

will soon show you what class of women will govern this nation.

Nor will female suffrage affect the question of female labor. For the prices of labor must follow the laws of trade, and with these voting has nothing to do. But could legislation regulate the wages of labor, is there any reason to suppose, our author inquires, that woman would be more disposed than man to pay higher wages to women? Every one who has traded much with women will join in her "I fear not."

Legislation, war, taxation, nothing to do with the laws of trade! We recommend Gail and her reviewer to a deeper consideration of this whole question of political economy, and they will find that the political status of the laborer has a good deal to do with his work and wages. The ballot in the hands of the southern laborer changes the law of southern trade. Instead of the lash for his unrequited toil, he to-day works for wages, and makes his own contract. With the right to all the offices under government, to the colleges, law schools, theological seminaries, medical schools and hospitals, which the ballot gives, who does not see that the ranks of school teachers and sewing women would be thinned out at once, and the wages of those who remained necessarily increased? Whatever women might do for each other, the laws of trade will secure equal wages to all not depressed in the market by artificial conditions. What gives point to the strikes of working men? The ballot that lies behind them. Why are laborers more dignified in this country than in the Old World? Because they have a voice in the government with the ballot they hold in their hand, the key to all the advantages and opportunities of life.

Nor will the right to suffrage raise woman in the social scale. The intelligent, cultivated woman, stands no lower in her own eyes or in the eyes of men, because of her political disability. The frivolous and vain would not be elevated were the disability removed. The first does not need the ballot as an incentive to exertion and self-culture; and if the exciting questions of the times fail to arouse the apathy of the latter, it is to be feared that going to the polls would prove insufficient. "Mobs and rowdies have always voted, and are mobs and rowdies still." The suggestion of the fat offices which the possession of the ballot would open to woman, Gail repels with an indignant "Get thee behind me, Satan."

The right of suffrage simply represents the divine idea of equality, taught in our new religion by Jesus, and echoed by the fathers in the theory of our government.

The moment you disfranchise any class you make an invidious distinction that degrades those thus ostracised, not only in their own eyes, but in the eyes of those in the superior position.

If women are not degraded in the eyes of men, how shall we account for the insulting laws on their statute books, their interpretations of Holy Writ—for Todd's pamphlet—for their treatment of our famous sculptor, Harriet Hosmer, who knocked in vain at the doors of their colleges for a course of lectures on anatomy—for their insolence to Dr. Mercy B. Jackson, in denying her the right to become a member of the Homeopathic Association of Physicians in Boston? Surely, these are not evidences of man's respect for woman. And if there are women in this nation who, knowing all these things, can read Coke, Blackstone, Story and Kent, without feeling the degradation of their whole sex, without an honest burst of indignation, we say they are lacking in the essential elements of true womanhood.

As to Gail's "Get thee behind me, Satan," we ask, would you rather be mistress of some fashionable rone, and live on his bounty, or postmistress on \$5,000 a year, and live on your

own industry, in virtue and independence? It is as honorable to serve the nation faithfully as it is the family and the home—no more, no less.

E. C. A.

WHAT THE PRESS SAYS OF US.

From the New York Citizen (Miles O'Reilly).

BRAINS, BONNETS, BABIES AND BALLOTS.

It will be an important step in the progress of society when women arrive at that state of mind which will induce them to pay more attention to their brains than to their bonnets, and to give more thought to their babies than to ballots. There is scarcely a doubt that the prevailing passion for fashionable display in dress absorbs much of the time which should be devoted to the improvement of the mind and to maternal duties. It has come to pass among women in our day, that the demands of fashion are inimical to the moral obligations imposed on the marriage state. The palpable duties of maternity are ignored for the frivolous gratification of frequenting the fashionable promenade in tight-fitting dresses and costly bonnets. The substantial treasures of the study are abandoned for the stupid frivolities of the boudoir, and society in consequence is overwhelmed with a nauseous flood of superficiality. It is idle to endeavor to conceal the vast amount of mischief effected in the world by the inordinate love of display that has grown up among us—carrying families down to ruin, and causing them to neglect many noble and virtuous duties.

Quite equal in its baleful effects on marital and social obligations is the passion for enfranchisement, at present animating the breasts of certain ladies with masculine proclivities. It seems almost incredible that as a matter of choice any woman should prefer the luxury of wielding a ballot to that of nursing a baby. The most potent source of woman's power is to be found in the nurture and training of her children, and the influence which a true woman will never fail to exert over her husband, her brother, or her friends. She will seldom seek in vain for noble representatives in these if she proves herself worthy of them. Then there are national considerations which the self-sacrifice of woman should not permit her to overlook. The country needs babies more than ballots, at this time; especially when we take into account our recent acquisitions from the negro ranks. It is of infinitely more importance that the ladies should have brains and babies than that they should flaunt bonnets and ballots. What say those talented and progressive ladies, including Parker Pillsbury, who edit "THE REVOLUTION?"

Now, Miles, pray do not mix things up in this unaccountable way. The strong and weak-minded have each their idiosyncrasies. To clear up your vision on this question, let us analyze and arrange for you the facts of life. On one side behold ballets, brains and babies. On the other, bonnets, balls, brocades, buchu and barrenness.

The women who demand the ballot are those who have brains and babies, who believe in one husband; in clean, comfortable, well-ordered homes; in healthy, happy children, and in the dignity and self-respect of those who serve the household—women who do not follow fashion or frivolity, but spend their leisure hours in works of charity and reform—in reading, writing, and healthy exercise. Every woman identified with our cause, except Susan B. Anthony, is married; nearly all have large families, and all alike are remarkable for vigor of mind and body. These women dress plainly, live simply, understand the science of government, political and domestic economy, and are at this moment the salt of the nation; trying to dignify labor and secure virtue, by urging on all women the duty of self-support; trying to purify and perpetuate the family relation, by pressing on men a new code of morals; trying to redeem the church by teaching practical Christianity; and trying to exalt the state by pressing on our statesmen the principles of justice and equality. Take a tour of inspection, Mr. O'Reilly, into the homes and habits of the

"strong-minded," before you again allow your pen to lay at our doors any of the follies or vices of that class of women moulded after man's ideal.

Remember the supply is ever equal to the demand. In the vice, vacuity and vanity of the weak-minded women of our day, behold, oh! men of the republic, your own handiwork.

From the Convention-day Journal, St. Louis.

"THE REVOLUTION."—This paper, devoted to Woman's Rights principally, is having good success. Probably there are few Spiritualists but sympathize with and endorse the views of its editors on the question of Woman's Rights, and we are sure its largest patronage comes from the members of our societies. Our lecturers are the most eloquent agitators on that subject that it has. A few of them make it almost a specialty, doing great service in the cause.

Yes, the Spiritualists have done much to advance the cause of woman and every other cause, by leading people to think and examine for themselves. We have indeed a good list of subscribers from St. Louis.

From the Newburgh Daily Journal.

"THE REVOLUTION."—We have received the fourteenth number of this zealous and aggressive advocate of "Woman's Rights." It is edited by Mrs. Stanton and Parker Pillsbury, who battle away "manfully" for what they think justice requires to be added to the "womanly" stature. Every aspect of the subject is treated with vigor and ability, but, naturally, not always with discretion. It is believed, by this school of reformers, apparently, that their work is that of challenging public attention by the boldness and audacity of their innovations and pretensions, and not always to consider either the desirability or feasibility of the "reforms" for which they demonstrate. The consequence is that they often wound and retard the cause they would advance. "THE REVOLUTION," however, furnishes its readers much that is valuable, and gives to the advocates of the doctrines which it espouses the advantage of having them presented by able writers and through a medium which must be recognized as authority upon these matters. "THE REVOLUTION" also grapples with public questions outside of those pertaining more especially to the "rights" and "wrong" of woman, and discusses politics, finance, and social topics, of every aspect.

If all these friends who criticise our mode of warfare will "wound the cause" the same way we do, we shall soon have the world ablaze on the question. If you have any fault to find, tell us precisely what it is. If there are any flaws in arguments or principles, show them up. We hate generalisms and mysterious warnings and doubtings.

From the Laws of Life, Dansville, N. Y.

"THE REVOLUTION," is the name of a weekly paper started at the beginning of this year, which advocates "educated suffrage, irrespective of sex or color; equal pay to women for equal work; eight hours labor," etc. Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the leading editor, is, by native talent, education, and experience, as competent to treat these subjects as any woman living, in this or any other country.

From the Memorial and Rock, Plymouth, Mass.

"THE REVOLUTION."—This sprightly paper, under the management of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, is making quite a stir in journalism. It discusses public matters in a spicy manner, and proves conclusively that for caustic sharpness and pointed pungency, a woman's pen fully maintains the reputation of her tongue.

From the Scholarie Republican.

"THE REVOLUTION."—"Principle, not policy, justice, not favors. Men, their rights and nothing more: Women, their rights and nothing less." Such is the title and such the motto of the organ of the "Women's Rights" party. It is sprightly, spicy and readable. Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Parker Pillsbury; Susan B. Anthony, Proprietor.

From the New York Atlas.

"THE REVOLUTION" exhibits pluck as well as ability. The force and freedom with which it discusses topics of vital importance, that are too often tabooed by false delicacy, deserve the warmest praise.

"THE REVOLUTION."—A number of this paper has

been sent to us with a request for an exchange. We cheerfully accede to this, inasmuch as we desire, at some future time, to discuss some of the objects which the paper has in view. We can only now say that it is designed to aid in effecting a revolution in woman's present social and political condition, raising her from a state of serfdom and dependence, and placing her in civil and social equality with man. It is an able exponent of the ideas of the advance guard of female freedom. Its terms are \$2 a year. Susan B. Anthony, publisher, 37 Park Row.

Discuss? That is right, Leonard. Get yourself ready armed and equipped with arguments on the principle "that taxation and representation are inseparable." Don't bring any old prejudices into the arena. We long to discuss this question of Woman's Rights, and, in fact, all questions, with reasonable, thinking men on their true merits. But do you know we give all our wit and wisdom to the world for the small sum of \$2.00? and we want the good women of Warwick to help us swell our subscription list, so that we can have some influence in the Presidential election. We want to see if we cannot have a man in the White House next time who holds his animal nature in abeyance to the moral. Let no drunkard again stand at the helm of our government.

From the Troy Daily Times.

We are bound in all candor to say that "THE REVOLUTION," Miss Anthony's Women's Rights paper, is a readable, well-edited and instructive journal. Mrs. Stanton and Mr. Pillsbury are the editors, and they are certainly sharp and able writers. Their correspondence, too, is spicy and interesting. "THE REVOLUTION" is a paper of ideas, however impracticable they may be, and its beautiful mechanical execution renders its appearance very attractive.

Now, Mr. Times, no innuendoes. Tell us like a man which one of our ideas is "impracticable." "By faith shall ye remove mountains." We believe it possible to end vice, misery and selfishness on the earth, and to so educate the race, that they will see the beauty and wisdom of all God's laws, and by bringing themselves into harmony with them, secure health and happiness, peace and good will to all men.

From the People's Weekly, Washington.

We have received "THE REVOLUTION," with respect "please notice and exchange."

At a hasty glance we see some good and correct ideas in "THE REVOLUTION," but its main idea—that the Creator made a mistake in the relations he established between the sexes—is one we are not prepared to accept.

Put on your spectacles and read us over again, and you will find that we believe the laws of the Creator wise, good and immutable. Far be it from us to make Providence the pack-horse for all man's follies and weaknesses. It is the laws of man and not of God that we arraign before the judgment of the world. Our main idea, "equality," was endorsed by the Fathers of '76, and by the gospel of Jesus, 1800 years ago, and we are sorry for the man not yet prepared to accept it.

From the Winsted Herald, Litchfield, Conn.

In our list of exchanges are many welcome visitors, and though comparisons are said to be odious, we propose to be a little odious, and say that "THE REVOLUTION" compares very favorably with any of them. Mrs. E. Cady Stanton is the chief spoke in "THE REVOLUTIONARY" wheel, and Mr. Parker Pillsbury is chief of staff. We suppose Mr. P. P. is attached to "THE REVOLUTION" not so much to strengthen the cause of Woman's Rights (though he does strengthen it), as it is handy to have a man in the house. We are not prepared just now to wage efficient warfare for Woman's Rights, because we have not made the subject a study. Our labors have been confined to the rights of men and humanity in general, but we offer "THE REVOLUTION" the right hand of fellowship, and gladly accede to help all that she ought to have. We are not prejudiced in favor of class, caste or sex, and shall always labor for

the rights of ALL THE PEOPLE, which we know they do not now enjoy. If the women of Connecticut had exercised the right of suffrage on Monday last, we should not now blush with shame to think that the sham democracy have elected their State ticket, when nearly double their entire majority was given by the puritans of New Haven—the Five Points of New York. We hope "THE REVOLUTION" will never go backward.

"Onward" is our motto. We hope you will prepare yourself at once to "wage efficient warfare for Woman's Rights." With your faith in what women might have done in the late election in Connecticut, it is evident you are "almost persuaded to be a Christian." There is nothing surer than that our political world will be purified and exalted when the moral power of woman is infused into its life and legislation. If you had invited half a dozen eloquent women to stump your State you might have carried the election.

WHAT THE PEOPLE SAY TO US.

MR. PILLSBURY: In reading "What the Press Says of Us," in your eleventh number, I said to myself, Why all these differences? "THE REVOLUTION" is a host in itself; why should it be so troubled at a Mordecai in the gate? Suppose that certain papers do ignore it, "will not shake hands or speak its name;" it cannot be expected that all of us will see things exactly from its standpoint. I know there are many from whom you have not received one word of encouragement, who rejoice exceedingly in the truths you utter and in the number of your readers.

Had "THE REVOLUTION" had its birth in a manger or in a garret, it might have been looked upon with less suspicion; but it came from less humble quarters, and so strangely swaddled in parti-colored webs, and heralded with so much redomontade that it disgusted good, staid, discreet reformers. I acknowledge to being myself as much troubled as others, especially about the Conventions, and one of the speakers nominating himself for the Presidency, and all that fustian; but as soon as it got breath and voice to speak, and fully assert itself, I recognized its tone as the genuine inspiration of truth and justice. It came to my ear as clearly as the sound of the bag-pipe to the ear of the Scotch woman at Lucknow.

Had I not written you, and I certainly should not, but for a personal acquaintance, you would have imagined me—for I am one of the *Standard's* subscribers—"looking dark and sullen, pouting, thumb in mouth," to think that an advance guard had got the start of us. You see how much mistaken you would have been; just so, doubtless, you misjudge others. "Let the honor of thy neighbor be to thee like thy own," is an old Talmudic proverb. We are great only when we are generous and just; when we can forget, and rise above the petty causes that sting the soul, and remember only the sacredness of our mission—educating woman into a nobler womanhood, and trying to bring up the nation to a higher nationality.

Again, if any paper advocating any branch of reform shall have a meagre subscription list, thus showing that the people do not appreciate or feel their need of it, it should be cause for deep sorrow, rather than occasion for an ungracious fling. Suppose it does not embrace Woman Suffrage—in that the Procrustean bed upon which everything is to be stretched, whether organized for that, or for some other specific object? You and I regard Woman Suffrage as one of the living and most important issues of the day, and most energetically should it be pressed at the present time, that reconstruction may be effected on a sure and safe basis. But others who desire as earnestly as we the salvation of the country and whose ideal of republicanism is as exalted as our own, whose labors to that end, I feel that I do myself honor by acknowledging with reverence, do not appear to agree with us. They must be governed by their convictions, we by ours.

Your caustic criticisms of the standard-bearers of reform give pleasure, no doubt, to all their opponents, from George Francis Train and the Cincinnati *Inquirer* down to the boys in the debating societies at the four corner settlements. Probably some rally around you now, attracted mostly by the castigation of these people whose lives and whose publications have been to them, in time past, a continual reproach.

All I have to say is this: Do not regard those as enemies who have not given you a cordial greeting, nor

those as your best friends who have. Time will demonstrate in which class our principles take the deepest root, and bear the fairest fruit. It is not easy to win men from the shrine of beauty and fashion, from the mire of sensualism, and enlist their influence for the elevation of woman. It is not easy to inspire woman with independence to claim more freedom, a larger, fuller, and better life, else you would hear not one, but many voices, from Fifth Avenue, and from every other Avenue. But God be thanked for "THE REVOLUTION," notwithstanding its strictures.

While writing the last sentence, number twelve came to hand, in which you say, "No other journal in the nation now exerts a more deleterious influence on the cause of impartial justice and freedom, in proportion to its circulation, than the *Anti-Slavery Standard*." Worse and worse! I see the argument that naturally lies behind this statement. Its origin is in that theology which says, the more moral the man the worse the man, unless he be a Christian. The same idea has largely pervaded our radicalism. How often have I heard that the respectable hotel that dispenses a glass occasionally is infinitely worse than the lowest, vilest groggery; and a very plausible argument can be made in its defence.

On the same principle, that organ that claims suffrage for one class, and not for all classes, has a worse influence than that paper which rejects and ridicules the whole question of freedom and equality. I do not believe in the doctrine, and I never did. God speed you in all that is good, and true, and noble, and save you from marred the grandeur of your work by unnecessary friction.

Truly yours,

J. ELIZABETH JONES.

LONG EDDY, April 7, 1868.

MRS. STANTON: I am a thorough believer in Woman's Rights, am in sympathy with your paper in general and many of your views in particular, and wholly second it in its determination to elevate, dignify and raise woman to the true place nature intended her to occupy as the equal and loving partner of man. The sex to which we belong needs only to adhere to the true delicacy of the female character to be heard. While we yield to man the strong attributes, and consider the loving kindness and gentle care so many of us have experienced, we must ask for and insist upon having our inalienable and natural rights. We must also show ourselves capable of exercising those rights before we are too persistent and strong in our demands that they be accorded to us.

The history of nations shows us that to suddenly give a people who have long been under the rule of tyrants too great liberty, is simply to ruin them. We must educate our sex up to their rights to make them capable of exercising those rights, when obtained. We must inspire woman with a desire for equal rights, that she make some struggle for it. The Greeks, the Romans and our own people were better prepared to enjoy and maintain their liberties by the sacrifices they made and the difficulties they surmounted in their heroic struggle to obtain them. Women, like generals, must win their way from the ranks to the chief command. We, as women, must show ourselves worthy; we must exhibit a strength of character and a determination to be equal to the high destiny we aspire to. But this cannot be done by sanctioning such sentiments and reasonings as are found in the number of "THE REVOLUTION" dated April 2, entitled "Mary Woolstoncraft—Is man the Natural Protector of Woman?" and signed Mirah. Speaking of the marriage rite, Mirah says: "Marriage controlled by the present rite is but legalized sensuality, the sad effects of which are not only visited upon the unhappy wives and mothers, but descend in two-fold degradation upon the generations that follow. Humanity is groaning beneath the corruptions and abominations practiced under the sanction of rite recognized by law. Woman would cry out against these abominations if complaint in this quarter were not so shocking and so odious to public feeling. By whom and for what must the holiest department of her nature be invaded? 'Twas a monster whose name was Lust! and the possessor her 'natural protector.'"

It is against such reasoning that I protest. I claim the right, being the mother of six children, and having lived fifteen years a wife, to cry out against such sentiments. I, who have borne my children, and worked hard to half clothe and feed them, would now shield them from such sickly sentimentalities. Is the "holiest department of a woman's nature" too holy to be invaded by her husband? Is a husband who loves his wife, and nature intended he should love her, "a monster whose name is Lust?" If so, shall we do away with the terrible rite and imitate the *Oneida Community*? Are we too good