

BARE DESERTION.—We have always declared the infidelity of republicanism to the rights of the colored race, with all their pretensions and professions. We have warned the abolitionists especially that they perilled the rights of that race by refusing to demand suffrage for woman also on the same basis of impartial justice, thus educating, elevating and purifying the public conscience and character, to but little or no purpose, and now our apprehensions are beginning to be realized on every hand. The *Springfield Republican*, one of the oldest, ablest and best of the Republican journals, very justly says, "that discreditable as the fact may be, it is pretty evident that the enfranchisement of the colored race in the Northern States will have to wait. The popular votes in Connecticut and Michigan, on Monday last, indicate beyond a doubt that the rank and file of the Republican party, that party of moral ideas, are yet so far from being unanimous in favor of impartial suffrage, that the more immediate interests of reconstruction might be jeopardised by forcing the issue at this juncture."

WASHINGTON LADIES' GAMBLING-HOUSE.—Washington has two gambling-halls exclusively for ladies. At all hours of the day the most elegant dressed ladies at the capital may be seen there staking their money, or somebody's money, in surprising amounts. It is rumored that a certain divorce case now pending in the district court is attributable in a measure to the squandering of a husband's money on the tables of one of these places—Madam Rumor placing the amount of the losses as high as \$50,000.

BLUE LAWS REACTING.—It is said that in neither the State Library of Connecticut nor in any of the Departments of the State House at Hartford is there a Bible. It has long been seen that there is little New Testament in her legislation. A state that will accept the aid of negro soldiers to defend her nationality, and then shut them from schools, colleges and churches (except in *negro peats*), and from the ballot-box besides, had better keep the Bible as much as possible out of sight.

INCONGRUOUS.—Andrew Johnson lives. Jefferson Davis and all his Cabinet are unwhipped of justice, and apparently safe from harm. But poor Mrs. Surratt was hung! Ben. Butler said "she was hung on insufficient evidence," and all have now good reason to believe so, if as the papers say Conover is now in the penitentiary; Cleaver has been convicted of an infamous crime; Baker is a fugitive from justice; and Montgomery has been arrested for swindling, for these are the creatures who swore her away to the gallows.

COOL COMFORT.—The *New York Times* thinks the republican successes in the Spring elections have not been of such a kind as to lead the party to indulge in any dangerous assurances of an easy triumph in the great campaign of the year.

SHOCKING IRONY.—The *New York Times* in open day says General Grant has shown a capacity for administration, a fitness for the performance of civil functions, a devotion to the principles of the Constitution, a respect to the laws, a degree of political sagacity and justice, and a faith in the ideas of liberty and progress that constitute far higher grounds than his mili-

tary record why he should be elevated to a position where he can use his powers for restoring peace and prosperity to our distracted country.

EDUCATED SUFFRAGE

DEAR REVOLUTION: Let me suggest to "Nemo" and to everybody, that perhaps the ultimate truth as to the right of voting is, that all human beings have the inherent right to vote on such matters as they understand and take an interest in. As a matter of scientific justice, it is evident that the vote of twelve ignorant men of forty ought not to outweigh the vote of one wise child of ten. But society and government are not at present constructed on the basis of science and justice. We fix an age at which a portion of one-half of the citizens may vote with certain limits as to property and education. In Massachusetts a male over 21 may vote if he can read and write, but he is not required to be sober or honest, or to know anything or care anything for political principles, or for the election of honest and able men to office. It seems to me, therefore, that under our present system it is hardly worth while to propose any practicable educational test. Experience shows that the class of people called educated among us are for the most part "conservative," that is to say, stupid in politics. We must reach a higher condition through universal suffrage, spite of its evils, which, manifest as they are, would be infinitely less than those of the present most unjust and arbitrarily limited suffrage. Beside the ballot, woman needs, to make her independent and individual and respected by man, the possession of the homestead. In all times those who have owned the land have been the masters of those who have owned none. All aristocracies are based on land owned in large quantities by a few persons. The "land is the original inheritance of the whole species," and as no man made it, so no man has a right to own it. Every human being has a God-given right to labor on the land and to enjoy the fruits of that labor; to earn his bread in the sweat of his brow, the doing of which is really a blessing instead of a curse. The first duty of an organized society is to protect every one of its children in that primary right, which it cannot do so long as land is recognized as individual property. But no society hitherto has done this duty, and the question is, what is the first practical step toward it.

Our salvation, here as everywhere else, is by woman, representative of the love element. The first step is for woman everywhere to control land enough to render her self-sustaining, thereby depriving the force element represented by man, of its principal power of oppression and depression. The race of healthy, land-cultivating women will govern the world and will redeem it. When women own the homestead, the earth will begin to be the garden of Eden prefigured in Genesis, and we shall be in a fair way to attain a paradise wherein there will be a "Marriage Union of Love and Wisdom in Uee."

F. S. C.

"SHALL MEN NURSE THE BABIES?"

FRANCIS BARRY TO MRS. LE BARDIN.

In your very readable letter, in No. 12 of "THE REVOLUTION," you ridicule the idea that man can be anything else than a nuisance in the kitchen or nursery. I readily grant that a large share of "husbands and fathers" are of the kind you describe, and I am not disposed to object to your estimate of them. But I wish to say, seriously, that no man is fit to be a father, or to sustain intimate relations with any true woman, who has not both the ability and inclination to help "take care of the babies," and also, in case of need, to wash the potatoes, sweep the floor, or engage in any domestic labor whatever, rather than allow a sick or over-worked woman to do it.

Men are bad enough, surely, as a class, with their present development, or, rather, with the present arrangements of society; but are not women greatly at fault in having so much to do with them? How can you make it appear that such monsters as you accurately picture are fit to "have about the house" at all? Let women embrace and carry out the idea that the man who is fit to sustain the most important and vital relations in domestic life, is necessarily fit to discharge the lesser and incidental obligations, and there will be far less occasion for such deceptions as you have given us. Let women decide (as when they become truly refined and mindful of their own self-respect they will) that the man gross enough to fill his home with the stime and scent of tobacco is not worthy to have a home with their help, and that evil will be corrected speedily. And

whatever may be said of this one thing may be said of all manner of masculine meanness and baseness. It will continue till woman is individualized and self-owned. She will then dictate the terms on which important domestic relations are secured and retained. Till then, men will be men, and women degraded, self-degraded, and will sanction the meanness of men by forming a close alliance with it.

LETTER FROM LONDON.

LONDON, March, 1868.

THE organization known as "The Reform League" has done this country some service in the past. It has taken up a variety of things, from Hyde Park fencing to discussing the propriety of passing a vote of thanks to Juarez, President of the Mexican Republic, for the unflinching bravery and persistency he displayed in driving out Maximilian. I don't remember whether this was carried; though I know it to have been discussed by the League. Between these two points exists a wide range. Thus, it is not a surprise to those who have watched the course of the League, to find it welcoming Mr. Thomas Hare, and discussing with that gentleman his favorite theory or scheme of "Personal Representation and an Enlarged Redistribution of Seats." That the questions were worthy of the consideration shown, is proven by the fact that the debate, presided over by Mr. Edmund Beales, has been attended by John Stuart Mill, Prof. Fawcett, Thomas Hughes, and George Jacob Holyoake. It interests many more (besides the gentlemen named), who are considered this side of the Atlantic to be deep thinkers; while under another and more familiar name—"Representation of Minorities"—it has claimed the attention of many Americans. This must be my excuse for troubling you with this letter. Your correspondent is entirely neutral in the controversy, not yet having made up his mind to the decided acceptance or rejection of Mr. Hare's theory. He thinks, from a careful reading of both sides, that there are some parts worth accepting, and that upon the other side there is a great deal of force in many of the objections. Thus, you will perceive, to favor both sides; and I trust that this letter will, therefore, be accepted as an effort upon the writer's part to contrast for their benefit the various utterances for and against now being freely made by our political thinkers, in the press, or in the places where they most do congregate.

I propose, in the first place, to briefly give Mr. Hare's theory, although that is more than that gentleman can do himself. There lies the great objection to it. Perhaps it is egotism to suppose that I can do what he cannot. We will assume that I give his theory as correctly as it can be given, in less space than the author has filled in the pamphlets he has written and had published. To begin, then. The principle of Mr. Hare's scheme is, that the true basis of redistribution is the number of votes actually polled in every county, city, borough, or other electoral constituency, at each general election. In order to obtain that number, the proper officers should be instructed in the writs for any constituency to return as representatives so many members, if more than one, as should be equal to the ratio which the number of its actual voters bear to the total number of voters in the United Kingdom, according to the provisions of the electoral law. If, then, 1,800,000 votes were polled, and 600 members were to be chosen, 3,000, or 1-600th part of the larger number should be sufficient for the election of a candidate. If 80,000 votes were polled in a county or borough, ten members should be returned; if 3,000, one member; and if less than 3,000, the candidate who had polled an approximate number of votes should make up the complement from other constituents in the neighborhood or elsewhere.

At the meeting held at the League Rooms last Saturday, Mr. Hare illustrated the scheme of redistribution which he proposes, by supposing that fifty persons then present with him were called upon to choose from ten candidates a committee of five. Instead of dividing them into five sections, according to their accidental position, allotting to each two candidates, and requiring every section, however they may differ among themselves, to elect one of two, the true method of bringing out the judgment and discretion of all would be to permit any ten of their number to elect one, thus giving to every elector choice from the whole list. Mr. Hare further said: "that it thus, in fact, substituted unanimous constituencies, united by personal confidence, for artificial and arbitrary combination. It was not so much the introduction of a new system, as the abolition of the restrictions of the old, and adapting it to the free inter-communication of the present day. It had been devel-