

THE MEN'S RIGHTS SOCIETY.

The organization of the Boston "Men's Rights Society" is the first step toward the emancipation of man. For generations a false public sentiment has deprived men of skirts and compelled them to wear that badge of servitude, trousers. So long as men can be made to wear trousers they will continue to be the subject sex. The physical deterioration of civilized man, which has been bewailed by all thoughtful persons and attributed to a variety of causes, not one of which has really had anything to do with the matter, is the result of wearing trousers. If man is to rival the robust British matron or the sinewy New-England schoolmistress he must be permitted to wear skirts, and the Boston "Men's Rights Society" is formed to begin an agitation in behalf of man's emancipation from trousers, the triumph of which, though it may be long delayed, is morally certain.

Trousers are entirely incompatible with health. They afford the male legs no adequate protection from the elements. A woman when driving in a carriage on a cold day can fold her skirts about her in a way to greatly increase the warmth of her person, but man has no way of folding his trousers so as to increase their protective powers. In rainy weather a man's waterproof coat and umbrella afford him no protection below the knees. The rain drives against the lower part of his trousers and renders them thoroughly wet, and, as they fit closely to his person, wet trousers naturally chill the wearer. The result, especially when a man is compelled to wear wet trousers for several hours, is frequently illness of a more or less serious character. A woman, on the contrary, finds her skirts an admirable protection against rain. She wears three or four skirts at the same time, and, owing to the fenders in the shape of "dress improvers" and other like devices which she wears under her skirts, the latter do not habitually touch her ankles. Thus the wetting of one or two skirts does not produce any sensation of dampness in the region of the stockings, and the wearer is not subjected to the danger of taking cold. Moreover, a woman whose outer skirts are damp can always turn them up and dry them with the aid of a grate fire, a process which cannot be applied to trousers. If our women would only try to walk in wet weather with no protection for their ankles except ordinary trousers they would wonder how men have ever been willing to wear such useless and dangerous garments.

In muddy weather trousers become not only dangerous to health but revolting to persons with any sense of decency. The mud not only sprinkles the exterior of the trousers but it plasters the interior of them to the height of at least three inches from the bottom of the leg. A woman in muddy weather can lift up her skirts and keep them out of the mud, but no man can lift up his trousers. The only thing he can do is to turn up the bottoms of them—a practice which not only gives a well-dressed man the appearance of a tramp, at least below the knees, but which converts the bottoms of trousers legs into reservoirs for the accumulation of mud and water. One has but to contrast the appearance of a woman walking briskly over a muddy pavement, with her skirts gracefully held up out of the mud by one hand, and that of a man stolidly striding along with his trousers, from the knees downward, splattered and splashed with mud, and his stockings—could they be seen—in even a worse plight. It is no wonder that our young men are feeble, thin-legged, and narrow-chested. The wonder is that the fatal trousers has not long ago extirpated the race.

Aside from considerations of health, man is handicapped in the race of life by his trousers. How many things does a man drop and lose in the course of a year in consequence of the fact that he has no lap in which to hold them. A woman, by spreading out her skirts, can give herself a lap capacity of fully two bushels, but a man cannot hold a single grain of corn in his lap. The trousers, although they may be provided with three or four pockets, have very little carrying capacity, since there is very little room between the inner surface of the trousers and the outer surface of the wearer; whereas a woman's pocket is of almost unlimited capacity, and in some cases—as Custom House searchers can testify—has been known to contain articles sufficient in quantity to fill a large-sized Saratoga trunk. Were man to wear skirts he could carry a week's change of clothing and toilet articles in his pocket, and make a trip to Washington or Chicago with absolutely nothing in his hands; whereas in consequence of wearing trousers he cannot leave home for a single night without loading himself down with a traveling bag.

Women have hitherto monopolized skirts from purely selfish motives, but they cannot forever deprive men of them. If we are to be healthy, and in a condition to fight the battle of life untrammelled, we must cast trousers to the winds and put on skirts.