

comes from the contact of different types of mind calls into action a greater variety of power.

At school, simple physical beauty stands but little chance for favoritism. The beauty that would of itself make a girl a belle in society will scarcely secure her respectable attention there. Her intellectual and genial qualities make her the favorite in her father's home, and the same qualities make her a favorite at school. She must interest by her wit and wisdom, and attract by her grace and kindness.

The fact that young men and women stand upon their genuine merits at school, and not upon superficial qualities, makes school a far better place for them to make mutual acquaintances and friendships than general society. If the young man cannot know the young woman he is to marry in her own home life, the next best thing is to know her in her school life, and the same may be said for the young woman. I know of nothing that will tend so much to promote proper marriages as to educate young men and women together; no other social relation affords so good an opportunity for knowing each other's tastes and aspirations. Under the old system girls spent the two, three or four years succeeding their school life in making the acquaintance of men; this necessitated their leaving school early, before they had had time to make more than the most superficial attainments. If this general knowledge of men can be gained at school, there is no reason why the school life may not be extended two or three years, till habits of thought are acquired, and a maturity sufficient to avoid most of the evils of the society period, so trying to health and morals.

With this extended time to devote to education, I see no reason why women may not be amply fitted for the important duties which the exercise of the franchise will impose upon them.

DOES THE REVOLUTION BELIEVE IN MARRIAGE?

BLOOMINGTON, Ill., March 18th, 1869.

MRS. E. C. STANTON: Some say you are opposed to the present legalized marriage relation. Will you state in THE REVOLUTION your views on that point? I have read THE REVOLUTION, but confess I am not posted thereon. Abolishing the law and sacredness of matrimony, what, better institution can you proffer?

I. A. PHOENIX.

Yes, I am opposed to the PRESENT legalized marriage, and the marriage and divorce laws of most of the states in the Union, because they bear unequally on man and woman. Six years ago I addressed the Legislature of New York on this subject, and the Divorce Bill then under discussion lacked but one vote of being passed. Ten thousand copies of my speech were published by the Hovey Committee, and whoever wishes to see that speech can get it by applying to the office of THE REVOLUTION. My views are essentially those of Robert Dale Owen, published in Mr. Greeley's "Recollections of a Busy Life." But so far from abolishing the institution of marriage, I would have it more pure and holy than it is to-day, by making woman the dictator in the whole social realm. The family, that great conservator of national strength and morals, how can you cement its ties but by one moral code for man and woman?

To-day we have the *man* marriage which, as set forth in his laws in the several states, every woman in the nation of the least pride or self-respect utterly repudiates. Laws which bind women of virtue, education and refinement to drunkards, licentious men, and villains are to-day filling our asylums with idiots, lunatics and criminals, with the blind, the deaf and the dumb. Such a wholesale desecration of womanhood my soul abhors, and the only escape from such abominations is to give woman a voice in these laws. In her independence, the state would soon realize a nobler type of manhood than the world has yet seen.

PORTLAND DAILY ADVERTISER.

This journal, too, is troubled about the marriage question, and innocently asks if "Woman Suffrage" and 'Free Love' are not two distinct

questions?" Yes, sir, as distinct as freedom and slavery; the one is destined to end the other. In the education and enfranchisement of woman, we hope to elevate her (where a large majority of women are not to-day) into the dignity of one true, life-long relation. When Massachusetts, the most enlightened spot on the habitable globe, grants 1,600 divorces in one year and the United States government winks at the slavery of woman in Utah, it is time for the thinking minds of the nation, to ponder this momentous problem of the true relation of the sexes. I sent my speech on Divorce to the *Advertiser* that the editor may read a summary of our marriage and divorce laws and publish them for the benefit of the women of Maine, when I hope he will tell what he thinks of them. In regard to the *Advertiser*, Stephen S. Foster writes us:

BOSTON, February 23, 1869.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I call you still my friend, for although we have differed considerably of late, I cannot doubt your devotion to the cause in which I am so deeply interested, and hence, can see no reason why I should not respect and love you still.

I write, this morning, to call your attention to some strictures on you, in the Editorial columns of the *Portland Advertiser*, which I deem objectionable both in character and purpose, and to which I should be glad to see a reply from your own spicy pen. The editor assures me that you shall have a fair hearing in his paper, in your own behalf, if you desire it. Our cause is young in that state, and this article, if unanswered, will create considerable prejudice against us.

Yours truly, STEPHEN S. FOSTER.

I do not know any point of difference, in principle, between our good friend, Mr. Foster and myself, except I may feel a little more interest in my own enfranchisement than he possibly can; an interest that led us of THE REVOLUTION to accept the aid of democrats in establishing a paper when we could not secure that of abolitionists. As Mr. Foster is one of the Hovey Committee, who voted the money to publish my speech on Divorce before the New York Legislature, I may presume he fully endorsed it, if not, we should be willing to publish any of his criticisms in THE REVOLUTION. As to the article in question from the *Advertiser* I suppose that "Christian Community" in which he lives, believes the Bible which says, "Be ye not unequally yoked," while woman to-day pleads in vain in our Courts to be released from all family ties with drunkards, licentious men and criminals. "Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." With most of the hap-hazard marriages about us, the wise Father has very little to do, but when good people meet and are happy, then I feel that there is a union approved in Heaven.

NEW YORK, March 20th, 1869.

DEAR MISS ANTHONY: With a full heart I sit down tonight to say, thank God, and thank you, for a new era for women, a blessed era wherein a woman may labor and be paid for her labor.

Conventionalities that beset the footsteps of women are being swept away by the resistless force of a right which your voice—God-inspired—has called into life. Millions of women yet unborn will bless your memory, and your name, years and years after the lips that plead for them shall have been made mute! Among my own acquaintances to-day I can count twenty women, educated and refined, who have either thriftless or drunken husbands, some of them both. They are obliged either to labor or to wait. Heretofore the arena of woman's exertions was limited to occupations unprofitable and degrading, and only now is dawning that future wherein a woman may herself "eat bread from the sweat of her brow," and give some crumbs to her little ones—if she have any. A few days ago I met a gentleman friend who has married daughters. On my enquiring after the members of his family, he remarked that one of his daughters had married a good-for-nothing fellow who gave her no support, and added, she must try to do

something to support herself. I said there are now better times for working women. Do you subscribe to Woman's Suffrage? No, I don't. I am against it. Why Well, I don't like the looks of it. After fifteen minutes conversation, I could extract from the man no reason more logical than the above. Another gentleman who has for his wife a lady of decided ability, and whom he has led a sad life, said he opposed Female Suffrage because he did not want a woman to "boss" over him! Another, a man of ability and intelligence, declared himself as willing to subscribe to Woman Suffrage because he was in favor of negroes voting and he considered a woman as good as a negro.

How can the fathers of daughters, whom the chances of life may place in difficult and destitute circumstances, refuse by their voices, to open to women the high roads of the world, that they may therein labor and win bread? How can the brothers of sisters circumscribe the footsteps of women? causing them, as many brothers can testify, to become prostitutes from their inability to get a living by honest labor? How can the sons of mothers, who have witnessed the struggles of a mother's life, and lived in the light of a mother's love, refuse her sex, and kind the right to live in the only way that life is worth having—free and untrammelled? God bless the voices, and inspire them that are eloquent in this cause. I need to labor for myself and others. I feel the benefit of your endeavors. Your courageous hands have opened to myself and many other miserable wives and mothers a field where with thankful hearts we can work for bread for ourselves and little ones.

H. L. C.

WHAT THE PRESS SAYS OF US.

TAKE CARE, YOU WILL "INJURE THE CAUSE."

From the Worcester (Mass.) *Exigis* and *Gazette*.

THE Woman Suffrage Convention which has just completed its session in Springfield has not been a success. It was too feeble and tame even for George Francis Train who was in that city during its sessions, to commit himself to it, and yet George Francis can face a good deal without blushing deeply. There was a vast deal of discursing; talking, a wearisome amount of tedious repetition of the ancient and threadbare dogmas of Free Loveism, and kindred topics. Lucy Stone talked much, but really said little; S. S. Foster railed against the law, and compared our tax-gatherers to highway robbers, and asserted that the government was organized chiefly to steal from woman. Mr. C. C. Burleigh translated a sweet vision which had come to him the night before or was suggested on the spot by the sight of so much beauty, of fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters, gathered tenderly about the hearth-stone of home—that is supposing they had an open fire-place—laying political plans, and discussing gently, and with that tenderness with which woman always deals with those from whom she differs, or whom she prefers, of the opposing candidates; the home turned into a caucus, with the baby crying neglected in a corner, while mother and neighbor went-off to lay pipe for his election. Brother Blackwell—we mean Lucy Stone's husband,—affirmed that the salvation of the world depended on woman's having the right to vote, and that when she had it, the millennium would come immediately, and earth be changed to heaven. An unknown female speaker gave a striking illustration of the Divine economy, by asserting that the Lord had afflicted Timothy Titcomb (Dr. Holland) and compelled him to go abroad in search of health, because he had not given his support to the woman movement. Thus the Lord had removed this obstacle from the path of human progress. So Timothy is lifted into the glory of martyrdom.

One touch of genuine common sense the convention had in the suggestion of Rev. Mr. Nye, a Universalist clergyman of Springfield, that there had been a great deal of irrelevant talk; that the question of women's wages was not involved in that of Woman's Suffrage, and that the efforts of these conventions should tend to something more practical. This puts the case in a nutshell. As long as they are made the eagerly-seized occasions for a gathering of all sorts of wild and impracticable theorists; as long as every ignorant person of either sex who has got hold of the tail end of an idea and does not know enough to know that he or she hasn't got the whole of it, may ventilate his or her crude notions, so long they will fail of effecting the good which they might accomplish. We do not understand why every possible and impossible "ism," every scheme that aims at the subversion of the present condition of society, every form of infidelity, should be associated with this simple and important question of Woman's Suffrage.

It seems that in the opinion of its enemies Mr. Train and THE REVOLUTION are not the only friends who are "injuring the cause." We had supposed that the Woman Suffrage platform in New England had been swept so clean that even Timothy Titcomb could have found health and happiness thereon, instead of going to Europe; and that the *Aegis* and *Gazette* could have sat down with Charles and Stephen, Brother Blackwell and Lucy and taken sweet council together. We are sorry to hear that Mr. Foster railed and called our husbands, fathers and grandfathers highway robbers, and that Mr. Burleigh has betaken himself to the land of dreams. This comes of their not taking THE REVOLUTION, the only paper that keeps people wide awake on the living present and follows principles wherever they legitimately lead.

What a blessing for "the cause" that Mr. Nye put the whole logic of the question into "a nut-shell," thus bringing it within the *Gazette's* comprehension, showing him that to seize the tail end of an idea, is in time getting the whole of it, and that with the added power of woman all "isms" will become possible. Bring yourself as speedily as possible, *Mr. Gazette*, into line with the great law of change, "for verily old things are to pass away and all things become new."

THE RUSSIAN RIVER (Cal.) *Flag*, a very handsome little journal away there in the new western world, John G. Howell, Editor, salutes THE REVOLUTION thus gallantly:

THE REVOLUTION, Susan B. Anthony, proprietor, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Parker Pillsbury, editors, has been laid on our table by the kindness of Mr. Philip Cowen of Petaluma.

No one doubts the ability of the conductors of the paper; perhaps a few doubt their honesty or sanity; while very, very many doubt the justice of their cause.

The subject of Woman's Rights is one that now engages the attention of the best writers and thinkers of the land, and will continue to do so until the ballot is placed in the hands of our wives and sisters, and we believe that, within ten years and perhaps within five, that event will occur. If the women of the land desire to vote, we say, let them. While the fair sex may occasionally stuff the ballot-box as did our grandmothers in New Jersey, yet all must acknowledge that woman is man's superior in honesty and moral principle.

We, therefore, take off our hat to THE REVOLUTION and wish it success.

SENATOR SPRAGUE—BOLD WORDS.

SENATOR SPRAGUE of Rhode Island is becoming eminent, and so far as yet appears, deservedly so, by speaking the truth. The other day he presented a Petition for Woman's Suffrage remarking that as in his deliberate judgment the voters of this country have less to do with the management of their government affairs than any other people in the world, there could be no great harm in granting the prayer of the petitioners. Since that time he has twice addressed the Senate in a strain that his republican allies of the press as well as brethren of the Senate find it easier to ridicule than to disprove. In his speech on last Tuesday in the Senate he said:

He never had before seen so much ignorance displayed as to-day in the discussion of this question of the financial condition of the country. He read a statistical statement of the exports and imports of Great Britain and the United States respectively, from which he deduced the conclusion that while Great Britain's exports consisted almost entirely of manufactured articles, the United States exported nothing but raw material. . . . The whole capital of the country is collected in the large cities and is used to increase the value of property there. The manufacturers of New England are manu-

facturing to-day at a loss and they have made no money for the last two or three years. The only way in which success can be attained there now is by the capitalists crushing out all who are engaged in the same business with him. Passing from the financial to the social constitution of the country, Mr. Sprague said that his previous remarks upon the latter subject had been severely criticised, and some had charged that he must be familiar with the disturbing element in American society, from the fact that he described it so minutely. If he had not been familiar with the constitution of American society, he would not have ventured to make such statements about it, because neither in the Senate nor elsewhere would he make statements that he could not substantiate by proof. The pending bill was one of the most dangerous propositions that have ever emanated from the Committee on Finance, and if enacted into a law, would disturb the relations of over sixty millions of capital, and, so far from relieving the South and West, would actually increase the premium they would have to pay for the use of the money. It was not a measure in the interest of the people, it was rather a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of other institutions like the Park Bank of New York. The great banks of New York and other places, which tied the capital of the country, were managed by men who knew nothing about the business interests and relations of the people, and yet the Congress and legislation of the country were influenced and governed by the managers of the banks, both by open and by indirect corruptive influences. He knew himself a legislator, a member of a Committee, who had been asked to report upon a certain matter in a certain way, and the temptation held out before him was \$100,000. The worst and most alarming feature of this matter was that the moving power could not be pushed.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Wilson) had undertaken to inform the Senate and the country that all was going well. That Senator, no doubt, repeated what had been told by others; but his information had been derived from men who expected to be benefited by the exercise of his influence in his high position. Can that Senator (said Mr. Sprague) tell the Senate of his own knowledge that his informants speak truly? Can he tell that they know the truth of what they gave him? Certainly not. What does he know about society? How much of it does he mingle with? He mingles with those that he comprehends. Are they such as can give a comprehensive view of the present situation? No man shall stand here and, either through intention or ignorance, or from any other cause, mistake or misstate the situation without being answered by me. The Senator understands the creation of parties and carrying them on successfully, as well as any man, but he mistakes his calling when he undertakes to form a judgment as to the business interests of the people of the United States.

On Saturday Mr. Sprague spoke again to this effect:

Mr. President: I rise to a personal explanation. The people of the United States will suspend their judgment on all newspaper articles hearing on me to my disadvantage. They may be assured that my words and courage do not rest on wine, or whiskey, or any other stimulant but upon knowledge of the shrinkage of property, and the loss of virtue going on around me. My great anxiety is to effect a cure now. The remedy is now accessible; a year hence it may be beyond our reach. My leading idea is to correct a condition of things of which the following is perhaps an aggravated case, but it is a substantial illustration of the condition throughout the country: A man in Washington has \$20,000 loaned out in sums of \$50 to the poor at ten per cent. per month, and secured by chattel mortgage. When the victim is exhausted demand for payment is made, and in default of payment the property is sold for one-fourth to one-half its value. The plan to correct this is to place within the reach of every man of energy and industry capital at a low rate of interest, upon which he can labor and make profits. This is the one I have in view, and is substantially the one in use in England, Belgium, Holland and France, the most prosperous states of modern times.

With some notice of the attacks made on him by Senators and the Radical press, he said: I will no longer sit and hear incorrect statements concerning our condition—our drifting condition—come from whence they may. To cure an evil we must know its character and not mistake it. Let those who think I am crazed study as I have done for three years past; let them examine without prejudice, patiently as I have done, into our exact situation. Ask those around me if there be any substantial difference between the opinions I now avow and those I have heretofore indicated. My present work is

to show the plan that will remedy our evils. This will take time and investigation. It is clear as the noon-day sun to my own mind; but to prove logically and with satisfactory reasons is the work to be accomplished now.

The N. Y. *Tribune* and several other of the city journals venture to suggest (drawing it very mildly) that Senator Sprague should be required to prove his charge about the 100,000 dollars. We shall soon see how much is done about it. The party in power is getting quite enough of such revelations for its honor, or credit.

WHY MR. MILL WAS DEFEATED.—We have before alluded to the cause of Mr. John Stuart Mill's lamentable defeat not being returned to the present Parliament; but Mr. Stephen Fiske, an American, in his *Photographs*, a London book, lately published on England, throws more light upon the subject in speaking of the *Times*.

Like most of the other London journals, it is terribly in the power of Mr. W. H. Smith, M.P., the news-dealer, who purchases a large proportion of its daily issue. Mr. Smith is a Conservative, and the *Times* is now Liberal in politics; but while Mr. Smith was canvassing Westminster against Mr. John Stuart Mill, the favorite Liberal philosopher, you vainly looked in the *Times* for any opposition to the Conservative candidate. Most of the other Liberal organs, except the *Star*, were in the same predicament. Mr. Smith could—I do not say he would—have practically suppressed them if, they had imperilled his election by their attacks; and so Mr. Mill was left to his fate by his journalistic friends. The clubmen, politicians, and gossips of London have had many a laugh and joke over this state of affairs; but I can only deeply regret it. It is an evil thing for English journalism, and for journalists all over the world, that any man should have, even temporarily, the power over the leading London press that the French Emperor has over the press of France.

TURKEY AND AMERICA.—We are all apt to speak of Turkey as but half civilized. But did not the late hanging in Maryland of three negroes, and the brutal death of one of them in particular, equal, if not surpass, the following account of a Turkish hanging scene taken from the *Levant Herald* of Jan. 24th.

On reaching the spot selected, the party of police escorting him halted, and the first intimation the wretch had of his fate was the question if he desired to say his prayers. He replied in the negative, and the executioner then advanced and attempted to throw a looped cord over his head. Manacled though he was, he resisted for some minutes, struggling fiercely, and screaming in a manner which, early as the hour was, speedily gathered a crowd into the previously empty street. At length the cord was got round his neck, and after a further short resistance, he was strangled into insensibility. This done, the body was hitched up to a hook in the door-post of a neighboring butcher's shop, with the feet barely off the ground, and left to die out thus, under watch of a single zaptieh. As usual there was no excitement amongst the spectators, and in less than half an hour after the murderer was dead only some three or four loiterers lingered near the spot. About one p.m. the body was cut down, and carried off in a sack for burial.

WHICH DRINKS HARDEST?—The New York *Times* says, Ireland drinks less whiskey than Scotland, though her population is twice as large. The late Budget shows that while the latter country drank, in 1868, 4,907,701 gallons, Ireland drank but 4,773,710 gallons. England at the same time consuming more than both together—over eleven millions of gallons.

A MARRIAGE took place at Concord, N. H., recently in which the bride was only sixteen years of age, and a widow at that. She was married the first time when she was only thirteen years old. The bridegroom on this occasion was twenty-four years old.