

LETTER FROM GERMANY.

Translation.

"THE REVOLUTION" sweeps over land and sea, waking voices everywhere. We have just received the following eloquent responsive echo from a lady in Germany. Truly our journal was only up to time. We gladly greet our German contemporary, and accept the proffer of an exchange.

HONORED EDITORS OF "REVOLUTION": Permit a German lady, who since her earliest days of girlhood, and during the past twenty-five years has struggled for the rights of our sex, to extend to you across the ocean the sisterly hand, and to joyously salute you as a promoter of our cause.

Between 1849 and 1862 I edited a journal for women, but it became a victim of the predominating reaction, and although the state of affairs has advanced so far now, that it became possible for me again during the past three years to start anew as well a journal for the women's question under the title "Neue Bahnen" (New Paths) as the "General German Club for Women" we are still so very much behind in Germany, and so surrounded with prejudices, that I, in order to procure access for our ideas, have to proceed in the most cautious manner, and in fact I only dare to express our desires and objects under the American banner; that is, I always like to point out how in America they are ahead of us, and how much there is done by and for women, so as to show our German sisters how much we are behind, and how moderate our demands are, though they are considered here as very bold!

Convinced that it is of value as well to you as to me to be posted in regard to the women's movements of other countries, I propose an exchange of our papers, and in order to bring more before the eyes of the Germans the example of the American women, you would confer a favor upon me by taking notice of our effort in your paper.

With sincere sisterly greeting, I am, yours most obediently,
 LOUISE OTTO. PETERS.
 Leipzig, Seitenstrasse, No. 1, 15th 6 mo., 1868.

TO MY FRIEND IN RHODE ISLAND.

"DEAR MRS. KIRK: Many read your articles in "THE REVOLUTION" with considerable reliab. I have felt constrained for some time to write and ask you a few questions which I have vainly tried to answer for a number of years. Please excuse me. Your ideas all meet my approval—my intense appreciation—but they do occasionally seem not a little impracticable. You counsel all women who are slighted, ill-treated—put aside for others—to step immediately out of the ranks. It strikes me that is more easily said than done. How is a woman to support herself and children if she voluntarily turns from her husband? But then I have no grievance of this sort. I am a widow with two children, and possessed of a handsome property, the greater part of which was invested in real estate and railroad stock before my husband's death. Since then, I have had to study right hard to acquaint myself with the technicalities of business, and have at last acquired a fair knowledge of trade. I am the wealthiest person in town, and yet have no voice in any affairs connected with town improvements. Does a road require to be cut through, a street to be paved or graded, a public school or armory to be built, a meeting is immediately called of all the men owning property in the town, and my money is voted away exactly as they feel disposed, and the consequence is I am everlastingly taxed for additions which are not improvements, while many things are neglected—overlooked—which I would gladly help through, were it possible for a woman to make a suggestion and have it receive the least consideration. There are other women who, like myself, are heavy tax-payers, and if you can give a hint in regard to the best way of dealing with this question you will confer a favor upon several as much in the dark as your humble servant."

The above is an extract of a letter received from a lady residing in a town of about five thousand inhabitants in the State of Rhode Island.

To begin, then, Mrs. M., I know all about that place, strange, but true, I was born there. There my youth was spent, and there from the "Ladies' Seminary," which was once an honor to the state, did the stranger you have called upon to reply to your questions graduate. I know all about the men who are property own,

ers there—know that any woman who would dare open her mouth in regard to anything so essentially unwomanly, as these moguls consider voting, or the appropriation of her own funds, must expect to be everlastingly snubbed.

In regard to the impracticability of my advice to married women who are unfortunate enough to possess tyrants for husbands—wretches who have no regard for the marital obligation—I can only repeat my convictions on the subject, strengthened every day by new developments. I speak from terrible experience, my dear friend, having for the last three years supported myself and a family of children by my own individual exertions. When I finally decided that further disgrace could not be borne without the burial of the last atom of my self-respect (a quality which, of all others, I disliked to part with), I humbly and tearfully asked a divine blessing—asked that my way might be made plain, arose from my knees with a determination to go it alone, and have never for a moment faltered.

What is the poor-house, the wash-tub, starvation or death, compared to the agony of a woman occupying the position of a slave? second to some female whom the precious husband, has entrapped into his wily meshes? It was not impracticable with me, why should it be with others? I have been asked by several to treat this subject at more length, and will some time.

Now for your questions in regard to yourself. It appears to me that your position is exactly the one to enable you to be popular with those of your own sex. You have money, social standing and education. Your movements must be characterized by dignity and extreme tact; and, more than all, you must bear in mind that patience and determination will, in most cases, ensure the success of an unjust cause, how much more then that one having for its watchwords justice and equality.

In the first place, it would be a good plan to imitate your sisters of Gotham. Form a club, and meet weekly for the discussion of affairs connected with your social and pecuniary interests. Sound the depths, go to the bottom, and see how many women you have in town who can be depended upon; who will make hard warfare against intolerance. There must be a beginning, and this will be a good initiatory movement. Frequent discussions, comparing notes with each other, reading aloud articles from "THE REVOLUTION" (which I am glad to find is no stranger in my native town), will give you a breadth and earnestness which will finally do away with this nonsensical squeamishness about the so much talked of unfeminine element. Instruct your husbands, brothers and friends that it is as much for their interest as your own for women to be capable, self-reliant and earnest; then do not wait to be invited. That day is still in the dim distance, although I do candidly believe that the time will arrive, and before many years, when men will be glad to take women into their public councils (as many of them do now behind the door). March boldly to the town meetings, and demand your right to have a voice in whatever is going on. Every question that concerns the public prosperity, you, as property owner, have a right to be consulted about. It is unnatural, monstrous, that women should sit quiet and allow men to dispose of their rights, as they have been doing ever since the creation.

I was considerably amused the other day at receiving a letter from a young lady friend in New Hampshire, who wished to know what these advocates of Woman's Rights looked like? Were they nearly all old maids? and did they wear poky bonnets and unfashionable dresses? and those that were married, did they insist that their husbands should stay at home and take care of the babies while their wives lectured and made stump speeches about the country?

Her ignorance was only second to that of a prominent New York editor, who, after I had spoken my mind pretty freely in regard to woman's wrongs, looked up with a subdued expression of countenance and remarked:

"Really, Mrs. Kirk, you must excuse me, but from the depths of my soul I hope you are not becoming fascinated with this new movement. I suppose most of the women who advocate such doctrines are believers in, and followers of, that wretched free-loveism which has accomplished so much mischief in the United States."

We forgot for a moment that to call one's brother a fool was not exactly orthodox, and muttered something exceedingly like it.

To my young friend in New Hampshire I say, the sooner you do away with these erroneous views in regard to those of your own sex who are nobly struggling against adverse elements, in order that their sisters may be kept from fainting and falling, in order that they may

realise the right to dispose of their own earnings as they feel disposed, the better. You are on the wrong track. Take "THE REVOLUTION" regularly, and read it carefully. This is a common cause, and numbers among its advocates, the weak, the firm, the high, the low. The very first minds of the country have taken hold of it with a will. Do not worry your little heart about the style of these women. Our representatives are to be found in Fifth avenue, in the parlors of the rich, in the kitchens of the poor; and there is not the slightest disposition on the part of the supporters of right to interfere with the tasteful costume of any individual, provided health be not sacrificed to fashion. That's all.

ELEANOR KIRK.

WHO ARE THE REPUDIATORS?

MONEY paid for an equivalent not seen, felt, or realized, is almost like money lost. The cancelling even of old debts contracted in honor, and for value received, brings more or less the feeling of a loss equal to the amount of indebtedness thus paid. And the payment of the indebtedness of the United States has much of this character connected with it. Still, I say, we are in honor bound to pay every cent we owe. I say the word we, as applying to every American citizen, excluding none. The debt was contracted in the interest and for the benefit of all parties, and all should bear equally the burden of taxation.

Under the present construction of the constitution and laws, the United States bonds must be redeemed, principal and interest. This indebtedness is liquidated without the bonds themselves being disturbed in the slightest; they must be cancelled by taxing other property en tirely. I assert that the thousands of millions of dollars invested in United States bonds, are owned almost entirely by the wealthy citizens of this and other countries, and that as the laws now are executed, they must all be taken up and the interest paid on them, until both principal and interest are paid by the non-bondholding portion of community, made up of the poorer classes; of the mass es who depend upon their daily toil for the daily bread of themselves and families. The hungry millions who have not laid by their thousands for future use where they cannot be taxed—these are the parties who now are slowly and surely—through toil and want—paying off the nation's debt. Is this right? Who answers? The few bondholders say yes! while from the millions comes up the earnest no!

It is all idle to talk about "validity of contracts." The very ground work of our government rests upon "equal rights to all." The only excuse for the issuance of such bonds is, that it was a "military necessity" which knows no law. Is this any reason why after such necessity has passed, this state of things should continue? Government had the benefit, we all shared alike in this benefit. Now, all should share alike in paying for the same. During the war, surgeons were in the habit of taking buildings, whether owned or occupied by friend or foe, for hospitals, as "military necessities;" is that any reason for the continuance of such practice. Are those buildings anywhere retained for the use of such surgeons? By no means; not only is the property given up, but proper damages paid for the same. Not so with the wholesale system of raising money. The property then taken is still held, and all efforts at restoration are failures. Still, the poor masses are made to pay the debts of the rich. Wiseacre, thinking themselves great political economists, thrust their fingers in their ears, and foolishly imagine the people are satisfied because they cannot hear their cries. But when too late, they will hear the voices of their opponents demanding their seats in the high councils of the nation. It is unfortunate for the country that Pendleton was not nominated by the democrats. Had he been a republican, Congress would have enacted a law, taxing the interest on the bonds, purely as a matter of "policy," not because it would be "right;" now, no such act will become a law. The facts are, that both parties stood alike on the bond question. Each may prate and dodge as much as it likes, they are both wrong on the financial question. Belmont's bonds ran Seymour on to the democrats, and the republicans have not yet become sufficiently awakened to the demands of the people in a financial direction.

As I intimated, the payment of these vast millions seems like so many millions lost. Now, the question is, who shall suffer this loss? As it is new, the poorer classes or non-bondholders suffer the entire loss. My plan is for all parties to be equal sharers; no one class having any advantage. To accomplish this, there may be several ways; one is for government to equalize by issuing greenbacks enough to purchase the bonds, making money plenty and within the reach of all; another,