

THE LOUISIANA BUNGLER.

Mr. Kellogg had a sufficiently good prima facie case for declining to recognize the House, as originally organized. Had he done so, had he even undertaken as executive of the state by the use of state machinery to compel a reorganization, there would have been no such feeling throughout the country as we see to-day. Instead, he instructed an officer of the United States army, who had been placed at his orders, to take a detachment of United States troops, enter the legislative chamber, remove the de facto speaker from the chair, remove the de facto members from their seats, and, in a word, fix matters to Mr. Kellogg's liking. His instructions were promptly carried out. The American people have ever since been asking themselves what call or right federal military officers have to march, arms in hand, upon the floor of a legislative chamber and rectify the irregularities or illegalities of a legislative organization. The more the people think of it, the more emphatic will be their indorsement of Congressman Phelps's position—that the federal interference was as illegal as the conservative viva voce organization. —*Springfield Republican*.

The gist of the outrage is that the legislature of an American State, the absolute, final judge—like every other legislature—of the qualifications of its members, having a legal quorum, in the very act of proceeding to the discharge of its duties, is turned neck and heels into the streets by an armed body sent on from Washington for that express purpose, without a shadow of excuse or even reason. We say without reason, for the pretense of Kellogg that the legislature was not organizing itself in a correct way is a mere sham. The constitution of Louisiana does not make Kellogg judge of the organization of the legislature of that State any more than it does of the legislature of Massachusetts. We do not get, however, the full flavor of the outrage without recalling the fact that as, on the present occasion, the troops are called in to turn an adverse majority out, two years ago they were brought up for the opposite purpose of seating a favorable majority; and this time the members were turned out on the strength of returns on their face ridiculous, unfair, and fraudulent, while two years ago they were seated on the strength of a midnight order, illegal on its face, issued by a drunken United States judge; while Congress is still considering the question, What is the legal government of Louisiana?—*The Nation*.

We are at a loss to make out what are Gen. Sheridan's ideas of the Constitution under which he lives, or of the functions of Congress, or of the powers of the Executive, to say nothing of the powers which may be rightfully exercised by a Lieutenant General of the Army. He first of all suggests that Congress should pass a bill declaring a certain class of the people of Louisiana, Arkansas and Mississippi "banditti." How many he would include in this class does not appear, nor does he explain since what date in our history it has been usual for officers in the army to presume to dictate to Congress as to the legislation it should adopt. But a moment afterwards a still better idea strikes him, and he says, "It is possible that, if the President would issue a proclamation declaring them banditti, no further action need be taken except that which would devolve upon me." If this means anything, it means that Gen. Sheridan would forthwith proceed to hang or shoot as many persons as he chose to bring under his own description of "banditti." We have, then, a plain proposal, that the President shall "declare" an indefinite number of citizens "banditti," and that Gen. Sheridan should then deal with them without benefit of judge or jury. This would certainly be resolving government into its primitive elements, but there is a shorter cut still, which Gen. Sheridan might have recommended. It is for the President to declare the Constitution and all its amendments annulled, shut up Congress, put down all the newspapers, and then proclaim himself Dictator, with Gen. Sheridan as his sole Minister and Chief Executioner. If Gen. Sheridan had advised this course at once he would scarcely have shown a greater ignorance or disregard of law than he has done in his most

extraordinary, and we must add disgraceful, dispatch of Jan. 5th.—*N. Y. Times*.

The late events in New Orleans have produced a more general and painful excitement than anything that has recently occurred, and the consequences will undoubtedly be far-reaching and most important. The Louisiana question is no longer one of party under the government, but of the fundamental guarantees of American liberty.

While the situation may be all that has been represented by the most heated partisan—while all may be true that General Sheridan stated in his first dispatch, although he could hardly have known it to be so—while all that is charged as to the murderous and unlawful designs of the white league may be correct—while all that was said in the Senate of assassination, Ku-Klux, and rebellion may be well founded—while all that is alleged of the irregularity and illegality of the organization of the Legislature may be conceded, the action of the Republican government upon the assembling of the Louisiana Legislature has no precedent whatever in American constitutional history, except the Democratic crime against Kansas, and painfully recalls King Charles's fatal and foolish arrest of the five members.

The gravity and the menace of this case we can better understand by making it our own. Suppose that the election had left the New York Legislature as closely divided between the parties as that of Louisiana, and half a dozen Republicans, claiming to be elected, but thrown out by the canvassers, had taken part in the organization, and the House so constituted had chosen a Republican Speaker, what should we have thought if Governor Tilden had sent a file of United States soldiers with orders that "persons not returned as elected should be removed from the floor of the House?" Mr. Thurman stated in the Senate that some years ago the Legislature of Ohio was engaged for a fortnight in a desperate wrangle over organization, but from whatever cause the trouble may have arisen, he said that if President Van Buren had sent the army to settle the difficulty, the army would never have left Columbus again. Sam Adams would have said very much the same thing a hundred years ago.

A very great wrong, as it seems to us, has been committed in New Orleans, and with the acquiescence of the Administration. Republican as we are, we are so only because we believe the equal rights of all Americans are safer with the intelligence and conscience that make the inspiration, and have in general directed the policy, of the Republican party. But we do not excuse or justify, in this or any other case, what seems to us a flagrant and fatal disregard of those guarantees which are indispensable to free popular government. And because we are Republican, and contemplate with profound apprehension the possibility of the restoration of the Democratic party to power, we see with the utmost amazement, incredulity, and pain that measures are approved by the Administration which can have but one result, and that is the total destruction of the party that was called into active and triumphant life by the aggressions of human slavery and the wrongs of Kansas.

* * * There is no need of rhetorical fury or brute force. Either our whole American system is wrong, or the intelligent vote of the country will peaceably settle this question.—*Harper's Weekly*.

The result of all is that when Mr. Beecher now goes to court his wife goes with him.

Talking politics is a business not profitable enough to support a family.

Many a child goes astray, not because there is want of prayer or virtue at home, but simply because home lacks sunshine.

The troublesome visitor who has been shutting the doors after him all summer now leaves them open.

There is nothing to be so highly prized as a soft, sweet voice in woman except her ability to take in washing when hard times come.

An aristocratic but economical matron out West has invested in a recent tea-bell, and invented a paragon of servants, whose only imperfection is her deafness. When she has company at tea, the mistress rings and rings for the cake basket, or more hot water, or something, then, with the remark that Jane gets deaf and deaf every day, goes for it herself and returns, maintaining a ventriloquial conversation with the imaginary Jane all the way up the basement stairs.

CO-OPERATIVE HOME.

There are certain needs common to all human beings in civilized life.

We must have food, and this food must possess qualities beyond mere power to sustain life. It must be carefully prepared with reference to the refined tastes begotten and fostered by civilization.

Our bodies must be clothed, and refinement here steps in and brings our desires and needs above what would be required in a barbarous age. We must have shelter, and this with us means more than the bark hut of the savage or the tent of the Bedouin. So also in the matter of intellectual culture our massive structures which tower in sublime magnificence and stretch forth their arms in loving benediction upon our race, and which are the pride and glory of this generation, would be powerless for good and a useless expenditure in a land where the population was composed chiefly of serfs and slaves.

Civilization has created needs, not desires merely, but positive needs, necessities of our nature which must be supplied. And so each advancing step in civilization, culture, and refinement, as every new unfoldment of our being brings with it increased demands, we find forced upon us the necessity for the solution of problems hitherto unpropounded and unsolved.

Systems suited to the past become cumbersome and oppressive as we advance, and if we will examine into the social needs of today we will find that our present system of home life is altogether an unwieldy and cumbersome affair, and far from promoting the best interests of the individual or of society at large; and any plan which has for its objects the bringing of our home life into an adaptation to our needs, and of extending its kindly arms over those who have never been so fortunate as to have experienced its benefits, is certainly worthy the attention of all thinking people. How dependent we all are upon the perfect, harmonious arrangement of our homes for our highest enjoyment of life!

The first desideratum in a home beyond the fundamental idea of a shelter is to secure privacy and as much quietness as possible, and complete temporary isolation when desired. Every family must have the privilege of enjoying their peculiar vocation or pleasure without annoyance from others. And in the opposite direction we have equally as great a need to be supplied, for inasmuch as we are social beings we need intellectual and social companionship, and unless our home can meet this demand of our being, it were imperfect in a vital point of its structure.

We need, moreover, to have our daily wants supplied in the best and at the same time most economical manner, and in order to do this we must have a scientifically constructed building, with all the best modern machinery, thereby adapting it to health, safety, comfort and economy of labor. There is no way of securing all these requirements in our present system of isolated homes. The wealthy have it within their power measurably to merit these wants, but this is not the case with the masses, and only by co-operation can they be so secured. Associated or co-operative homes, properly arranged, would be an incalculable blessing to a very large majority of our population. It is not necessary here to show how much more economically of fuel and food the labor of cooking would be performed for the benefit of several families in one kitchen and under one superintendence, than where done for a like number of persons in several houses, and by several cooks and under as many superintendents, for all our public institutions wherein the physical wants are provided for are samples of this system of economy. Here we have provisions bought at wholesale, butter brought direct from the country, and the mechanical appliances for heating, lighting, ventilating, and labor-saving machines, all of which appeal to the thrifty housekeeper or domestic economist as important to bring within the reach of society at large.

Let a site be selected with special reference to its adaptability for a co-operative home, within easy access to places of business by street cars, and with space not only for commodious buildings, but grounds surrounding them which may be ornamented. Let a building be erected possessing in its architect-

ural design, both internal and external, all the requisites of an attractive associated home. Let this be arranged, together with the land and carriage house, at an expense of \$100,000, and sold in shares of \$1,000 each, this share giving to the holder the exclusive ownership of one suite of rooms, together with the joint ownership in the kitchen, laundry, dining-room, parlors, lecture-rooms or dancing hall, school-room or kindergarten, and also carriage house, and the land upon which these buildings are erected.

The home which a man can at present purchase for \$1,000 will not bear any comparison with the luxuries secured under this system of co-operation. Of course each shareholder is subject to his proportion of the taxes and of expenses for general improvements, and in this particular he will find his expenses materially lessened under this system.

He secures for his family board and washing, fuel and lights at actual cost, as there is to be no profit made out of the "Home" by any one. The money making must be done in their individual vocations outside. This is simply their home. If there be those among their number who wish to lighten their expenses by labor in the house, the preference when help is needed will, of course, be given to those who are stockholders, provided they possess the requisite ability. We must have a system of organized labor and trained and skilled hands to work in it, and talented minds to direct and guide in it. And this will provide a school for instruction in domestic work. There can be no schools in cookery where there are no dinners to be eaten; there can be no instruction given where there is no work to be done; and here, where there is the work to be done for three hundred or four hundred, there would be abundant opportunity to give instruction in all branches of culinary art and domestic service generally, with but little inconvenience. And parents should pay for their daughters' instruction in this branch of industry as they do for their sons in their trades.

There is one subject of importance which must not be lost sight of in establishing a complete "Home," and that is provision for the care and comfort of children.

A nursery and a Kindergarten would here be important institutions of incalculable value to both parents and children.

There is such an aversion at the present time to the parental relation, that any means by which we can systematize the care and management of children, thus in a measure relieving the mother and giving her a portion of time for rest and recreation, will work a revolution in the sentiments of the community upon this all important subject. To every well developed and well balanced woman, who has not been perverted by disease or false education, the maternal instinct is the strongest faculty in her nature; and it is fearful to contemplate the perverting power our social system has had upon her soul. And this unholy influence has reacted upon the men until today children are considered a curse rather than a blessing, and every device of art and charlatany are brought into requisition that we may defeat the holy purpose of marriage, and preserve our homes childless. Preaching or denunciation will not avail to effect any change for the better. Something practical must be done, some radical improvement must be effected in our mode of living; whereby maternity will not of necessity involve crucifixion. The benefits which would accrue to mothers and children in a systematized co-operative home are so patent that it seems almost needless to enlarge upon them. It would be well to divide the children into three groups or classes for nursery, kindergarten, and the public school. The kindergarten should always precede the public school, and here would be afforded an excellent opportunity for kindergarten instruction. The nursery should be superintended by a thoroughly competent woman, and all the guardians of the children should be educated and true ladies in the highest sense of the term, and should possess a certain amount of medical knowledge. Only such ladies should be thought qualified for this position, and they would be companions and guides of mothers, especially young mothers. There is a vast amount of

injury done to the minds and bodies of young children through the ignorance and carelessness of young mothers, and the neglect of nursery maids, which would here be prevented. A volume might be written upon this point, but I pass on.

The opportunity which such a "Home" would present for social life and culture is not of trifling importance. Upon this feature of associated life, I will give the thoughts of an English writer—E. M. King—who seems to have fathomed the subject and presented it in such a manner as to reach the internal consciousness of all who care to give it a reading.

There were several letters in the *Daily News*, a short time ago, lamenting the want of home amusements and the dullness of evenings at home. The gentlemen said they heard their wives' songs, over and over again, till they were tired of them. Conversation was rather a dead and dragging affair, reading to one's self an unsocial thing, and also apt to degenerate into a doze. Shakesperian readings were recommended, and a society has, I believe, been founded to inaugurate these readings, but that meets the difficulty but a very short way, if at all, because, whenever a party is required to carry out a plan of amusement it is an "evening at home" to only one of the party, all the rest have to go from home to seek it. Besides, every one cannot be amused by Shakesperian readings; many would think it a bore; some, in the same family, might prefer music, some dancing, some conversation, and in that case the taste of all must be either sacrificed to the tastes of the one, or each member of the family must take cabs in two or three different directions to find their favorite amusements. But where two or three hundred people were living under one roof, every individual might be gratified and meet their coteries by walking only the length of a passage.

Social reforms have a much stronger influence upon national character than political ones. No reform would have a more powerful influence than such a home reform, by bringing the masculine intellect more closely to bear upon the feminine, and the moral character of the woman to bear more directly upon the man; taking out of the man's hand, in a great measure, the power of domestic tyranny, so injurious to his own character, and so degrading to the woman's; by placing the means of pleasant and elevating social intercourse between old and young, boys and girls, men and women, substituting an intercourse which is free because healthy and natural for one which is free only because morally diseased, licentious and deadly.

One of the chief causes which produce a morbid taste for vicious pleasures lies in the solitary life hundreds of young people have to live, suddenly cut off from all home influence, and having hardly any means of social intercourse unconnected with dissipation.

For such as these, then, as well as for ourselves, a home reform is a most crying need, and to those who would elevate the moral tone and life of the country, those who would do justice to those below them, and those who would give the best chance to their children of the means of educating both their minds and characters, such a scheme deserves, I think, the most earnest attention and assistance.

SARA B. CHASE.

—*Cleveland Herald*.

DANCING AND RELIGION.

The action of the Methodist Episcopal Conference in Bozeman discountenancing Dancing Parties, brings up the question as to whether the position of many of the churches, especially in a country like this, forbidding their members to participate in such festivities is well taken. Although a religious animal to the average extent, we do not consider this from the standpoint of a professor of religion, but from the merely practical standpoint of a citizen, and do not therefore here deny that "attendance on dancing parties interferes materially with the spiritual success of Christianity." That is for those who teach it and know the facts to determine. We might allege that the austerities and severe discipline with which many of the denominations have encompassed their religion keeps many a well disposed soul outside the churches, and compels many a person inside to live a