

Juror, if even northern women rebel, what can you expect at the south? The "negro element" at the south, of which we hear so much, may make voters for the republican party, but it does not give us what we need in government. The people are concerned about deeper principles than such as serve the shifting purposes of politicians.

We hear much high-sounding talk about "saving the country," but what is a country to the women who have no voice in the laws that govern them? What is a country to the suffering masses; the denizens of garrets, and cellars, and mud cabins, on the lonely prairies, so long as all the fruit of their industry is stolen by their rulers.

E. C. S.

### HOUSEWORK.

EVERY year adds to the difficulty of hiring good housekeeping. Perhaps it is not a marketable commodity. At any rate, in the large cities it is at a higher premium than gold. There is a reason for this somewhere. Good cooks are as few and far between as were righteous men in Sodom. Wendell Phillips might add good cookery to his list of Lost Arts. Most families in the cities do not even know what good cooking is. A loaf of good bread is almost as much a miracle as were the five thousand we read of produced in the Judean desert. Cooking should be reckoned a Fine Art, and taught as are music and painting. Instead of being entrusted to the worst conditioned, and worst taught in the community, it should at least be superintended by the most refined, the best cultivated. Every man and every woman should consider the human body as infinitely higher in the scale of existence than a statue. All should be artists to produce a form and figure as divine as the statue of Pygmalion, making the myth in some sense true. Food must have much to do with it. The instinct of brutes is better to them than is the wisdom of man to him. He is badly born, badly nursed, and it is bad with him ever. So with woman. We talk of beautiful women, but not of beautiful men. Why not? But there are not many beautiful women, even. Health is essential to beauty. Women generally have no health. It is even fashionable to be delicate. It is said that Bonaparte declared if a soldier is not depraved, it is the business of war to make him so. If woman is not frail, drooping, sickly, what is fashion for but to make her so? We don't know health, beauty, or cookery. The latter has all to do with the two former, that culture and skill have with the artist in producing beautiful statues. Ambrosia need not be fabulous. It should be the food of men as well as gods. If what we eat do not give us immortal life, it surely should not be mortal death to us. Hired housekeeping is now an abomination. Perhaps it must be, to teach us the better way. It is all wrong from the foundation. There is talk of the "eight hour system" as an amelioration of labor. What will become of families and house-work, when women adopt it?

But the purpose intended when we began is almost forgotten. It was only to introduce some sensible suggestions on the general subject of housework, from the Jamestown (N. Y.) Journal, as follows:

There are two minor reasons why intelligent women dislike domestic labor. One is because they are so often made the victims of—not the ill usage—but the whims of incompetent mistresses—"ladies" who don't know

what good housework is and have all the more conceit and impracticable ideas on that account. The less a person knows the more he or she assumes. There are more incompetent mistresses than incompetent servants—if it were not so, the demand for "some one to do the housework" would not be so great. Another philosophical reason is, that women hate to be dictated to by women, especially by a woman who knows less about the work than one she directs and only has the advantage of the servant in that she is "settled in life" with a husband who can afford to hire help for her—a point of very little merit in the servant's eyes.

In our opinion the plain fact of the case is, that housework is avoided because of its severity. It is the hardest muscular exertion a woman has to do. We do not mean that it is the most exhausting nor that it soonest wears a woman out—but that it has more duties that call for a great outlay of strength. It is reduced to a simple question of muscle, in our opinion. There is about as much human nature in a woman as in a man, and either one of them will select the easiest life possible. While a large class shun the severe labor of housework and prefer lighter, but less profitable and more confining work; there is a large class that actually cannot do housework—they have not the necessary physical power and endurance. So that work is left to the more robust and more muscular Celt, German or Swede. Our American girls, as a class, are physically incompetent for housework. We know this is not a popular theory. It is not so fine spun and philosophical as the "social ostracism" idea; but it is plainer and more reasonable.

Men of loose observation will be apt to scout the idea of housework being hard. They generally do—but it is on the same principle that the Indian found it easy work to sit on the fence and watch a white man mowing. When some man has done housework a few weeks, with all the crude, unimproved and inconvenient appliances of the business as at present developed, he may make an intelligent estimate of the amount of muscle it requires.

### WOMEN AS JURORS.

THE N. Y. Express doubts whether women would be more lenient to their sex, detected in Infanticides or kindred immoralities than men. It says: "The right of jury duty, which most men regard as great a trial as do plaintiffs and defendants before them, is one of these privileges or rights. Miss Anthony would have women tried by women, and this has been a complaint in the case of Hester Vaughan,—but those who think that women are more lenient than men to the foibles or offences of their sex, greatly mistake all that is taught in the school of experience. Would a jury of women show more favor to the woman accused of slaying her infant to conceal her departure from virtue, than they would have shown to her if detected in the latter transgression?"

"And speaking of INFANTICIDE, the Express adds, there is but one way to rid the world of its accumulating horrors. Remove the conditions and the temptations from which they grow. So long as women becoming mothers outside of a conventional pale are to see before them social proscription, deadly and inexorable for the rest of their lives, some driven by despair will kill themselves, and others by terror will kill their infants. So long, too, as there are social conditions of such a nature as to cause the birth of children, even in wedlock, to be regarded as an infelicitous event, some of those who take this view of family enlargement, will, depend upon it, in order to keep within proper limitations, resort to bad practices. Parker Pillsbury when he said that 'wives, with husbands consenting, were continually guilty of the crime' of infanticide, was not much in the wrong, speaking of the highly civilized people among whom he lives. Gen. Butler states, upon statistical data, that the charity of Massachusetts kills more than one-half both of the children and adults taken under its protection."

Massachusetts is bad enough, but as to the

crime of infanticide not worse than the states adjoining her on every hand. Dr. Oaks of Androscoggin county, Me., testified, scarcely a year ago, in a medical convention, that according to the best estimate he could make, there were four hundred child murders in that single county every year. Nor is it a populous county by any means. Nor probably is it any worse than the country will average. It is an awful fountain that sends forth such streams; a terrible tree that bears such fruit.

### WOMEN AND DRESS.

UNDER this head, the London Saturday Review has some suggestions that will apply as well to one side of the Atlantic as the other. It first considers the common notion that "Women dress to please men." As a diagnosis of the original physiology of woman's love of ornaments, or as an evolution of the first elementary principle whence sprang that habit of self-adornment which is now congenial in woman, this apophthegm, though inadequate, no doubt partly expresses the truth. But as an explanation of the causes of the modern extravagance of dress-worship in woman, it is not merely inadequate, but positively untrue. Whatever may be the case in a savage community, it is certain that, as English society is at present constituted, women do not "dress to please men," but to please, or rather to escape the persecutions of their own sex. Fear of woman, and not love of man, is the feeling which makes them submit to the tyranny of the fashions. Woman is, in this respect, her own enslaver. If any woman doubts this, let her ask herself whether, when she dresses for a dinner party, it is the attention bestowed by the host, or that bestowed by the hostess on her toilette, that gives her the most concern. Is it the criticism of the men, or that of the women, that she most courts and fears? Is it before or after dinner that justice is done to her dress? The truth is that the nine men out of ten who tell us that "women dress to please men" never criticise women's dress at all. If a woman is very eccentrically or very unbecomingly dressed, most of them have a vague, general impression of something wrong; but not one in a hundred really criticises the dress of his hostess or of the women between whom he finds himself at the dinner table. Fear of each other is, then, the principal sentiment which ties women down to the slavery of dress-worship.

Women are not naturally, perhaps, more vain than men, but they have more opportunities and more temptations for the indulgence of vanity than men have. The wealth of the nation has increased at a more rapid rate than its civilization. Our riches have outgrown our culture, and in nothing is this more palpably evident than in the present position of the women of our wealthy middle-class. The growth of commercial wealth, and the transfer of industrial processes, such as spinning, from the parlor to the factory, have enormously multiplied the number of those unfortunate women who have "got no work to do." Idleness, ignorance, want of culture, and of thorough mental training, want of intellectual resource, want of all real discipline, combining with the natural tendencies mentioned above, produce, among other results, that senseless worship of the fashions which is sanctioned by the selfish apathy or cynical indifference of men, and is perpetually stimulated by the arts of the decorator and clothesmonger. The evil is really getting great, both from an artistic and an economical point