

A HOPEFUL SIGN.

THE New Orleans *Picayune* has a letter from Texas to the following encouraging purport. Give the south plenty of such women as are here described, and Congress would be of smaller account than it is at present, were this possible:

SAN AUGUSTINE, TEXAS, March 4, 1868.

To the Editors of the *Picayune*:

As I know your readers would like to hear what is going on in any of our afflicted sister states, it has come into my mind to tell them something of our doings in this portion of Texas.

I have good news to tell. A great many of our people, of both sexes, seem to have found out that frothing and frowning do not pay, and are now diligently working with their own delicate hands. A friend told me the other day that a lady of our acquaintance, living not a thousand miles from here, had plowed up her garden herself. "Capital," exclaimed I, "but how did she manage it?" "Why," said my friend, "you know her husband is building his house almost alone, and he was pressed for time; they had not money to pay for having the garden plowed, so she got a little negro boy to hold the plow while she led the mule herself. We all told her it would make her sick, for it was a cold, damp day, and you know she is quite delicate, but she would do it." "Well now, I am delighted," said I, "I honor that lady, and wish I could have seen the sight."

A gentleman, who is not as rich as Croesus, told his son to try to hire a man to plow his garden. The son, a boy of sixteen, who had been a student all his life, and delicately nurtured, borrowed from a kind neighbor a mule and plow, drove it boldly through the streets, and plowed the garden himself, doing a good day's work. He had never plowed before. Were not his parents proud of him! Aye, that they were.

Many of our most refined ladies are doing their own cooking and other work. I saw one of them, not long ago, diligently sweeping her yard, and not long after I heard her performing on the piano forte music of a high character. I know some fair young ladies who are not afraid to roll up their sleeves, tuck up their skirts and run out to milk the cows; and, when the labors of the day are over, they are ready to entertain their beaux with some really good music. One such girl is worth a hundred fine ladies, who spend their time in imitating the latest fashion or reading the last novel.

MARY WOLSTONCRAFT.

IS MAN THE NATURAL PROTECTOR OF WOMAN?

IN "THE REVOLUTION" of the 20th of February, S. A. Underwood calls the attention of the editors to the injustice done Mary Wolstoncraft, the first "defender and vindicator" of Woman's Rights, and refers to the holy horror of certain "self-righteous Pharisees," who shrink from her morality of atheism, and are shocked at her "disregard of the marriage rite," her "bold handling of subjects foreign to woman's delicacy," and her contempt for those clinging, dependent graces which make her sex so lovely in the eyes of man, "her natural protector." Now, I know nothing of Mary Wolstoncraft's writings, except what I gather from S. A. Underwood's communication. But the scoffers at the morality of atheism should know the quality of atheistical morality. It is the predominance of the principle of moral right, a principle which is inherent in the nature of its possessor, neither born of fear, nor by fear compelled, or forced within certain limits or boundaries. Now, it appears to me that this natural, inherent morality ought to possess moral, responsible beings. It is the morality of intelligent, civilized christianity, and nothing short of it is morality.

The marriage rite seems to have been disregarded by Mary Wolstoncraft! Let us examine it. A rite is a form intended to express the existence of certain conditions, used in the absence of the recognition of a higher law. Marriage! What is it? One writer defines it thus: "The union of two souls, the joining of two life streams for a stronger, diviner flow to the eternal sea." Now, what is the object of marriage? The question not to be answered in the darkness in which sensualism has enshrouded it; but in the light of Divinity enthroned on the altar of Humanity. The true object of marriage is the blending of two harmonious souls, whose united thought shall perfect be to the end, not only to promote present happiness but to produce a perfect race of peo-

ple. Marriage controlled by the present rite is but legalized sensuality, the sad effects of which are not only visited upon the unhappy mothers and wives, but descend in two-fold degradation upon the generations that follow. Humanity is groaning beneath the corruption and abomination practiced under the sanction of rite recognized by law. Woman would cry out against these abominations, if complaint in this quarter was not so shocking and so odious to public feeling. By whom and for what has this public sentiment been created that compels woman to be disloyal to true virtue and all her moral rights, and loyal to a rite—a form. By whom and for what must the holiest department of her nature be invaded? 'Twas a monster whose name is Lust! and the possessor her "natural protector." And to secure this monster's traffic on the high sea of female purity, man has stolen the livery of heavenly purity for its garments—they have robbed it with the name of love, and poets have immortalized woman's submission to it. They have made it a noble, a beautiful thing for women still to cling to the limp of corruption whose affections are burned to a black crisp by the fires of passion, and whose moral sensibilities are as obtuse as a mule's. They have immortalized that dependence that makes her acknowledge him her "natural protector." Love is harmony of blending, not submission to lust. No woman can be true to her womanly nature, and associate her love with lust. To continually and repeatedly violate a moral law so as to escape the penalty of a civil one, is no part of woman's duty. The rite which should be regarded as sacred in the respect shown for personal liberty, of virtue; and woman, instead of echoing parrot-like the cry of shame and disgrace which man raises when a woman has moral strength and virtue enough to escape from the fetters of a sensualist, should be ready to stay up her hands and her heart. Civil law cannot compel nor control our likes and dislikes.

We appreciate and love according to the ability of the object to call forth that appreciation in us. Our sense of morality does not grow out of civil enactments; but, underlying civil law, is the soul whose continually developing nature will work out for the material man what civil enactments, rites and ceremonies have ever failed to do—a nature of purity.

With regard to Mary Wolstoncraft's "bold handling of subjects foreign to womanly delicacy," let me say: Any subject touching woman's nature—and that nature the holiest of the God-given—which, if being agitated by her would result in benefit to her sex and coming generations, should not, cannot, by the wise be considered foreign to womanly delicacy. What woman would be considered indelicate who, seeing a filthy thing, the miasms of which was carrying corruption and death to a community, would with her own hands bury the rotten carcass, because no man was found able to do it? Why do we find so many men who are ready to point the finger of scorn at women and cry indelicate? and does woman shrink from duty at this ridicule? Because man has an idol to protect, and he fears woman's moral power; and woman's ideas of womanly delicacy are the result of her education, which is to a great extent false, based upon masculine prejudices and power and false notions of right. And this false delicacy is just what man demands for the protection of his idol. And the ground-work of masculine objection to woman's political equality with him is, her interest in politics would divert her mind from this idea of duty, and she might be able to protect her sex from the abuse of their rights. Mary Wolstoncraft's "contempt for those clinging, dependent graces which make her sex so lovely in the eyes of man," "her natural protector," is another point of disgrace to her. This admission on the part of man shows that he can appreciate woman only as a slave. The same kind of love characterized the slaveholder for the beautiful Creole that was subject to his will—he loved her to the deepest extent of his masculine nature. In view of this, how is woman to retain the affections of her "protector," simply by being a willing slave to his basest desires? Now all this perversion of natural feeling is the direct result of Woman's Rights being held in masculine hands. Man has not only crowned himself with rights, but has secured to himself all the privileges, while he attempts to pacify woman with the sugar-coated pill of the privilege of his gallantry, such as vacating his seat in the omnibus, giving her the inside of the walk and carrying her little basket. The privilege of his gallantry amounts to nothing, but the privilege of being victimized. Is man woman's "natural protector?" Let us see! How does he protect the sixteen thousand wretched girls found in houses of infamy. In the city of New York alone—saying nothing of the thousands in other places in this land of masculine protection and "Equal Rights?" Why, simply by paying starvation prices for honest labor, and offering for a sacrifice of wo-

man's virtue a price that would keep her above actual necessity; and punish woman as you will, stigmatize her as you may, make her an outcast, is not remedying the evil in the least; her hard-earned bread is bitter when she gets it, because she has earned it through a business that finds no sanction from her higher faculties. It is a business transaction with her; not for the gratification of lust has she bartered her virtue! But him, her "natural protector"—how is it with him? For the basest, the lowest gratification of his nature he has obtained a slave, and he "protects" her for that purpose, because of remuneration; not because he feels the nobility of natural divinity inspiring to a holy deed of protection. Man, woman's natural protector," offers a premium for the sacrifice of virtue. If he was woman's natural protector, would he not protect her virtue and reward her for it? This state of things must continue so long as the rights of woman are held by man. There is a multitude of women who can be completely gulled by this cry of masculine protection.

But man is woman's natural protector: as a wife she is protected by him. Yes, the rite by which they were bound considered him her natural protector until they should be by death separated; but the civil law sets bounds to this obligation, this "protection." He is bound to protect her so long as she does not desert his "bed" and can eat the "bread" that he provides; but let her once desert his "bed" and the sacredness of the rite is no longer visible. Therefore, the sacredness of the marriage rite and the right to protection from woman's "natural protector" all depends upon her keeping his "bed" and eating his bread. He becomes her "protector" for a remuneration; nothing natural in this protection. Masculine protection gives to man the right to use for intoxicating drinks the breadstuffs, and thereby causing a great scarcity of the staff of life; gives man the right to degrade himself with intoxicating drinks, and bring woman, the creature of his "protection," to want and suffering. And the legacy which masculine protection leaves their sons who are soon to sit in the council chambers of the nation, is moral weakness. Man cannot protect himself from degradation, saying nothing of protecting a "clinging vine;" for when he seeks his own dishonor, woman saves him by withholding from him embrace, his defflement. This masculine protection, this giving support to a "clinging vine," is all a play upon words, a farce, a picture of the imagination, that vanishes when you open your eyes to see the reality to the facts. Yes, a "clinging vine," beautiful in its dependence, winding itself around the poisonous ugly tree, whose very breath in the council chambers of the nation is moral contamination and whose presence with woman at the polls is degrading; "a vine" that has crept into a bed of thorns, pierced at every turn; "a vine" to which is extended the sugar plum of privilege through which the more successfully to victimize.

The poet that wrote those lines ought to be whipped around the standard of masculine protection as long as woman has been, for six thousand years, and we, think a new song would be put into his mouth, even the right of self-protection to every intelligent human being. Woman in her clinging dependence has not done for man nor herself what she might have done, what she can and will do, were she a "helmet" for him—stood side by side with him in every department of life. She has not succeeded in covering up the rough bark of his nature. It will show itself, for instance, at the polls and in the legislative hall. Relieve woman of the care of masculine protection, and man of a work he is in no wise able to perform; give her rights to protect, instead of privileges to depend upon man for, and the moral force of her nature will raise a bulwark and defence against corruption and degradation. Engraft this "vine" into the political life of the nation, and it will change its leprous spots of inequality for a covering of pure democracy, and the "vine," losing its dependence and helplessness, will become the "helmet" the God of nature designed.

S. A. Underwood would not have the "carefully guarded" sisters, the *petted* and *idolized* daughters of the present generation, follow step by step the example of Mary Wolstoncraft. Most certainly not. The morality of the *petted* and *carefully-guarded* women of this present generation is a sickly plant, born in the hot-house of protection, guarded from contact with those healthful, invigorating breezes which result from self-reliance. They would ill bear up against the legalized masculine privateering upon the high sea of feminine weakness. And the way to perpetuate this traffic is to keep her under masculine protection—keep her carefully guarded from a knowledge that she can protect herself, and the business is safe. But there are women to-day whose ears cannot be soothed with the cry of *feminine weakness*. They know that moral strength lies in woman's heart, that

EDUCATED SUFFRAGE

Editors of the Revolution :

To the reformer nothing is of greater importance than to know, first that he is right, second that the basis of his argument is one which can never be destroyed. You, for the present, and I hope the need is only temporary, are reformers. That you are right, that your cause is just is almost universally admitted. Some, however, remain to be convinced. To the basis of your argument I beg leave to call your earnest attention.

In "THE REVOLUTION" of March 12th, page 146, in an article entitled, "Suffrage for Women," you say: "The Post" says there are two courses either of which is apparently just; one, the conferring of the right of suffrage upon all irrespective of color or sex; the other, the establishment of certain requirements of education, which all must comply with to be entitled to enfranchisement. * * * 'THE REVOLUTION' only proposes a slight educational test." Many who are opposed to female suffrage have here found a peg upon which to hang an argument; it is this; by saying that it is just to confer the right of suffrage upon all irrespective of color or sex, and that "THE REVOLUTION" only proposes a slight educational test, you admit that there is somewhere a power entitled to confer this right. Secondly, that you who are women of education, think it will be just to refuse to confer it upon those who are not educated. Now, reasoning upon these two propositions they say; if you admit that suffrage is to be conferred and that it is right to deprive some who are your inferiors in education, you ought not to blame man for assuming, as you do, to draw a line even though that line exclude women. They liken you to the old lady, who, protesting to another dressing in feathers and jewels in reply to the remark "but you wear ribbons," answered, "Well, the line must be drawn somewhere, I draw it at ribbons." If you admit that the line must be drawn somewhere, is it not assumption to say that where you draw it is the only right place, and that where man draws it is the wrong place. These questions I have been asked by our enemies (I say our, for although a man I have as deep an interest in the cause of universal suffrage as any woman), with a tone indicating that they thought, that, at least, was conclusive. My answer invariably is, that the right of suffrage is a natural right, is born with the child, belongs to him as he sleeps in his cradle, follows him through youth and age until he sleeps again in the grave. That very individual, whether infant or adult, who is of sound mind, and is not permitted to vote, is deprived of a right. In the child it is an inchoate right, from his weakness incapable of being exercised, but none the less his right. That while no line should be drawn, yet since he is incapable in infancy of exercising it, some time, some age should be fixed, at which governments shall cease to deprive him of this right, and that time should be one where the least injustice will be done. Experience and reason would seem to teach us, that at or about the age of 21, the time when children are regarded as able to be emancipated from the family government and take care of themselves in the great world around them, is the nearest to that desirable period when the mind shall be capable of comprehending the theory of government, and of forming its opinions upon the issues of the hour. Even this is depriving some but it is the nearest approach to full justice the mind can conceive. All will some day reach it; the poor, the rich, the ignorant and the wise shall all speak. Some may be competent younger, some not competent even then, but this age approaches nearer perhaps, than any other, the age when reason, rather than passion, shall govern, when judgment, rather than influence, direct. With education this cannot always be so. Some may be uneducated either because of a failure of opportunity, inclination or incapacity.

But again, "Taxation without representation." A poor illiterate man who cannot even read may own property. Shall he because of this want of education be disfranchised, or will you only tax voters? Even then he is answerable to your laws, in the creation of which he has nothing to do. Yet he may not be to blame. Now I present this question to you, in order that you, considering it, shall give your friends throughout the country, either the certainty that woman claims her right or asks a privilege; that we may know whether woman demands a right which she is willing all shall have in its full degree, "without money and without price," or that she draws a line which may exclude some less fortunate; whether she and her friends are endeavoring to deepen the foundations and render more permanent the structure of free government, by placing it upon the rock of "Universal Liberty and Equality" in the genuine meaning of the term, or are advocating an "educational aristocracy." Is it not better, safer, truer and

moral force is an inherent element in her nature, and if permitted to protect herself this inherent germ would develop. She is fully capable of going forth in a philanthropic work for the elevation of that class of degraded feminine protectors, whose very presence at the polls and in the legislative halls of the nation would degrade her." They know that rights are worth more to them as a sex and to us as a nation than all the "privileges" that masculine gallantry can dole out to them. This sugar-plum of "privileges" has soured at last upon the moral stomach of woman. MARAH.

"MARYLAND, MY MARYLAND."

Editors of the Revolution :

PERHAPS you will like an occasional word from that freshly-initiated co-worker, the Maryland Equal Rights Society, and to learn that it is struggling upon its feet, growing and strengthening as rapidly as can be anticipated of so young an association in so stagnant an atmosphere. The most recent act of this Society was the sending of a petition to the Maryland Legislature, which body is at present engaged in framing a school system for the state. The petition in question prays that the same facilities for education may be extended likewise to the colored children of the state, and that, as there exists a system of night schools for males who have no opportunity during the day for study, a similar provision, for a like reason, may be made for females. It is supported by the signatures of upwards of a thousand persons, irrespective of sex, color, or political bias. No doubt it will share the common fate of all memorials that jostle against popular prejudices, but as a reminder that there are individuals alive to full consciousness of the measure of justice which should appertain to them, it will not fall wholly of effect.

We continue to receive countenance and favor from the direction of the Quaker City. Mr. Samuel H. Paist, in the course of a late address before the Society, gave us, in his epicy way, some uncompromising facts. In reference to the argument so frequently urged against extending the elective franchise to woman, that to permit her to come in contact with the drunkenness and profanity of the polls was contaminating to her virtue and refinement, he remarked that it applied also in the case of the tax office, where she came into proximity with foul language and tobacco in their most aggravated forms. Yet nobody on this account was so considerate of female purity as to propose the exemption of woman from taxation, and thus forbid her appearance at that scene of corruption, rather than expose her to its polluting influence.

We ourselves think that the supporters of this favorite argument would do well to act upon the hint here given. Verily, consistency is a jewel, which our law-makers, if they have found, refuse to wear.

In conclusion, a word as to the status of "THE REVOLUTION" in this city. It is proving itself literally worthy of its name. Many who have made its acquaintance, both men and women, admit that they see the question of universal suffrage in a new light, and that they cannot answer the arguments brought to bear in its favor. Indeed, all that the people at large require in regard to this most unfairly defined of all reform principles, is enlightenment. It is well that it has at last found an organ through which to become its own exponent, no longer at the mercy of ignorant and unprincipled interpreters, who have so persistently warped its plain justice according to the stupidity of their heads and the lying malice of their hearts. The sexes are not brought into hostile opposition, but into harmony and good understanding with each other, based upon mutual fair dealing, for it is a fixed fact that none are truly friends except upon equal terms. Woman is not to abandon her duties, but to enlarge and perfect her circumscribed means of performing them, and man is not in danger, as some timorous hearts have forbidden, of exchanging places with her unless he so choose.

That you may prosper as you have persevered in the fervent wish of

A TRUE FRIEND OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

THE N. Y. Times says "THE REVOLUTION" tells us 'there are plenty of ladies quite equal to the Victorias, Annes and Elizabeths of England, the Theresas of Austria and the Catharines of Russia.' We have not met this item of news in any other of our contemporaries." If the Times doubts about it, we fear it has been unfortunate in its lady acquaintance.

wisser to maintain that the right to vote is a natural right, of which none capable of self-government should be deprived, and that the time at which it shall become operative ought to be one which all must attain, rather than a test which only the "select" shall ever reach.

Our government, at least, should have no disfranchised class, except those who occupy a felon's place after having broken their contract with God and man. No disfranchisement because of race, sex, color, political or religious opinion. If education is made the standard, those men and women who to-day cannot read and are now too old to attain your standard of education will be a disfranchised class. Is it not better that the restriction on the exercise of the right should cease at some age which wisdom shall point out, and experience teach to be the true one, rather than the privilege be conferred on standing certain tests?

If the education of the people is desired, is it not better to educate all to a proper degree and bear with the ignorance of the few, than to have a standard of enfranchisement and a disfranchised class?

These questions I ask in a spirit of sincerity and anxious inquiry. NEMO.

THE CAUSE IN MAINE.

WOMEN FOR SCHOOL COMMITTEES.

FOR some reason, not a paper in Portland seems willing to exchange with "THE REVOLUTION," and very few in the whole state of Maine. It is cheering, however, to know that our doctrines penetrate even into the fogs of the "Lumber state," as witness the following letter, copied from the Portland Press, sent us by a friend:

HIRAM, March 15, 1868.

MR. EDITOR: A statement is going the rounds of the press that the democrats of Hiram supported a lady for a member of the school committee. I am unwilling that any person or party shall be ridiculed or censured for an act of which I was the instigator, and for which I am chiefly responsible. I am in favor of electing ladies to that office, and accordingly voted for a lady, without her knowledge or consent; several democrats and several republicans voted with me. I have reason to believe that scores of democrats voted for the able and popular candidate of the republicans (Dr. Wm. H. Smith) and but for my peculiar notion I should have voted for him myself, as I always vote with the republican party. I am in favor, however, of laying aside politics in voting for school committees, and the question of capability should outweigh the question of sex or crinoline.

A few years ago we had a large number of boy school-masters, but agents are learning to appreciate teachers of fact, experience and natural qualifications as well as book knowledge. Of eleven schools under the care of the writer the past year, but one was taught by a male teacher, and by turning to the reports I find that of forty-nine schools taught in Hiram during the past two years, forty-two were taught by ladies.

Four of our female teachers of the past year have taught respectively 20, 21, 23 and 30 schools.

I pit the question, why should a lady who has taught thirty schools be considered less suitable for the office of school committee than the undersigned who has taught but two, or scores of men who never taught school at all? Slowly and with hesitation over the ice of prejudice comes that unreasonable reason—"O, cause." But regardless of pants or crinoline or ridicule, the question remains unanswered and unanswerable. It is not deemed improper for the ladies of Hiram to go with their husbands to the town house to a cattle show and fair, and serve as committees on butter and cheese, but it is considered unreasonable for ladies to serve as superintending school committees.

General Washington gave a lieutenant's commission to a woman, for her skill and bravery in manning a battery at the battle of Monmouth. He also granted her half pay during life. It is slated in Lincoln's Lives of the Presidents that "she wore an apotheosis, and everybody called her Captain Molly." And yet I do not read in history that Gen. Washington was ever impeached. Females have more and better influence than males, and under their instruction our schools have been improving for some years. There is less kicking and cudgelling, and more attention is given to that best of all rules, The Golden Rule. If they are more efficient as teachers it is not fair to presume that they would excel as committees? Very respectfully yours,

ELLSWELLEN A. WADSWORTH.

The editor of the Press adds to the above his own endorsement, in these words: