

will soon show you what class of women will govern this nation.

Nor will female suffrage affect the question of female labor. For the prices of labor must follow the laws of trade, and with these voting has nothing to do. But could legislation regulate the wages of labor, is there any reason to suppose, our author inquires, that woman would be more disposed than man to pay higher wages to women? Every one who has traded much with women will join in her "I fear not."

Legislation, war, taxation, nothing to do with the laws of trade! We recommend Gail and her reviewer to a deeper consideration of this whole question of political economy, and they will find that the political status of the laborer has a good deal to do with his work and wages. The ballot in the hands of the southern laborer changes the law of southern trade. Instead of the lash for his unrequited toil, he to-day works for wages, and makes his own contract. With the right to all the offices under government, to the colleges, law schools, theological seminaries, medical schools and hospitals, which the ballot gives, who does not see that the ranks of school teachers and sewing women would be thinned out at once, and the wages of those who remained necessarily increased? Whatever women might do for each other, the laws of trade will secure equal wages to all not depressed in the market by artificial conditions. What gives point to the strikes of working men? The ballot that lies behind them. Why are laborers more dignified in this country than in the Old World? Because they have a voice in the government with the ballot they hold in their hand, the key to all the advantages and opportunities of life.

Nor will the right to suffrage raise woman in the social scale. The intelligent, cultivated woman, stands no lower in her own eyes or in the eyes of men, because of her political disability. The frivolous and vain would not be elevated were the disability removed. The first does not need the ballot as an incentive to exertion and self-culture; and if the exciting questions of the times fail to arouse the apathy of the latter, it is to be feared that going to the polls would prove insufficient. "Mobs and rowdies have always voted, and are mobs and rowdies still." The suggestion of the fat offices which the possession of the ballot would open to woman, Gail repels with an indignant "Get thee behind me, Satan."

The right of suffrage simply represents the divine idea of equality, taught in our new religion by Jesus, and echoed by the fathers in the theory of our government.

The moment you disfranchise any class you make an invidious distinction that degrades those thus ostracised, not only in their own eyes, but in the eyes of those in the superior position.

If women are not degraded in the eyes of men, how shall we account for the insulting laws on their statute books, their interpretations of Holy Writ—for Todd's pamphlet—for their treatment of our famous sculptor, Harriet Hosmer, who knocked in vain at the doors of their colleges for a course of lectures on anatomy—for their insolence to Dr. Mercy B. Jackson, in denying her the right to become a member of the Homeopathic Association of Physicians in Boston? Surely, these are not evidences of man's respect for woman. And if there are women in this nation who, knowing all these things, can read Coke, Blackstone, Story and Kent, without feeling the degradation of their whole sex, without an honest burst of indignation, we say they are lacking in the essential elements of true womanhood.

As to Gail's "Get thee behind me, Satan," we ask, would you rather be mistress of some fashionable rone, and live on his bounty, or postmistress on \$5,000 a year, and live on your

own industry, in virtue and independence? It is as honorable to serve the nation faithfully as it is the family and the home—no more, no less.

E. C. A.

WHAT THE PRESS SAYS OF US.

From the New York Citizen (Miles O'Reilly).

BRAINS, BONNETS, BABIES AND BALLOTS.

It will be an important step in the progress of society when women arrive at that state of mind which will induce them to pay more attention to their brains than to their bonnets, and to give more thought to their babies than to ballots. There is scarcely a doubt that the prevailing passion for fashionable display in dress absorbs much of the time which should be devoted to the improvement of the mind and to maternal duties. It has come to pass among women in our day, that the demands of fashion are inimical to the moral obligations imposed on the marriage state. The palpable duties of maternity are ignored for the frivolous gratification of frequenting the fashionable promenade in tight-fitting dresses and costly bonnets. The substantial treasures of the study are abandoned for the stupid frivolities of the boudoir, and society in consequence is overwhelmed with a nauseous flood of superficiality. It is idle to endeavor to conceal the vast amount of mischief effected in the world by the inordinate love of display that has grown up among us—carrying families down to ruin, and causing them to neglect many noble and virtuous duties.

Quite equal in its baleful effects on marital and social obligations is the passion for enfranchisement, at present animating the breasts of certain ladies with masculine proclivities. It seems almost incredible that as a matter of choice any woman should prefer the luxury of wielding a ballot to that of nursing a baby. The most potent source of woman's power is to be found in the nurture and training of her children, and the influence which a true woman will never fail to exert over her husband, her brother, or her friends. She will seldom seek in vain for noble representatives in these if she proves herself worthy of them. Then there are national considerations which the self-sacrifice of woman should not permit her to overlook. The country needs babies more than ballots, at this time; especially when we take into account our recent acquisitions from the negro ranks. It is of infinitely more importance that the ladies should have brains and babies than that they should flaunt bonnets and ballots. What say those talented and progressive ladies, including Parker Pillsbury, who edit "THE REVOLUTION?"

Now, Miles, pray do not mix things up in this unaccountable way. The strong and weak-minded have each their idiosyncrasies. To clear up your vision on this question, let us analyze and arrange for you the facts of life. On one side behold ballots, brains and babies. On the other, bonnets, balls, brocades, buchu and barrenness.

The women who demand the ballot are those who have brains and babies, who believe in one husband; in clean, comfortable, well-ordered homes; in healthy, happy children, and in the dignity and self-respect of those who serve the household—women who do not follow fashion or frivolity, but spend their leisure hours in works of charity and reform—in reading, writing, and healthy exercise. Every woman identified with our cause, except Susan B. Anthony, is married; nearly all have large families, and all alike are remarkable for vigor of mind and body. These women dress plainly, live simply, understand the science of government, political and domestic economy, and are at this moment the salt of the nation; trying to dignify labor and secure virtue, by urging on all women the duty of self-support; trying to purify and perpetuate the family relation, by pressing on men a new code of morals; trying to redeem the church by teaching practical Christianity; and trying to exalt the state by pressing on our statesmen the principles of justice and equality. Take a tour of inspection, Mr. O'Reilly, into the homes and habits of the

"strong-minded," before you again allow your pen to lay at our doors any of the follies or vices of that class of women moulded after man's ideal.

Remember the supply is ever equal to the demand. In the vice, vacuity and vanity of the weak-minded women of our day, behold, oh! men of the republic, your own handiwork.

From the Convention-day Journal, St. Louis.

"THE REVOLUTION."—This paper, devoted to Woman's Rights principally, is having good success. Probably there are few Spiritualists but sympathize with and endorse the views of its editors on the question of Woman's Rights, and we are sure its largest patronage comes from the members of our societies. Our lecturers are the most eloquent agitators on that subject that it has. A few of them make it almost a specialty, doing great service in the cause.

Yes, the Spiritualists have done much to advance the cause of woman and every other cause, by leading people to think and examine for themselves. We have indeed a good list of subscribers from St. Louis.

From the Newburgh Daily Journal.

"THE REVOLUTION."—We have received the fourteenth number of this zealous and aggressive advocate of "Woman's Rights." It is edited by Mrs. Stanton and Parker Pillsbury, who battle away "manfully" for what they think justice requires to be added to the "womanly" stature. Every aspect of the subject is treated with vigor and ability, but, naturally, not always with discretion. It is believed, by this school of reformers, apparently, that their work is that of challenging public attention by the boldness and audacity of their innovations and pretensions, and not always to consider either the desirability or feasibility of the "reforms" for which they demonstrate. The consequence is that they often wound and retard the cause they would advance. "THE REVOLUTION," however, furnishes its readers much that is valuable, and gives to the advocates of the doctrines which it espouses the advantage of having them presented by able writers and through a medium which must be recognized as authority upon these matters. "THE REVOLUTION" also grapples with public questions outside of those pertaining more especially to the "rights" and "wrong" of woman, and discusses politics, finance, and social topics, of every aspect.

If all these friends who criticise our mode of warfare will "wound the cause" the same way we do, we shall soon have the world ablaze on the question. If you have any fault to find, tell us precisely what it is. If there are any flaws in arguments or principles, show them up. We hate generalisms and mysterious warnings and doubtings.

From the Laws of Life, Danville, N. Y.

"THE REVOLUTION," is the name of a weekly paper started at the beginning of this year, which advocates "educated suffrage, irrespective of sex or color; equal pay to women for equal work; eight hours labor," etc. Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the leading editor, is, by native talent, education, and experience, as competent to treat these subjects as any woman living, in this or any other country.

From the Memorial and Rock, Plymouth, Mass.

"THE REVOLUTION."—This sprightly paper, under the management of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, is making quite a stir in journalism. It discusses public matters in a spicy manner, and proves conclusively that for caustic sharpness and pointed pungency, a woman's pen fully maintains the reputation of her tongue.

From the Scholarie Republican.

"THE REVOLUTION."—"Principle, not policy, justice, not favors. Men, their rights and nothing more: Women, their rights and nothing less." Such is the title and such the motto of the organ of the "Women's Rights" party. It is sprightly, spicy and readable. Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Parker Pillsbury; Susan B. Anthony, Proprietor.

From the New York Atlas.

"THE REVOLUTION" exhibits pluck as well as ability. The force and freedom with which it discusses topics of vital importance, that are too often tabooed by false delicacy, deserve the warmest praise.

"THE REVOLUTION."—A number of this paper has