade, and the  
 jails were almost depopulated,  
 But even before that apostle of Temp-  
 erance closed his earthly life, he  
 saw the greater part of his con-  
 gregants ~~ship~~ <sup>go</sup> ~~toward~~ <sup>back into their old habits</sup>  
 this experience, with others simi-  
 lar elsewhere caused the next  
 step, legal evasion added to the  
 moral, in the form of local opi-



tion or state prohibition. But state prohibition also failed in part, and at last the full fledged national constitutional prohibition policy was reached by the temperance hosts. Each step had done good, but each step had also shown the necessity for taking another. From the inception of the temperance movement women had taken a part, but one merely secondary or supplemental. But among other lessons learned was that one that women and children were the principal sufferers from the drink evil, and in 1873 came the call of the Lord to the women to come out in their full strength against the enemy of their homes and happiness. The baptism of fire known as the Woman's



in 1873 4.

Crusade led promptly to the organiza-  
tion of the W. C. T. U. in 1874. After the  
brief course of the Crusade, which  
depended solely upon moral sua-  
sion both upon the drink seller  
and the drinker, the W. C. T. U.  
took its stand firmly upon  
the ~~ground~~ <sup>principles</sup> learned through  
the previous years of the Temperance  
movement. It adopted an unflin-  
ing pledge of total abstinence from  
every form of alcoholic liquor; it  
declared its object to be to educate  
public sentiment up to the standard  
of total abstinence, to train the young,  
save the inebriate, and secure the le-  
gal prohibition and complete ban-  
ishment of the liquor traffic. Only  
in the last <sup>attempts</sup> ~~instance~~ <sup>named</sup> ~~executing~~ this  
last object did they repeat the steps  
of the previous temperance workers;  
for the women intended to bring



this about not by their own legal  
 action, but by moral suasion alone,  
 moral suasion on the voters through  
 the instrumentality known as  
 their influence, woman's influence.  
 The scope credited to this force called  
 "woman's influence" is worthy of  
 some attention; for we find as-  
 cribed ~~certain characteristics~~ of  
 potency ascribed to it not ascribed  
 to influence in general or men's  
 influence. Certainly women possess  
 influence, just as men possess  
~~influence~~ <sup>it</sup>; but why is ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> that the  
 larger part of what men accomplish  
~~is~~ referred and referred correctly,  
 to their direct action, while what  
 is accomplished by women is very  
 largely referred to "woman's influ-  
 ence", instead of to women's direct ac-  
 tion? Here is a little social prob-  
 lem. Nature made woman an exact



co-ordinate half of humanity;  
 but man-made laws have assign-  
 ed her quite a different position, one  
 essentially inferior, in fact. Having  
 thus regulated human law, they fancied  
 they had regulated nature, but nature  
 is not so complaisant. These laws  
 had effect <sup>only</sup> upon what men  
 thought of nature, ~~that~~ not upon  
 nature herself. Woman's share in  
 human society was distorted, but  
 probably not in the least degree  
 diminished. So when it was ob-  
 served that woman exerted an ef-  
 fect upon society much larger  
 than that intentionally assigned  
 to her, it was imputed to a  
 force, almost occult in its  
~~manifestations~~ <sup>manifestations</sup>, and called "woman's  
 influence". But in fact, in the fami-  
 ly and society, ~~woman~~ in America  
~~person~~ with ~~her~~ ~~ideas~~ promoted



with Christian, ~~though~~ ideas, women  
 in the family and society, though  
 shorn of some just rights and  
 securities, enjoy almost that  
 equality <sup>of opportunity</sup> designed <sup>for them</sup> by nature. ~~Only~~  
~~in politics has the unnatural~~  
~~and vicious separation. Having~~  
 therefore little cause to complain  
 Only in politics is the woman  
~~indiv~~ ~~idually~~ as non-entity, ~~it~~  
~~is~~ <sup>entirely</sup> dependent upon her "in-  
 fluence", for her power, if she has  
 any. But the temperance women,  
 accustomed in the family and  
 society to the fair measure of  
~~power of~~ equality of action, and habituated  
~~to~~ ~~ascribe~~ ~~the~~ results of their <sup>power</sup> efforts  
 being ascribed to their "influence",  
 entered into the new field of  
 politics undismayed because they  
 had no weapon but "influence"  
 and looked to the results with a



confidence which surprises nobody more than themselves in retrospect. So sure were they of the "influence" they surpassed themselves to possess that they were even inclined to be a little supercilious to their woman suffrage sisters, who frankly avowed that they did not ~~count~~ <sup>count</sup> their influence of ~~such~~ <sup>any</sup> great <sup>current</sup> political value. Some of you have heard from Mrs. Jewella G. Wallace's own lips the account of her <sup>awakening</sup> conversion from her dream of "influence" to woman suffrage. Anecdote.

The main body of the W. C. T. U. did not learn the lesson as quickly as dear Mother Wallace, but they did learn it with an expedition that does great credit to their common sense, and the franchise department was adopted in —



In addition to moral suasion upon voters to vote <sup>for prohibition</sup> right, the W. C. T. U. are striving to obtain the crowning right of citizenship for themselves, ~~and when~~ <sup>and</sup> they get it, they may vote for prohibition themselves, and <sup>for</sup> other righteous ~~laws~~ <sup>laws</sup> also. They have learned that as human beings and citizens, they are entitled to a ballot, as well as to an "influence". Therefore — years after the woman suffrage movement attained strength enough to attempt a national association for its propagation, which was done first in 1869, the W. C. T. U. incorporated ~~their~~ <sup>the</sup> reform also ~~in its~~ <sup>in its</sup> ~~comprehensive~~ <sup>comprehensive</sup> illustrated the correlation of moral reform by incorporating <sup>the</sup> ~~its~~ <sup>principles of that</sup> ~~principles~~ <sup>principles of woman suffrage</sup>. From the first the W. C. T. U. had freely used the right of women to public speech,



which was a concession from  
 public opinion which the early  
 suffragists had won by long  
 and heroic struggle. Without  
 this right <sup>already conceded</sup> it would have been  
 impossible for the W. C. T. U. to  
 make the rapid progress it has;  
 but even with all that had  
 been done <sup>previously</sup> along the line of the  
 public rights of women, the  
 franchise department has  
 met with more <sup>persistent</sup> opposition ~~and~~  
~~persistent~~ than any other in  
 the range of the W. C. T. U. From  
 its inception the spirit and  
 methods of the W. C. T. U. have been  
 distinctively religious. ~~It has~~  
 cast out thoroughly the sectarian  
 spirit, but it has <sup>imposed</sup> ~~stamped~~ upon  
 each and every one of its  
 departments a deeply religious  
~~spirit~~ <sup>method</sup>. So the <sup>only</sup> opposition to this



department which has caused  
 any solicitude to these bands  
 of devoted women is that  
 which comes from a mistaken  
 Biblical interpretation <sup>and opposing</sup> the  
 rights of women; other opposition  
 in the main the W. C. T. U. is  
 willing to leave to the refutation  
 sure to come through the logic  
 of events <sup>and general progress</sup> that which comes to  
 them in the garb of religion  
 they meet with the sword of  
 the Spirit, always ready to give  
 a reason for the faith that is  
 in them. In the Louisville Commer-  
 cial of last Sunday appeared a  
 long article from the pen of Dr. Broad-  
 us, the great Louisville Baptist divine,  
~~principally~~ devoted to the ~~argument~~  
 opposition to women's speaking in  
 mixed assemblies. As the passages  
 of Scripture adduced to support



this position are the same as those  
 adduced to oppose their suffrage;  
 and as Dr. Broadus is one of  
 the ablest supporters of that side,  
 and one whose opinions have an  
 large extensive influence in the  
 state, I think a review of his article  
 will be a concise way of meeting  
 the most approved ~~arguments~~ Scriptural  
 arguments against the rights  
 of women. Though I maintain that  
 Dr. Broadus' interpretation of the  
 Scripture is defective, yet his ~~exposition~~  
 is so free from exaggeration and  
 misstatement ~~in the presentation~~  
 of his side that his paper is admir-  
 ably adapted to the elucidation  
 of truth by its fair presentment  
 of his side, and may be taken  
 as an exponent of the stage this  
 controversy has now reached. He takes  
 for his text [Cor XIV, 34, and 1. Tim, 2



2. 14-15; and he thinks these two pas-  
 sages are similar in their con-  
 nection and meaning; while I will  
 say at once that I hope to prove  
 that they are not. Remembering  
 that in 11 chap. of 1 Cor. Paul spoke of  
 women as praying or prophesying in  
 the public assemblies, Dr. Broadus  
 freely admits that women did so in  
 the apostolic age by divine inspira-  
 tion, but that such <sup>say</sup> inspiration ~~is~~ speak-  
 ing is <sup>not</sup> possible for us now, and adds  
 "Unless the apostle has contradicted  
 himself, we seem shut up to un-  
 derstand that the passage in chap.  
 14 is a general direction, leaving  
 out of the case of women who prophesied,  
 i. e., spoke by special inspiration.  
 But what right from the context have  
 we to suppose that Paul left out  
 on the ~~contrary~~, we are ~~excluding~~ by the  
 their cases. None, none whatever ~~is~~  
~~context~~ from any such understanding,  
~~except~~ the common-sense duty of re-  
 and must accomplish



consulting the apostle with himself; and this is done vastly more perfectly by another ~~supposition~~ explanation, which is arrived at by reading the whole epistle; for it has been well said that to understand an epistle of Paul's, it should be read at one sitting; By reading it in this way, as it was intended to be, and as it was received by the church at Corinth, we learn that Paul had received information of the church at Corinth from the household of Chloe, and also in a letter from the church; that he is answering concerning the things whereof they wrote, and also reproving some ~~things~~ <sup>disorders</sup> of which he had been informed. The subject of spiritual gifts commences with the 12<sup>th</sup> chap; with the words "Now I would not have



you ignorant, brethren, concerning  
 spiritual gifts, and continues  
 through the 14<sup>th</sup> without digression.  
~~It is impossible to read these~~  
 chapters without believing, that eve-  
 ry Christian, without distinction  
 of sex, <sup>was equalled by every</sup> had a right to hope for  
 spiritual gifts, ~~and~~ <sup>as chapters</sup> and Dr. Broadus  
 admits that when <sup>women</sup> they did  
 possess them, Paul had already  
 conceded their right to use them  
 publicly. When then suddenly  
 we come to a denial to women  
 to speak in the church, and  
 that while ~~the~~ spiritual gifts is  
 still the unbroken theme of  
 the apostle's discourse, and  
 with no reason assigned which  
 would not condemn <sup>every</sup> the speaking  
~~even~~ of inspired women as a  
 breach of law, and a commission  
 of a shameful act, it is unac-







resurrection of the dead, because some of these Corinthians were saying that there is no resurrection of the dead. It was these Corinthians, still imperfectly converted from heathenism, that Paul, who were forbidding even women endowed with spiritual gifts to speak in the churches.

In the passage from [Tim. 2 chap 11-15] I agree with Dr. Broadus in thinking the apostle does not refer to the use of spiritual gifts, but to ordinary teaching in the church. But I disagree with him in thinking the interdiction was any thing more than local or temporary. Since the public ministry of women was authorized of God, in his dealings with the long line of prophetesses, and



confirmed by our Lord by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on them on the day of Pentecost, as well as other <sup>instances of</sup> spiritual gifts, it is evident that it would exceed the authority of any apostle to interdict it as unlawful or wrong; the utmost that he could do would be to pronounce it inexpedient at that time or place. "All things are lawful, but not all things are expedient," Paul writes once and again. He says (I, that is, Paul, not God) permit not a woman to teach; and apparently does so on his authority as a bishop, with reference only to expediency, basing his views, as Dr. Broadus points out, ~~with~~ upon facts connected with the creation, and the fall of Adam and Eve. But Dr. Broadus apparently does not observe that



Paul recognizes that his interdiction to women's teaching is only temporary or local, in his promise that they shall be "saved" from their incompetency, under certain circumstances, if they continued in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety." This promise is already so far fulfilled that all the churches of the present day admit the fitness of women as teachers, and are also beginning to admit their fitness for public ministry, particularly in the Sunday school and missionary field.

Dr. Broadus thinks that both of these passages, as well as others, enjoin the subjection of woman to man, and that it seems beyond question both that the Bible teaches woman's subjection, and that the apostle makes that his



special reason for the prohibition  
 of women's speaking to mixed  
 assemblies. As Dr Broadus does  
 not extend his article to ~~argue~~  
 show his arguments for woman's  
 subjection, I cannot follow  
 him on that <sup>question</sup> ~~subject~~, but will  
 say briefly that the W. C. T. U.  
 utters rejects the subjection  
 of woman as a Biblical doc-  
 trine, but believes that God's  
 plan is the equal rights of  
 both sexes and <sup>their</sup> co-ordination  
 in dominion, not the subjection  
 of one to the other. They ~~have~~  
 maintain the rights of women  
 to public speech by practice  
 as well as precept, and per-  
 haps the W. C. T. U. has trained  
 more public speakers among  
 women than any other organ-  
 ization, and the Spirit has borne



witness to their work by blessing it to the extension of Christ's Kingdom. So they are demonstrating their fitness for co-ordinate power with man in politics by the beneficent results of their interposition in the laws, ~~as far as their ~~semi-~~ power permits them~~ by the semi-political methods of ~~not~~ public agitation and <sup>petition</sup> ~~petition~~. Their success in obtaining police matrons, Sabbath observance and their help in local option elections are some instances that readily occur to us. But there is one instance that deserves special mention. See Imp. Instruction.

But I believe that God is using the W. C. T. U. as a training school to fit women for far greater patriotic usefulness than they have



have yet attained. To those who believe with Christian suffragists that the co-ordination of the sexes in government is nature's, God's plan, it cannot be observed without apprehension that democratic institutions as exhibited with woman disfranchised presents the most ~~complete~~ systematic separation of women from men in politics of any form of government; and that, because our republic is the most democratic, this ~~separation~~ ~~of~~ elimination of women ~~and~~ from the conduct of public affairs is <sup>by our own founders</sup> the most entire. Even in England, where government is so nearly democratic, woman has still considerable political power. The sovereign is a queen; the women of the aristocratic class have privileges as



well as the men. An instance of that  
 is just now attracting the attention  
 of the ~~World~~ <sup>European people</sup>. In the case of the  
 great <sup>English</sup> W. V. leader ~~in~~ Lady  
 Henry Somerset, she has ordered the  
 closing of all the saloons through-  
 out her vast landed estates, and if  
 her legal <sup>rights to do so</sup> power is <sup>maintained</sup> ~~proved~~ against the  
 injunctions which others interested  
 in the estate are bringing against  
 her, this one woman will have  
 the power to bestow prohibition  
 upon hundreds of her fellow crea-  
 tures. But our own grand Miss  
 Willard has not a fragment of  
 such power, and would not have  
 did she possess the wealth of a  
 Vanderbilt, because all our insti-  
 tutions are opposed to the exercise  
 of such power by any <sup>On the other hand</sup> class in  
 America, every male creature, not  
 debarr'd by deficiencies in intellect



or condemned for <sup>24</sup>crime,  
or ~~granted~~ is granted <sup>a voice</sup> ~~appreciable power~~  
in politics; while ~~not a fragment of~~ ~~political power~~ <sup>is being</sup> ~~is being~~ <sup>granted</sup> ~~is granted~~ <sup>to women</sup> ~~is granted~~  
~~matter~~ <sup>high</sup> ~~high~~ <sup>endowments</sup>, same in ~~two~~ <sup>the</sup>  
states. Such an division of women  
from men in any department  
of human affairs is unnatural;  
it is ominous. No department of  
society can remain healthy where  
the gentleness, the prudence, the law-  
adding spirit of women is wholly  
withheld. ~~Already there are indications~~  
~~that our country has pursued this~~  
~~policy beyond the danger line are~~  
~~pressing upon us. With~~ ~~human~~  
~~so~~ ~~natural~~ ~~resources~~ ~~as~~ ~~fitted~~ ~~to~~ ~~yield~~  
~~human~~ ~~unexampled~~ ~~abundance,~~  
with governmental institutions ~~pro-~~  
~~guaranteeing~~ ~~every~~ ~~creature~~ ~~but~~ ~~women~~ ~~equal~~  
rights and opportunities. The country  
is darkened with a ~~cloud~~ <sup>black</sup> ~~cloud~~ <sup>cloud</sup> of finan-  
cial depression, ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~signs~~ ~~of~~ ~~calamity~~ ~~upon~~  
~~it~~ ~~which~~ ~~is~~ ~~clearly~~ ~~seen~~







The admission of women to  
revolve around the sun & without shame in the result  
were they permitted to do so, men and women  
never did think like or act alike in the  
same circumstances, and never will. Slight  
as <sup>the</sup> differences ~~are~~, we have the right  
to believe, both from scripture and nature,  
that we can find in it the help we shall  
need to save us from the dangers that  
will eventually ~~be~~ <sup>overcome</sup> us from this unnatural  
~~separation of women from men~~ <sup>which this way of God</sup>  
grants to our statesmen to avail themselves  
of the help women can give, it will be found  
that the W. C. T. U. has already trained hun-  
dreds of thousands of women to conscientious  
intelligent political action.



Woman Suffrage in the  
W. C. T. U.

Speech delivered at Lexington

Chattanooga, July, 1894



post-1894  
(Speech to Women's  
Club of Central  
Kentucky?)

Laws of the State affecting  
Women as Wives, Mothers and  
Property Owners.

but before  
J. K. Henry  
left the  
organization  
(Ky. ERA)



Perhaps on seeing my subject on the programme for this department some of the members may have felt that it was one in which women could take only a passive, intellectual interest, because, though laws affect them very directly, they have been in the habit of accepting the decrees of legislatures very much as ~~in the~~ they accept the decrees of Providence, that is, with the thought that it is out of their province or power to alter them. ~~But my observation, on the contrary, is that the~~ But to my <sup>mind</sup>, my subject is an ~~also~~ intensely practical one as my experience of some years past leads me to believe that



To obtain a really intelligent comprehension of the laws, it is essential that along with a hearing of the facts of the law there shall be a measurement of them to see how nearly they conform to the objects of law, that is, to promote the welfare of the people, and to maintain justice in the relations between individuals. To judge of the ~~good~~ character of laws relating to women, I apprehend that we must constantly measure them by two. The laws of the state relating to women as wives, mothers and property holders are modifications of more general laws, so as to apply to the particular relations involved; and to rightly judge of the essential



43

what is most needed to elevate  
our laws, and ~~bring~~ <sup>raise</sup> them up  
to a high standard of justice  
to both sexes, is clear, broad  
careful,  
feminine thought, ~~and~~ Men  
need nothing so much as the aid  
of womanly ~~thought~~ judgment  
upon the difficult and knotty  
problems of how to adjust  
the laws so as to promote the  
welfare of the <sup>whole</sup> people, and to  
maintain justice between indivi-  
duals, and more particularly  
<sup>in the relations between</sup>  
between men and women, where  
<sup>at</sup> sometimes the complexity of the  
interests involved make an ap-  
parent conflict in the rights of  
the sexes.

~~With the hope in my heart  
Trusting that this Club may  
Believing that this Club can promote  
materially this elevated feminine  
thought, I have cheerfully accept-  
ed what might otherwise prove but  
a dry subject~~



qualities of the law requires  
a continual judgment of them  
by ~~the~~ two standards, <sup>one</sup> of general  
equity, and one of the rights of  
women as compared with men.  
For instance, the laws affecting wo-  
men as mothers immediately  
~~bring up the thought, Is the~~  
~~law good as it affects~~ <sup>be judged as good or bad</sup> ~~these~~  
rights and duties of parentage?  
and again, ~~Is the law good as it~~  
affects the rights and duties of  
motherhood in contradistinction  
to fatherhood?



under twelve years <sup>2</sup> of age.

Any Such marriages ~~as any~~  
of these ~~are~~ prohibited and  
declared void.

Besides these, Courts having general equity jurisdiction may declare void a marriage obtained by fraud or force, or at the instance of any next friend, where the male was under sixteen or the female under fourteen years of age at the time of the marriage, and the marriage was without the consent of the father, mother, guardian, or other person having the proper charge of his or her person, and has not been ratified by cohabitation after that age. ¶

This difference of two years of age in the female and



Beginning with the laws affecting marriage,  
The laws of Kentucky forbid the  
In this Conn  
marriage of blood relations near-  
er than first cousins. Some  
states forbid the marriage of  
first cousins, and attempts  
have been made from time  
to time to have legislation for-  
bidding it in this state, but so  
far without success. ~~The~~  
Marriage is forbidden <sup>in the follow-</sup> ~~with~~ an  
<sup>every case,</sup> idiot or lunatic; 2 between a  
white person and a negro or mu-  
latto; 3 where there is a husband  
or wife living, from whom the  
person marrying has not been  
divorced; 4 when not solemn-  
ized or contracted in the  
presence of an authorized  
person or society; 5 when, at  
the time of marriage, the male  
is under fourteen, or the female



in these cases  
the male, is the only dif-  
ference the law recognizes  
between the sexes in the  
right of contracting marri-  
age. This difference is founded  
upon the supposed earlier phy-  
sical development of the fe-  
male, though I believe ~~such~~  
~~this~~ <sup>such earlier development</sup> is not an accepted fact  
among physiologists.

~~When we turn to~~ The statutes  
which define the offenses  
which permit the marriage  
contract to be dissolved by di-  
vorce <sup>class them in four categories.</sup> The first cat-  
egory <sup>enumerates</sup> two causes for  
~~which both parties may obtain a~~  
divorce; six causes divorce may  
be given to both parties; <sup>the second</sup> six causes  
causes, ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> the party not in  
fault; <sup>the third</sup> three, to the wife, where  
not in like fault; and <sup>the fourth</sup> three  
to the husband, two of them whether



er he is in <sup>4</sup> like fault or not.  
It is only with ~~the first~~ <sup>category</sup> these last that I  
will call your particular at-  
tention, as they are ~~marked~~  
because they are examples of  
the double moral standard, ~~as~~  
~~accepted~~ <sup>supposed</sup> so fatal to any true mo-  
rality, ~~and~~ <sup>confusing</sup> the moral percep-  
tion and vitiating the whole  
moral atmosphere.

~~One of these permits divorce to the  
wife when not in like fault.~~

~~One of these; To the wife, when not  
in like fault; Confirmed habit  
of drunkenness on the part of  
the husband of not less than  
one year's duration, accompa-  
nied with a wasting of his es-  
tate, and without any suita-  
ble provision for the mainte-  
nance of his wife or children.  
On the other side, the nearest par-~~



The first is, <sup>5</sup>  
~~the second is:~~ To the husband, when  
not in like fault; Habitual  
drunkenness on the part of  
the wife of not less than one  
year's duration.

Again, to the husband, whether  
he is in like fault or not; Adul-  
tery by the wife or such  
kind, lascivious behavior on  
her part as proves her to be  
unchaste, without actual  
proof of an act of adul-  
tery.

The wife has no similar  
protection against the <sup>similar</sup> un-  
faithfulness of the husband.  
~~All that she has in found~~  
~~in the category though from more~~  
~~aggravated forms she is protect~~  
etc



The nearest parallel to this for  
the wife's protection is; To the  
wife, when not in like fault:  
Confirmed habit of drunken-  
ness on the part of the hus-  
band of not less than one year's  
duration, accompanied with a  
wasting of his estate, and with-  
out any suitable provision for  
the maintenance of his wife  
or children.

The second <sup>in the category is</sup> ~~unequal provision is~~; To  
the husband, whether he is in  
like fault or not; "Adultery by  
the wife, or such lewd, lascivious  
behavior on her part as proves  
her to be unchaste, without <sup>an</sup> actual  
proof of an act of adultery."

The wife has no protection a-  
gainst the similar unfaithful-  
ness of the husband; though  
from more aggravated forms



7  
as well as the husband.  
she is protected by the <sup>two</sup> provisions  
second category, To party not in fault; serv-  
ing in adultery with another man  
or woman; and, concealment  
from the other party of any  
loathsome disease existing at  
the time of marriage, or con-  
tracting such afterward.

When we come to the laws  
relating to women as mothers,  
and not the utter disregard of the rights  
I confess that I find difficult  
of motherhood,  
in expressing myself with  
moderation; and perhaps I  
should not care to try to do  
so if I were not thoroughly  
convinced by the experience I  
~~have had in trying to have~~  
~~these laws corrected~~ I have  
had with lawyers, intelligent  
<sup>fair-minded</sup> lawyers, men, and legislators during some  
years past, that in these laws  
our legislators have erred far



more through their ignorance  
of the <sup>maternal heart</sup> actual wishes of mothers  
about the matter, and their  
inherent inability to take a  
feminine view of the subject,  
than through <sup>careless indifference</sup> ~~designed injus-~~  
tice <sup>for the or misery of women</sup> and selfish love of power.  
That the laws stand as they  
are is the fault of women equal  
ly with men, <sup>because</sup> ~~through~~ women  
have <sup>been far too apathetic and negli-</sup> ~~borne a~~ <sup>gent in expressing their disapproval of</sup>  
~~part in the~~ <sup>laws unjust to their sex.</sup> ~~men.~~

As this subject is worthy of very  
careful study, I shall state  
the theory of the law, as <sup>exactly</sup> ~~nearly~~  
as I can, and then how it is  
carried out in practice.

The theory of the law is that  
the State itself is the guar-  
dian of every child born in  
it, and is charged with the du-  
ty of proper <sup>care</sup> oversight for its safety.



nurture and education, and of  
 oversight of <sup>care for</sup> its estate, if it possesses  
 any. <sup>+ But in ordinary cases, however,</sup> For obvious reasons, this  
 duty of <sup>enatchment</sup> must be delegated, and  
<sup>deposed</sup> placed upon individuals or courts.  
 The law, therefore, ~~follows~~ <sup>regards</sup> the  
 line of natural <sup>ties</sup> and devolves  
 the custody, nurture and edu-  
 cation of the child, ~~as a~~ ward,  
 upon the <sup>its</sup> parent. I say, ~~the~~  
 parent, because <sup>ordinarily</sup> ~~in general~~  
 the law does not recognize  
~~the natural fact that every~~  
~~but one parent, and that the~~  
~~child has two parents; but~~  
~~father,~~  
~~takes cognizance only of the~~  
~~existence of its father; only~~  
 and always excepting the  
 case of a child whose mother  
 of the poor, despised woman  
 whose offspring is the sign



+9.

These duties it performs through its courts of law; and the exercise of the supreme right of the state over ~~the~~ children is evidenced in the case of ~~homeless~~ destitute orphans ~~and~~ or of neglected or vagrant children; for when such cases are brought to the <sup>cognizance</sup> notice of courts, they take measures to remove them from such destitute or demoralizing surroundings, and place them in <sup>homes,</sup> asylums, reformatories or similar institutions.



of her shame. Though legislators  
 have had ample opportunity  
 to do so, they have never shown  
 any disposition to ~~assist~~  
~~that the father is the only~~  
~~to assist the~~ <sup>ignore</sup> ~~rights~~ <sup>rights</sup> ~~of unmarried mothers,~~  
~~of unmarried mothers in favor~~  
 and place the ~~recognition~~ <sup>by</sup> ~~guardianship~~  
 upon <sup>the</sup> ~~fathers~~ the guardianship  
 of their children of unmarried  
 mothers. With married mothers,  
 it is different. ~~If live it is~~  
~~no~~ <sup>of unmarried mothers</sup> ~~axag~~ <sup>unmarried</sup> in favor of the fathers, but  
 unmarried mothers are invested  
 with the same rights of guar-  
 dianship as married fathers.  
 With married mothers it is  
 different. I cannot so force-  
 bly express the insignificance  
 in which they are held as  
 by reading extracts from  
 the statutes concerning Guardianship



and Ward.

~~of the father~~

"~~Sec. 2033~~. The father of the minor, if living, or, if dead, the mother, if united to the trust, shall be allowed by the court to have the custody, nurture and education of the ward." Think of this, women, you who have been in the habit of supposing that ~~womanhood~~ <sup>womanhood</sup> was an office honored by the state from their office of motherhood. "If united for the trust," ~~they~~ she may have the custody of her own child. But not in all cases, however, even if the father be dead, and the mother is united to the trust. For a dead father has more rights than a living mother, as is seen by ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~contracts~~ <sup>contracts</sup>:

"Any father may, by will, ap-



point a guardian to his infant child during its minority or for any less period, and may appoint the guardianship of the infant's estate to one, and the custody, nurture and education of the infant to another."

You observe that the father is not placed under the slightest constraint to ~~place the infant~~ <sup>appoint the mother</sup> in the custody, nurture and education of the ~~infant~~.

Further, <sup>we read</sup> In appointing a guardian, the court shall pay proper attention to the following order of precedence in right, and not depart therefrom, unless it deems that prudence and the interest of the infant so require:

First, The father, or testamentary guardian of his appointing.

Secondly, The mother, if unmarried;



and Thirdly, <sup>13</sup> The next of kin,  
giving preference to males.

Notice this provision, also, under the  
Chapter of "Wills":

"No person under twenty-one  
years of age can make a will,  
except in pursuance of a power  
specially given to that effect,  
and except, also, that a father,  
though under twenty-one years  
of age, may appoint by will a  
guardian to his child."

<sup>Sayley</sup> This is the culmination of the injury to mother  
The law strains a point to ex-  
tend a father's <sup>so-called</sup> precedence in right,  
if a man dying under twenty-one  
possesses a calf, he may not  
dispose of it by will, but if he  
leaves a child, is a father, his  
immaturity may not ~~deprive~~  
prevent his appointing a guardian  
whose right to the custody, nur-  
ture and education of the child is  
superior to and may supersede



that of  
the mother.

14

In the exercise of this ~~delegated~~  
right of guardianship ~~from the~~  
~~state~~, undivided with the mother,  
a father has the sole direction  
of ~~all~~ his child's life, the mother's  
wishes being consulted only so far  
as he ~~chooses~~. ~~He alone chooses~~  
if he is in humble circumstances  
and hires out or apprentices the  
child, he ~~chooses~~ <sup>alone decides</sup> the employment  
and surroundings, <sup>as to whether they are</sup> and the wages  
come to him exclusively moral, or  
healthful, or happy for the child,  
and he alone receives its wages.  
~~He alone~~ If in better circumstances  
he alone may direct the educa-  
tion of the child, choosing its resi-  
dence, its school and the moral  
or ~~religious~~ <sup>religious</sup> training and ~~best~~  
it <sup>must</sup> shall receive. It is always  
within his legal right to remove



the child at his pleasure from  
 the custody and nurture of the  
 mother, and to place it with  
 whomsoever he ~~pleases~~ chooses; and  
<sup>if he pleases</sup> by will, he is permitted to depute  
 all the rights to a guardian of  
 his appointing. It is terrible to  
 think of the sufferings a moth-  
 er may have to endure from the  
 misguided ~~fat.~~ exercise of these un-  
 restricted power by a misguided  
 husbands though ~~even~~ when ~~they~~  
 are ~~well~~ <sup>well</sup> ~~meanings~~ <sup>meanings</sup>; ~~care~~ <sup>care</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~them~~  
 and ~~just~~ <sup>well</sup> ~~meanings~~ <sup>meanings</sup>; ~~care~~ <sup>care</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~them~~  
 towards ~~them~~ <sup>and their children,</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> ~~use~~ <sup>use</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~them~~  
 but ~~who~~ <sup>who</sup> ~~can~~ <sup>can</sup> ~~tell~~ <sup>tell</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~possibilities~~ <sup>possibilities</sup>  
~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~miseries~~ <sup>miseries</sup> ~~when~~ <sup>when</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~fathers~~ <sup>fathers</sup> ~~were~~ <sup>were</sup>  
~~depraved~~ <sup>depraved</sup> and selfish, or when  
 they used their authority over her  
 children with indifference to their  
<sup>mothers'</sup> happiness and even with the  
 distinct intention of torturing  
 them through their maternal af-



fictional ~~case~~ among the darkest realities  
of human life! 16

The protection the law affords to  
mothers ~~women~~ against the abuse of these  
powers by fathers, is inadequate  
~~and hard to obtain in every case~~  
~~in every~~ <sup>always</sup>, and in many  
of the worst ~~cases~~ <sup>instances</sup> wholly un-  
available. As long as the parties  
~~remain together as~~ <sup>the</sup> husband and  
wife, ~~without either~~ <sup>remaining together</sup> ~~sepa~~ legal  
separation or divorce, there is  
no ~~any~~ clear provision for the  
defence of the mother, though  
perhaps a lawyer might find  
some in the intricacies of the law.  
~~in some aggravated cases.~~  
I was informed of ~~an instance~~  
in point <sup>reported</sup> last spring, <sup>in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~city~~ <sup>city</sup>  
since been made public. The case  
was that of a respectable <sup>but poor</sup> woman  
in this city, whose husband, with-  
out any intimation of his inten-  
tion to her, took one of the chil-  
dren, a boy ~~of~~ <sup>between</sup> five ~~and~~  
seven years of age, and placed



it in the care of his mother  
 in Texas; while ~~the man~~<sup>he</sup>, leaving  
 his family here, ~~went~~ lived in  
 Cincinnati with a worthless  
 woman. The mother was in a  
 distracted state over the loss  
 of her child, but as she  
 did not wish to take legal  
 steps to separate ~~from~~ divorce  
 her ~~husband~~ self from her hus-  
 band, it was not evident what  
 relief she could obtain. ~~The grand~~<sup>The grand</sup>  
 was that ~~the grandmother would~~<sup>mother would</sup> to her to  
~~take care of the child.~~<sup>the care of the</sup>  
~~She~~<sup>The</sup> mother had to collect  
 money for the ~~child~~<sup>child</sup> from sympathizing  
 friends and now has the child ~~until the father~~<sup>until the father</sup>  
 chooses to take it away again.  
 When husband and wife are  
 legally separated or divorced,  
 the court decides which parent  
 shall have the custody of the  
 children, regarding the interest  
 of the children in the decision.  
 But the presumption is always  
 in favor of the father, and



if he visits the <sup>18</sup> courts assigning the  
children to the mother,  
a clear case must be made out  
that ~~she~~ has morally or finan-  
cially ~~unfitness~~ <sup>unfitness</sup> for the charge  
of the children before the  
mother's superior claim is al-  
lowed, no matter if she is wholly "swept  
<sup>to the trust."</sup>  
The inadequacy of these <sup>law-free</sup> provisions  
for the protection of the mother  
<sup>appears</sup> is shown in the facts that as  
long as the parties remain togeth-  
er no security of the mother's  
right is given at all, ~~unless~~  
in very aggravated cases, and  
~~then only~~ <sup>through</sup> through an ap-  
peal to the court, which is a  
relief practically out of the  
reach of the women who  
most need it. When these are  
proceedings for legal separa-  
tion or divorce are begun or  
threatened, if the father has  
all the presumption of the



law on his side; and if he has reason to anticipate that this will not suffice, he can in many instances easily defeat the law by removing the child from the custody of the mother and transferring it to another state before the court has taken action. After the child is <sup>over</sup> out of the state (and his legal right to take it where he pleases is unimpeachable until there is a decree of court to the contrary) it would take years of tedious and expensive litigation to compel him to return it, if he was disinclined to do so. Practically, therefore, the mother has no right guaranteed to her by the law.



20. ~~are not~~ ~~make some of~~  
~~the darkest realities~~  
life. It is no excuse for these  
iniquitous laws <sup>to say</sup> that there is  
little temptation ~~for~~ men for a  
buse of these power, and that they  
is rarely done. Law is meant  
~~to restrain~~ is not needed is  
meant for the restraint of the  
and there is no legal cruelty ~~is~~ shielded by  
law ~~too~~ ~~precious~~ for some bad man to practice,  
a position to say such power  
is rarely abused, for since relief  
is so precious and long delayed, there is every  
reason for women to keep these sorrows secret, and  
there is <sup>from time to time</sup> a revelation of heart  
rending misery endured by a moth-  
er under the threat of the hus-  
band to use this oppressive pow-  
er, and the <sup>her</sup> mother's wretchedness  
was never made public until  
<sup>perhaps after years of suffering</sup>  
either it became beyond endu-  
rance, or some circumstance  
occurred to enable her to throw



Her tyranny with impunity.

Women are reduced to pitiable straits to escape the ~~hardships~~<sup>severity</sup> of the laws. ~~So~~ I have observed instances reported in the papers such as a woman denying that she had ever been married to the man who was trying to rob her of her child; Another, ~~declaring~~ perjuring herself as was believed by the neighbors who accounted her a virtuous woman, by swearing in her desperation that her husband was not the father of her child. When I was in South Carolina, these <sup>giving the children's</sup> ~~early~~ were mentioned to me as one reason why the negro women were so lax about entering marriage. Among ~~It~~<sup>It is</sup> a too common occurrence for the negro husbands to ~~leave~~<sup>neglect</sup> the children to the ~~superior~~ upon



the wives as long as they were  
 probably deserting her in the mean-  
 while, small, and when they <sup>children</sup> were  
 large enough to work, to assert  
 their rights, <sup>to their face, and through</sup> under the law, so the  
~~women were not so willing as~~  
~~they might have been, to enter~~  
~~the bonds of matrimony, and~~  
 as the laws of that state do not  
 permit <sup>every</sup> the miserable relief of  
 divorce, the negro women ~~preferred~~  
~~not~~ were not so willing to <sup>risk</sup> enter  
 the bonds of matrimony, which  
 required so much and gave so  
 little as they might <sup>be</sup> otherwise have  
~~been~~. This struck me as an un-  
 expected outcropping of the  
 demoralization caused by an un-  
 just law. Surely if women, Chris-  
 tian women, would once open  
 their minds to see that ~~if~~ <sup>through</sup> they  
 themselves may not ~~likely~~ suffer  
 from a law unjust to their



23

Let no woman "lay the flat-  
tering unction to her soul" that if  
<sup>because</sup> a law unjust to her sex ~~does~~ <sup>may</sup> not  
force its evil consequences upon  
her in her own case or in her  
circle of acquaintance that it is  
~~perhaps~~ not very harmful. She  
may be sure that somewhere,  
secretly or openly, it is doing  
its deadly work of carrying  
<sup>misery</sup> and degradation to her  
sister woman.

The remedy for all this injustice  
and misery is a comparatively  
simple amendment of the Law;  
of which the principal features  
are; granting to father and mo-  
ther equal <sup>or co-</sup> guardianship of chil-  
dren, making their rights equal,  
and forbidding, under a penalty,  
either one or the other from rema-  
ving a child from the custody of



the other, without <sup>the</sup> due process of law.

In happy and well regulated families the <sup>infringement</sup> difference of the law would never be perceived, for <sup>equality</sup> that is the rule of conduct now.

Where there is not <sup>perfect</sup> unity between the parents, ~~both~~ the father would be more equitable conciliatory in his requirements, knowing that in the last resort he would have to justify his actions to a judge other than himself, and the wife would be more patient, secure in the assurance that her rights could never be seriously infringed ~~upon~~, because, when necessary, she could be protected by law. So co-guardianship would remove cause of dissension between parents, rather than <sup>produce</sup> ~~cause~~ them, as it sometimes asserted. The principal



thing needed, as I believe, to effect this wholesome change in the Kentucky law, after <sup>as has been</sup> the exam-  
 ple of <sup>some</sup> ~~light~~ or nine other states, is to ~~bring~~ <sup>an</sup> enlighten <sup>ment</sup> the public mind upon the subject, and to get such an expression from the women as will convince our legislators of what ~~is~~ is their intelligent wish.

It is interesting to club women <sup>+</sup> to notice that in ~~Denver~~, Colorado the Denver Woman's Club, consisting of six hundred women, have a ~~legislative~~ legal department which spent the whole of last season in studying three bills which they wished presented to the Legislature. And now, the chairman of the legal department, <sup>Mrs. M. A. B. Conner,</sup> has been elected to the legislature, no doubt partly by the



votes of her fellow-club women. That is a pretty effective way of bringing their opinions to bear upon legislation, which our Woman's Club of Central Kentucky ~~is yet~~ <sup>lacks</sup> lacking. Yet we are not without some influence on popular opinion, which in a way suited to our methods can be used to improve the legislation for our sex.

When we come to the last division and inspect the laws relating to women as property owners, the view is vastly more cheerful, for women have been at work and have spoken for themselves, with the effect of wonderfully ameliorating the law. The Equal Kentucky Equal Rights Association claims for



27  
itself the credit of being the  
instrument for obtaining three  
great ameliorations of property  
laws for women. The first in  
1890, ~~the law~~ <sup>the act</sup> which gave wives  
the sole right to their own wages,  
and the Acts of 1893 and 1894,  
which effected changes which  
I am going to describe by  
quoting the words of the late  
Hon. Royal Wisinger, since he  
writes with professional accu-  
racy, which I cannot emulate.



Hon. Poyet Weisinger distinctly disclaims, in the admirable article from which I have read, the authorship of this now famous bill of 1874. And yet the Woman's Club of Louisville are proposing to erect a monument to his memory in honor of it. Probably a detailed history of the whole movement that finally led to this noble act of justice to Ky. women may be of interest at this time. The Ky. C. R. A. commenced work for equal property rights in the legislature of 1870, and ~~while every member~~ no one member being so prominent in it as Mrs. Josephine K. Henry, who is the Superintendent of Legislative



work. Though <sup>2<sup>d</sup></sup> the efforts of the  
Association Judge William Lindsay,  
then a state senator, was interest-  
ed in the cause, and brought into  
the senate a very liberal bill,  
which he defen advocated with  
splendid eloquence. It was ~~def~~  
carried through the Senate, but  
was defeated in the House. The  
C. R. A. continued its labors  
through the Com. Con., winning  
the co-operation of many of  
its most distinguished members,  
but without any positive  
results. In the long legislature  
of 92-93, however, we obtained  
the great advance of securing  
to women the ~~proceeds~~ <sup>income from</sup> her  
real estate, and the right of  
married women to make a  
will. When the legislature  
of 1894 met, the Com. from the  
C. R. A. went as usual to Frank.



part, and Mrs. Henry made  
a very eloquent speech for  
equal property rights. ~~After it~~  
At its close, numbers of the  
members crowded around  
her, declaring that they  
would vote for such a bill.  
And they nobly redeemed  
their word. Shortly afterwards  
Judge S. B. Vance brought in  
a very liberal bill, <sup>in the House.</sup> ~~on the~~  
main the same as the ~~pre-~~  
defeated one of Judge Lindsay.  
Judge Becknor had previously  
brought in a less liberal one,  
but he, in a very noble speech,  
declared that he preferred  
Judge Vance's, would work and  
vote for it, and would with-  
draw his, unless the legisla-  
ture were not yet ready for  
one so liberal as Judge Vance's.



The legislative<sup>31</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>are</sup> were ready, how-  
ever, and passed it by the  
magnificent majority of 79  
to 14. It then went to the Senate,  
where it underwent considerable  
amendment, taking away  
some what of its liberality.  
This displeased the House, and the  
Senate amendments were re-  
jected. The Senate then asked  
for a joint committee of the  
Senate and House, which was ap-  
pointed and the bill referred  
to it. In the meanwhile, the ene-  
mies of the bill in the Senate  
had rallied their forces, ~~so that~~  
and added some to their side, so  
when the joint committee re-  
ported, the Senate rejected their  
report. All seemed now lost,  
and in all probability would  
have been, but for the circum-  
stance that Mrs. Henry's elo-



32  
queen had so pleased the  
members that some of them  
had invited her to return and  
give them an address on a  
general subject. This invita-  
tion she accepted, choosing  
for her subject American Citi-  
zenship, I believe. Just at  
the time, then, that our bill  
seemed lost, Mrs. Henry went  
to Brauffort to make this ad-  
dress, and though she did not  
allude to property rights, her  
speech roused our friends to  
make another effort. And now  
here comes a very interesting,  
almost romantic, instance  
of the power a knowledge of  
parliamentary law sometimes  
has. Gen. W. W. Stephenson, who  
had always been the friend of  
the bill, bet thought himself



of a Congressional ~~precedent~~ <sup>par-</sup>liamentary precedent which applied to the case. The enemies in the Senate had supposed the bill was killed, because more than a week had passed since the report of the Joint Committee had been rejected. But now Sen. Stephenson, <sup>armed with this Congressional precedent</sup> went to the friends in the House, pointed out that it was better to have a law not so liberal as they desired, rather than none at all, and urged them to reconsider the Senate amendments which they had rejected. They consented, called up the bill for reconsideration, and passed it triumphantly much to the surprise and consternation of its enemies in the Senate, who found themselves helpless, however, to



34.  
opposed it. The session was so  
far advanced that there was  
barely the constitutionally re-  
quired time for its enrollment,  
and the Gen. Assembly adjourned  
before Gen. Brown, who had  
always favored it, had time  
to sign it; but he took pains  
to do so before the ten days'  
limit of the law had expired;  
and the bill stands today a  
glorious testimony of the jus-  
tice of Kentucky men, and, I  
may add, a testimonial of  
what women can do to im-  
prove legislation for their  
sex when they turn to it  
their attention and efforts.



I believe <sup>H.H.</sup> legislators will  
cheerfully, ~~even gratefully~~, ac-  
cept assistance from women  
on such points, when they  
~~are convinced~~ or concede to  
their petitions, when they are  
convinced that their suggest-  
ions are given after acqui-  
ring a fair knowledge of the  
subject, and proceed from an  
honest desire to promote jus-  
tice and not mere personal  
ends. With this conviction in  
my mind, and in the assu-  
rance that this Club can  
make valuable contributions  
to this much needed feminine  
thought, I have ~~cheerfully~~ wil-  
lingly accepted what might  
otherwise be a dry subject.