

The Revolution.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, Editor.
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, Proprietor.

NEW YORK, JULY 29, 1869.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.—Don't fail to notice the figures on your wrappers, for they tell you the number at which your subscription expires; if you do, you'll fail to receive your paper.

S. B. A.

NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE CONVENTION AT NEWPORT, R. I.

A WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE Convention, under the auspices of the National Woman's Suffrage Association, will be held in the Academy of Music at Newport, Rhode Island, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 25 and 26 days of August next.

The success attending the recent gathering at Saratoga, warrants the most sanguine hopes and expectations from this also. The intense interest now everywhere felt on the great question, renders all appeal for a full attendance unnecessary.

Among the speakers will be Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Mrs. Paulina Wright Davis, Mrs. Celis Burleigh, Rev. Phebe A. Hannaford, Mrs. Wilbour and Miss Susan B. Anthony. The Misses Alice and Phebe Carey, Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker, Mrs. E. H. Bullard and many other of the most eminent women of the country, will be in attendance. Names of other speakers will be announced hereafter.

In behalf of the National Woman's Suffrage Association,

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, Pres.

A. L. NORTON, } Advisory Counsel for the
PAULINA W. DAVIS, } State of Rhode Island.

THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT.

THE TABLES TURNED.

To make our position clear and to enable our masculine law-makers to take a feeling view of the situation, let us suppose the tables turned, and that no man in this republic had ever been permitted to exercise the right of suffrage.

Imagine the government administered for the last century entirely by women. After depriving the sons of Adam of all their inalienable rights to person, property, wages, children, they had legislated, as they undoubtedly would, on their tastes, habits, sentiments and affections. Under this dynasty the manufacture and sale of whiskey, the importation of tobacco, the opening of gambling saloons and brothels, smoking and spitting and swearing were all strictly forbidden. The men, weary and heart-sick of their oppressed, down-trodden condition, had prayed, petitioned and protested against these wrongs with pen and tongue, in public and private, year after year, in season and out of

season, but all in vain; for as men and women differ as essentially as "silk and flax, as daisies and sunflowers," how was it possible for one sex to understand the wants and tastes of the other, and legislate with fairness and wisdom? The women firmly believed that the restraining laws they had made for these captious, carnal men, were far better than any they could possibly make for themselves, and so they reasoned with them and ridiculed them by turns, but the men, still chewed the bitter quid of discontent, and a few rebellious spirits here and there tried to stir up the indignation of the whole sex. So matters went on until, in the progress of events, the country was in such a terribly disorganized condition that it was evident to all that something must be done. The women naturally enough thought that the extension of suffrage to all their sex might bring about the much needed reform; so a great discussion arose all over the country, on the general question of suffrage, as to whether it was a natural or political right, and if natural, then black women, no one thought of men, as well as white should share its privileges. Accordingly it was decided to enfranchise the black women, and the proposition was received with wild applause from Maine to California, and after much debate in Congress and out an amendment to the Constitution was submitted, demanding "womanhood suffrage" in every state in the Union. The men pricked up their ears to all this talk and thus discussed among themselves:

"Well, if these tyrannical women reinforce themselves with more of their numbers, our doom is sealed. While native born women of property and education have held sway, we have been most grievously robbed and oppressed, their rule has ever been unjust, one-sided and fragmentary; everything in our condition and the country at large is deplorable; justice is a mockery;—bribery and corruption rule alike every branch of our government, and what have we to hope from the present proposition to enfranchise all the ignorant, degraded types of womanhood, native and foreign, now crowding our shores. It is evident to any thinking mind that we need some new element in government. Man's thought is imperative to make and administer law with justice and wisdom."

"Such men as Wendell Phillips, Garrison, Greeley, Gerrit Smith, Douglass, Beecher, and Bushnell met in convention and declared out and out that if they could prevent it, not another woman should be enfranchised until they had some representatives in the councils of the nation. "The idea," said they, "is simply preposterous, that every shade of ignorant womanhood is to make laws for us, while we, refined, educated, tax-paying men have not one word to say. Our rights never can be protected in the nature of things, until we have a voice in the laws, and the government never can be safe and stable until all classes are represented. We have had enough of woman's governing. Let us make the welkin ring with our demands, that if there is to be any further extension of the suffrage, educated men come next in order; it is but just that some of our class be admitted into all the rights and privileges of citizens."

Just as their enthusiasm was at white heat, up rose the silver tongued orator, Anna E. Dickinson, baton in hand, and rapping them all mercilessly on the pate, she cried, "Down, you ignorant, narrow, selfish men, you besotted democrats, masquerading in the garb of human rights! had you been educated in my school, you

would not stand here to-day clamoring for your own rights nor those of your race or sex, but you would make angels weep with your eloquent appeals for the black women of the south, the most peeled and down-trodden of all God's creatures! Do you not see that if the black women are enfranchised it lifts that whole race to a level with the proudest Saxon? and when all women of every color and clime are safe in the political kingdom that a mighty stride in progress is taken? Then man's turn comes next, naturally, and properly, for it will leave the naked, base, intolerable, illogical test of sex, so monstrous as it stands isolated, that it will almost topple over of its own weight."

The men were so charmed with the dash and brilliancy of the young orator and so confused with her sophistry, that they were about to shout "Womanhood Suffrage!" "this is the black woman's hour!" when Mr. Phillips, with streaming eyes, arose and said: "Be not deceived, oh men of the republic! think not that woman in a conglomerate mass will understand you better or legislate for you more wisely than the few have in the past. What assurance have you that the ignorant hordes you are now marshalling into the political citadel will not be the first to pull up the draw-bridge and bar the gates? If such women as Miss Dickinson and her compeers have no appreciation of what is galling and humiliating to us, what can we expect of the Dinal's and Bridget's? 'Womanhood Suffrage' is national suicide and our destruction. The conceit too of these women passes all understanding. Having brought our government to the very verge of destruction, one would think they would naturally turn to us for assistance; but no, they regard the opinion of the most ignorant of their own sex as of far more value than the wisest from man!"

Let our readers make the application, for this is the way the case stands to-day for woman.

E. C. S.

DECISION DIABOLICAL!

ONE of the court reports last week read thus: The child Anna Larout, eleven years of age, with her step-father, Charles F. Gittens, of India street, Greenpoint, appeared before Justice Voorhies yesterday to complain of Ludlam Cornell, of No. 5 Benson street, New York, who was arrested the previous evening on a charge of rape. The child originally accused Cornell of ravishing her three times, on Wednesday night last, while she was alone with him at her step-father's residence. The fact that she was injured was attested to by a physician. The accused yesterday pleaded that the child consented, and the Justice held that the law did not hold men responsible in such cases when the child is over ten years of age! Cornell was discharged.

State and church, common consent and general usage have decided and declared man to be "the natural protector of woman," and here is a specimen of his protection. Here is Ludlam Cornell's protection, and Justice Voorhies's protection in a New York court, under New York law. New York law, civilization and religion abandon girls "over ten years of age" to the lust of such human fiends as this Ludlam Cornell, only if they can procure their "consent" to such abominable, unnatural outrages! This is the legal as well as natural protection which justice Voorhies extends over his little daughters of ten and eleven and twelve, if he have them. And the daughters of Fifth Avenue. And Murray Hill. And the baptized children of Grace Church. And of Trinity Church. And all the churches! "The fact that Anna was injured was attested to, by a physician." "Iu

jured," but what of that? The child "consented." She may have been injured for life. But suppose she is; "she was eleven years of age!" And she "consented." So her outraged "was discharged." The child was injured; a physician said so, but then it was not the wretch who ravished her that did it, though the horrible act was "three times repeated!" He was innocent, and was acquitted. Justice Voorhies discharged him under the law of the christian state of New York. Only the child sinned by consenting. Why did not justice Voorhies order her to be stoned to death? he himself casting the first stone! In an offence so so diabolical as that, somebody was guilty, and the court declared Cornell innocent, so there was nobody left to stone to death but the poor child.

Let the ravishers who go about seeking whose little daughters they may devour, be careful as to the age of their victims. Be sure of more than ten years. Ten years and a day will do, or a night. But remember justice Voorhies says, and the law of New York says, the victims must be "over ten years of age." And New York religion helped to make and sanctifies the law. And, demons, be careful of another thing! Be sure that you can make the court believe your victims consented! That, too, is very important. In little Anna Laroni's case, that was what saved your fellow-fiend, Cornell. It is not likely he produced any witnesses to swear they heard her give "consent." Justice Voorhies would not be so hard on him as that. His own declaration doubtless would be all the justice would require. He might possibly ask him to be good enough to hold up his hand and swear to it. And that he could do doubtless, without pricking his conscience skin-deep. So the case was disposed of as flippantly as though a brood of chickens, or a litter of kittens only were involved; instead of one of God's "little ones," whose protecting angels in heaven "do always behold the face of their Father!"

And now who can ever expect any extermination of such indescribable horrors, until woman herself, the mother of these babes, has a voice in both the making and executing of the laws? What mother's, what woman's heart is not wrung with anguish unutterable, at only reading such a decision as stands at the head of this article? Not to speak of being the mother of the poor victim of a fell demon's lust; a court's ungodly decision; a state's most inhuman, unnatural and unrighteous laws; a public sentiment foul as the breath of perdition, and a religion that solemnly sanctifies it all!

It is said that woman does not want the ballot. True, nor does she want children in, alas! how many million homes? And so she kills them, kills them unborn! The awful time predicted has come. Nature has changed;

And mothers, monsters prove!

What wonder, then, that the courts abandon the daughters over ten years old to the tender mercies of the ravisher! That mother who does not wish and strive earnestly to obtain the right to equal voice and participation in the government in every department, has abandoned her young daughters too. She is accessory to all the terrible ruling of Justice Voorhies and all the courts. Nay, she is an accomplice with all the infamous Ludlam Cornells who prey upon woman's virtue, young or old. With such mothers, we shall have such monsters as he, such judges as Voorhies, and such legislators as made the law on which he based that diabolical decision. The woman, the mother more

than all, who, in view of this Anna Laroni case, and the rulings of the court upon it, does not desire the ballot, does not desire all the power possible for her protection and that of her children, is certainly logically consistent in quenching the life of her offspring before they are born. Many of the ancient philosophers and stoics inculcated and practiced suicide as the best escape from inevitable ills. Women who do not desire the ballot, who are willing to trust their daughters to such protection as the laws and courts now give them, would add little to their present fearful culpability, by openly proclaiming and defending, as well as perpetrating the crimes of foeticide and infanticide.

We scarcely blame the Hindoo mother for tossing her female child to the crocodile to save it from her own sad fate. But what shall be said of American mothers, of New York mothers, who plunge their little ones into a fouler stream than the Ganges, where crocodile Cornells and crocodile Voorhies, more dreadful than swim those waters, mercilessly prey upon them? The legislature having decreed that at ten years old they are able to protect themselves! And if their virtue be torn in pieces and devoured, their bodies despoiled, their souls polluted, their salvation imperilled, it is their own fault. For behold! were they not "above ten years of age?" and did they not "consent" to the ruin?

P. P.

CO-OPERATIVE HOUSEKEEPING.

It is actually to be tried in Cambridge, Mass., without delay. May it be without fail! The time will come when the present modes of life among rich and poor, will be held as miserable vagabondage. The world should be ashamed of itself. Thousands of years old, and yet could not get a living any way under heaven, only that it has new fields always open to forage! Had slavery been confined to its original domain and never allowed to rove over the western and south western states and territories, its death would have been chronicled full fifty years ago. So all our present and past filibustering, especially present, tell the secret of our national continuance. Our country could support unknown millions, with a wise economy exercised, on less hard labor than is now done by the forty millions. But for the vast new territory that we have to run over, tread down and waste, like herds of cattle broke into a prairie of ripening corn, we should be absolutely bankrupt to-day. We should have been long ago. All the gold of California and the world couldn't save us. New England isn't cultivated. Nor New York, nor Pennsylvania, nor any of the old States. And our household economy is no better than our agriculture and horticulture. It is just like it. It is fearfully laborious, wasteful, unwholesome, and much of it insufferably unclean. Families in the cities go often into the very slums, and out of hovels, burrows, garrets, and every conceivable form of human sty, they snatch their cooks, chambermaids and even nurses for their children; frequently so filthy as to be unendurable until furnished with baths, brushes, combs and better clothes than when hired, they possess of their own. Some of the best houses in New York have been suddenly peopled with vermin in variety by the coming of a new housemaid with her carpet-bag from such habitations. Every week the city papers give descriptions of the "tenant houses" as visited by their reporters, too sickening to read, too loathsome almost for pub-

lication. But it is in these, and in the meanest of these, that myriads of our "domestics" are born and live and grow, till old enough to report at the intelligence offices, or to advertise in the *Herald* as "a good American girl, accustomed to cooking and all kinds of housework." Or if newly imported from abroad, the case is not unfrequently still worse; as all travellers can testify who have seen where so many of them were born, how they were cradled, what they wore, on what they were fed, and in what schools they were taught. These poor beings are not to be reproached for their poverty, nor for their degradation. The rich, the well-to-do in the world, are to be blamed, if any body, that there are such, and in such multitudes. And our vagabond housekeeping in all its multifarious departments is part of the penalty for so unnatural and unnecessary a state of human society.

It is indeed high time Co-operative Housekeeping was tried. It is said that a considerable number of the first women in Cambridge are undertaking the experiment. They propose a provision store, a bakery, a kitchen and laundry. If they succeed in the first three, so as to secure wholesome food and cookery, and make them generally available to human needs they will deserve, and will ultimately enjoy, too the gratitude and blessings of the human race. The laundry cannot fail when the other objects are reached and secured. The Revolution will watch this unspeakably important enterprise with a solicitude and hopefulness, too, commensurate in some degree with its importance.

Since the above was written and in type, I have received some extracts from an address on this subject, delivered by Mrs. Pierce herself to a large audience of ladies in Cambridge, and published in the *Boston Daily Advertiser*. Some of the more practical portions of it are as follows, and it is only want of space that prevents giving the whole of it. Mrs. Pierce says:

I do not wish to lay too much stress on the economy of a co-operative kitchen, since we do not certainly know what proportion it will save, or whether it will save anything at all. I would rather inspire you with faith in its superior comfort, convenience and perfection. For one, I should be perfectly delighted to have no such thing around my house as the kitchen sink, with the greasy pots and pans that have to be continually in it, even with the neatest cook; no such floor as the kitchen floor with its greasy spots always having to be washed up; no dreadful smell of grease pervading the house whenever anything is tried; no soap suds flavoured to my breakfast on Monday mornings; above all, no swill pail! Think, too, of the mental rancor and distress one could escape when one has no cook to tell one just as one has got her trained in all one's ways, "If you please, mum, will you get another gyrol, for I'm going to lave when me week is up." These are the pains from which we would be free. As for the pleasures we would experience, as I said before, we scarcely know what cooking, as an art—as a *fine art*—is. I, for one, am not disposed to blame too much the cooks for the ignorance of their blunders. Go into your kitchen for a week—do all the cooking, and halt the washing and ironing, and keep everything clean, and see whether to accomplish such a variety of work does not take off the interest in the main business of cooking. Our bakery we expect to make perfect, and to have home-made and French bread and biscuit, white, brown and Indian bread, waters, cakes and pies of every description—made, too, not of such butter as any housekeeper would think poison (as the case is said to be now in the bakeries), but of the best and sweetest materials. Another point of view from which we may regard the kitchen, is that of a training school in housewifery for young ladies. It is difficult now for girls to get any knowledge of, or taste for, cooking, for a good many reasons. One is, that a home kitchen is not usually a pleasant place to work in. It is small, hot and sometimes dismal. The kitchen sink is in it—unsightliest of objects. The cook may or may not be obliging, just as it happens. Mamma very often does not know enough of cooking to teach her daughter; or, if she does, would rather do it