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INTRODUCTION.

In July, 1848, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, Martha C. Wright and Ann McClintock issued an unsigned call for a convention, which was "to consider the social, civil and religious condition and rights of woman." They framed a "Declaration of Sentiments" for "the inauguration of a rebellion such as the world had never seen before." This "Declaration" travestied the Declaration of Independence, summing up, after many verbose statements, their sentiments in these words:

"The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her."

From that date until the year 1894 the women suffragists, acting in accord with the "Declaration" and its eighteen grievances, besieged Legislatures to give women the right of suffrage, this being the crux of their argument: That women had an inalienable right to the ballot, and were subject to taxation without representation.

No great opposition was made to the suffrage clamor. Legislators treated the annual visit of the women suffragists as a sort of "field day," and the women who were opposed made no outward sign, resting their cause in the common sense and justice of the men who made the laws of the State to govern and protect alike male and female citizens.

In the winter of 1893 Miss Susan B. Anthony, in an address made in Albany, N. Y., stated that at the Constitutional Convention, which was to be held in May, 1894, there would be an amendment demanded striking out the word "male" from the Constitution, thereby allowing women to vote; and, that in order to effect this, the women suffragists were going into every town, village and city of the State to secure the names of 1,000,000 women over 21 years of age to a petition for such an amendment.

In answer to a question as to whether all women of the State desired the suffrage, she said: "They do not oppose it."

It seemed then, to the women who had hitherto been silent, that this was a time when they must, of necessity, make themselves heard. In Massachusetts there had been for years a silent organization which worked to defeat the suffragists, and which was ready
to take open action if the New York State women should decide
to do likewise. In Illinois there was the same feeling.

Brooklyn, N. Y., took the initiative, and following in line, on the
27th of April, 1894, a meeting of women opposed to woman suffrage
was held at the residence of Mrs. John V. L. Pruyn, 13 Elk street,
Albany, N. Y. An organization was perfected, and the work of
securing signatures to a protest against striking the word "male"
from the State Constitution was undertaken. In less than a month
more than 8,000 names of women over 21 years of age were enrolled
upon the protest, which was presented to the Convention on June
12th.

It is of interest to note that the suffragists failed in their effort to
secure 1,000,000 names to their petition, though every county in the
State was canvassed during the year preceding the Convention, by
women engaged for the purpose, some of whom were paid for each
signature procured. In one town there were more names sent in
than there were women and girls in the town. Rooms were secured
in the Capitol, and a banner flung out: "Come in and sign the
1,000,000 petition." Finally men were urged to sign, messenger
boys getting much amusement filling up the pages, one lad signing
"Mike Dolan, Paris, England." It was claimed that two labor
organizations had sent in 250,000 names through the votes of their
respective secretaries, and that the secretary of the W. C. T. U. had
signed for its membership of 75,000, though many persons of each
organization were known to be opposed to woman suffrage. Their
petitions as presented to the Convention were published in the daily
press, and with the foregoing additions only reached 397,055 names.
It is well to bear in mind that, at that time, there was a population
of over 7,000,000 in the State.

After full and free discussion before the committee appointed
by President Choate, on the proposed sufferage amendment, the
Constitutional Convention decided that: "Until it is shown that
woman may become a politician without losing something of the
precious charm of her personality, and that the State may exact
her services in that capacity without imperiling its stability and
tranquility," and "until the time also come when party politics
shall be so pure that the presence of women at the polls would
not be incongruous; and party feeling so subdued that opposi-

from those we love could be freely tolerated by our better
natures," the experiment of woman suffrage should not be tried
and so refused to submit the question to the people.
The anti-suffragists went back to the duties laid aside for the while and forgot that there was an opposing faction.

But that faction is noted for its tenacity of purpose, and so at the next legislative session they appeared with the amendment framed as a concurrent resolution of the Legislature and asked that it be passed.

To defeat this the women of Albany, who had been active in opposition, reorganized as a permanent association, at a meeting held at the residence of Mrs. J. V. L. Pruyn, on May 14, 1895. At this meeting a board of officers, consisting of a president, first vice-president, secretary, treasurer, an executive committee of seven, and 100 vice-presidents were elected, with a membership classified as sustaining, active, and associate. The name adopted was: "The Anti-Suffragists of Albany and Vicinity."

At a meeting held subsequently it was decided to work in unison with the New York and Brooklyn Associations, as an auxiliary to a State Organization, the field of work for Albany being the Third Judicial District of the State.

But Albany did not confine her efforts to the State of New York alone. In unison with other associations she sent a representative both to the Republican National Convention held at St. Louis in 1896, and to the Democratic National Convention held at Chicago the same year, to oppose the introduction of a suffrage plank in the National Platforms. Later the Albany Society joined in sending at the request of many women of the State of South Dakota and of the State of Washington, a representative to help the resident women defeat amendments to their State Constitutions which would force suffrage upon them. The amendments were lost in both States.

In this way the women of the other States of the Union came to know of the organized opposition to woman suffrage; and, as a result, many requests were made for information and literature.

Since the organization of the Albany Association 153,050 leaflets have been published and sent out through the energy and liberality of its honorary president. Thousands of personal letters have been written, and hundreds of letters have been published through the courtesy of the press. Later, a request came from the libraries for literature on the subject, and for that reason the honorary president has caused the leaflets published by the Society to be bound in book form and placed in libraries where the public may have access to them.
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The following resolution was offered by Mrs. J. V. L. Pruyn, and was unanimously adopted, and signed by all present:

"To the constitutional convention of the State of New York,

Gentlemen:

"We, the undersigned women of the State of New York, respectfully remonstrate against the imposition of political duties upon women, and beg to present to your honorable body this brief statement of the reasons which compel us to urge our earnest request that the proposal to strike out the word "male," in the constitutional qualification of voters in the State of New York, may not prevail.

"First — The theory that suffrage is a natural right is mistaken and false. It is and always has been a political privilege granted by the government to the governed. The very fact of this petition proves that the people who make up the government of this country may extend or restrict the power to vote, as it has been from time to time granted, modified or withheld on grounds of public advantage or expediency.

"Second — There is no reason why the privilege should be extended to women in America in this country for any protection or preservation of their rights. Whatever may be urged in England, or whatever may have been urged in America a half century ago, it cannot be doubted that women are absolutely and abundantly protected now under the existing system of suffrage, and every step in advance has been secured by the votes of men.

"Third — The true application of the term "taxation without representation," is not that every tax payer should vote, but that such representation should be assured as will give to every property holder the protection of his or her
property and rights. The male votes of America have so generously represented women, that they have to-day a degree of protection, as to their personal property, far beyond that which is given to men.

"Fourth — The evil effects of unqualified universal suffrage are already so serious and so widely felt, that it would only increase the danger which menaces our free institutions to-day to enlarge the suffrage by an increase of voters similarly unqualified.

"Fifth — The temptation to corruption in buying the votes of large numbers of uneducated women, with no fixed political principles and entirely irresponsible, would be enormous. It is a felt fact to-day, that in our large towns it is difficult to get out the intelligent and incorruptible voters, and this same tendency would undoubtedly swell the number of the worst class at the polls.

"Sixth — The granting of the privilege to vote would mean the right to be voted for, participation in the canvass, the entrance into the arena of what is called practical politics; from all which things women are excluded, not by law, but by the domestic duties, their temperament, their instincts and preferences.

"Seventh — Placing of this power and privilege in the hands of women would mean their exposure to conflicts and contests for which their whole constitution, training and character absolutely unfit them as much as they are unfitted for service in the militia, the police, or the fire departments.

"Eighth — The relation between men and women in matters of government which now rests upon the strong and growing sentiment of chivalry and courtesy, would be rudely disturbed, and antagonism and rivalry both in families and in society would take their place to the discomfort of both sexes, and the especial detriment of the best interests of women."
"Nowhere have such important changes been made in the law conferring rights upon women as in the State of New York. Previous to 1848 the legal existence of a married woman was merged in her husband. Every agreement made without his consent was void. She could not execute a paper of any kind by which she entered into a contract, which would bind either herself or her separate property. The husband might take and dispose of the wife's personal property at his pleasure, and on her death it went to the husband, while he was entitled to the use of her real estate during his life.

"In 1848 the law was so amended as to provide that the real and personal property of a woman who married thereafter, should not be subject to the disposal of her husband, and in 1849, that any married woman might take personal property, by inheritance, to her sole and personal use, and devise her property as if she were unmarried. In 1860, that the property which a married woman either owned at the time of her marriage or acquired afterwards, should so remain and should not be subject to interference and control of her husband, and that she might contract with reference to her separate property, and carry on trade or business on her own account and be entitled to the proceeds.

"In 1862 she was authorized to convey real estate in the same manner as if she were unmarried. In 1864 it was enacted that a married woman may contract to the same extent, with like effect, and in the same form as if unmarried. "In 1890 a woman was authorized to sue, and might be sued the same as if unmarried. In 1892 it was provided that a married woman might contract with her husband, retaining the express provision that a husband shall not be relieved from the liability to support the wife.

"Thus the emancipation of women, so far as the husband is concerned, is fully accomplished, at the same time leaving to her right of dower to her husband's estate, and the right
to inherit a certain portion of his personal property in case he dies without otherwise disposing of it, and retaining all her previous rights to demand support and maintenance from her husband.

"It is to be particularly noted that all these rights and privileges have been granted women, not at the request or solicitation of women, but as a voluntary concession, made by men to womanly women in recognition of natural right and justice.

"While the law still recognizes the husband as the head of the family, as regards control of the household, the rule is well established that in case of controversy, it gives the care of the children to the parent with whom the child will be best cared for and protected, with but little or no reference to questions other than those relating to its welfare depending upon its sex, age and general conditions."
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It were a rash man to attempt "By either force or skill to turn the current of a woman's will," and it must therefore be conceded on all hands that when the majority of the women of New York favor the extension of suffrage it will speedily become an accomplished fact. Since men will grant this privilege when women demand it, as they have conceded heretofore more than could be reasonably required, through their disposition to treat the gentler sex not only with justice but in a broad-minded and liberal spirit.

The question is not whether men will exclude women from a right to which they are absolutely entitled, but a broader and more comprehensive one. Will women be benefited by the suffrage, or will its exercise tend to their real disadvantage? If it is to be valuable to them, men will yield it with pleasure. If it is to be injurious or disadvantageous to them, then men will refuse to grant the dangerous privilege even though it is claimed as a heaven-born right, and refuse it because of their interest in and respect for women.

The average man, as in duty bound, treats this question in its relation to him as a son, a husband or a father, and as he regards women in the light of mother, wife or daughter, and cannot escape looking at the question from the point of view that he owes a duty of care and protection to what is physically, at least, the weaker sex. True, many women are both independent and self-supporting, but the discussion of this subject must proceed with reference to the condition of the great mass of women and to their relations to each other and to the race, and not solely with a view to the interests of the minority who are self-supporting, or for any other reason indifferent to the attention, protection and courtesies of the sterner sex.

As was justly observed on a very recent public occasion by a polished and accomplished orator, the question is from its nature one of extreme delicacy and cannot be treated in many of its aspects with the frankness its importance demands, since much must be left unsaid that has an important bearing upon the determination of the question, but its main features, as to the benefits and disadvantages of the suffrage to the gentler sex, are open to full discussion.
Woman is not qualified for the ballot or likely to be benefited by its exercise for physical and physiological reasons:

Plato in his ideal Republic, in order to arrive at a conclusion as to the propriety of woman's sharing in the duties citizens owe to the state, asks, "Is she capable of sharing, either wholly or partially, or not at all, in the actions of men," and seems to regard her right to participate in the affairs of Government to be determined by the answer of the question he proposes: "Whether she can share in the toils of war and the defense of the country?"

The right to take part in the political affairs is one of the same class of duties as the performance of duty as jurors in courts of justice, and service, voluntary or compulsory, in the army and navy, and from time immemorial the person exercising political control in time of Peace have been held responsible for the preservation of the Government by force of arms in the time of war.

The protest against the suffrage rightly speaks of its burdens and responsibilities, since with the right to vote is closely connected the enforcement of purity of the ballot, the inquiry into the honesty and capability of public officials and the proper administration of affairs of Government. To all these, women are manifestly and confessedly unequal. Physically, women are not fitted for the task of protecting and upholding any form of government. They may be active in putting it in operation by their ballots but must yield the burden and cast aside the responsibility when the circumstances demand strength and endurance in camp or on the battlefield. These are, however, necessarily and logically connected with the right to the ballot and are burdens and responsibilities which must reasonably be assumed as inseparable from it. Women must therefore recognize the natural limitations upon her strength and fitness to discharge the duties of citizenship.

From what may reasonably be termed a business standpoint, involving the legal rights of women, there is certainly little to be desired by way of improvement or reform and nothing to be gained by her active participation in politics. The old restrictions upon the rights of women to hold property independent of their husbands and to deal with it in the same manner as men have been entirely swept away, and women stand before the law in every respect entitled to at least the same rights and privileges as the sterner sex. In addition there is a survival of all the old rules devised as a protection to women, well illustrated by the retention upon the statute books of the right of dower which every married woman has in the real estate of her husband, so that he is unable to dispose of his real property
without her consent, and the right on the part of the wife to demand and receive from the husband support and maintenance according to his rank and station in life and his ability to provide for himself and family. Thus, in no respect is woman hampered by law as regards material affairs, but rather highly favored by its provisions and the reason so frequently and persistently alleged that women should be granted the ballot, that she may be able to protect herself in her property rights, is entirely dissipated by the progress of modern law reform in the direction of legal emancipation of women, so that in truth and fact she is entitled not only to absolutely control her own property but to certain rights in that of her husband, of which she cannot by any act of his be divested or deprived.

In the natural course of events and order of things the right of suffrage, by means of which woman is expected to provide for and protect herself at the polls, must react against her so far as her legal rights are concerned, by compelling men to lay aside all considerations of compliment, chivalry or courtesy and assert their rights, to at least an equality with reference to property interests. It can scarcely be possible that women can at the same time appeal to the sense of justice in men by reason of their helplessness and in the same breath insist upon their rights at the ballot box which are to be enforced by their political power.

There still remains the sentimental side of the question,—difficult of treatment and scarcely possible of adequate presentation,—well expressed in a recent pithy discussion of the question in these words, "It seems a pity that the barriers to harmony and sympathy between men and women, which have been building for the last fifty years, should be increased by this new effort, in as much as the sexes cannot exist without each other as long as the world lasts. American women, of all others, should shrink from encouraging distrust in their husbands and fathers and looking upon them as they are learning to do in the light of lineal descendants of the forty thieves."

If women are no longer to rely upon the fact that they are to be treated with consideration because they are the weaker sex physically, but insist upon certain alleged rights and privileges because they may be able at the ballot box to govern and control Legislation, they must certainly expect but scant courtesy outside of matters of strict justice and can scarcely be reasonably expected to receive at the hands of men that chivalrous treatment with regard, not only to their rights but as to their privileges, which is now so cheerfully accorded them. In this aspect, assertion of power must, in every respect, be disadvantageous to women, since they are certainly not
so well qualified to carry on the machinery of politics and the administration of the affairs of Government as are men, by reason of their nature, education and experience.

It is insisted that the advent of women in the field of active political life would tend to purify elections and reform legislators, which is by no means likely, since it is much more probable that in the contact with political methods at the polls and in the details of legislation, women would be dragged to the political level of men than elevate the existing standard of political morality. Even were it otherwise, it would seem that the price would be too great to pay for a reform of this character, if, in order to accomplish it, women must not only exercise the right of suffrage, but as its logical outcome, must attend the primaries, arrange for local assemblies and political meetings, be active at the caucus and upon the stump and take upon themselves not only the right and privileges but the burdens and responsibilities of the ward politician as well as of the statesman.

It is for these, among other reasons, that women have not heretofore desired, and do not, as to the majority, now insist upon the right of suffrage, and this question must ultimately turn, not upon whether suffrage is their natural right or whether it may prove expedient to the administration of governmental affairs, but upon its effect upon women as such, whether beneficial or the contrary, and until the gentler sex are fully satisfied that they will receive some substantial and material benefit from the burdens and responsibilities of the suffrage, the majority will continue to protest against having cast upon them a right which will subject them to personal annoyance, serious inconveniences and material disadvantages, without corresponding benefits. Until such time, Man as the natural guardian and protector of woman will insist upon shielding her from burdens and responsibilities fit to be borne alone by that sterner sex which is endowed by nature in such a manner as to be physically adapted to govern as statesman, or, if need be, maintain as soldiers the integrity of the political institutions for which it should be solely responsible.

Apply for more papers to Anti-Suffrage Association, 13 Elk Street, Albany, N. Y.
Why Women Should Not Vote.

Remarks made by the Hon. Matthew Hale, at a Mass Meeting called by the Anti-Woman Suffrage Association of Albany, N. Y., May 11, 1894.

(The address of Mr. Hale was made without notes, and cannot be reproduced as delivered, but this leaflet contains the principal points of his arguments.)

FELLOW CITIZENS, MALE AND FEMALE:—The subject before you is one of great importance. A Convention to revise the Constitution of this State commenced its session in this city last Tuesday. That Convention is asked, by striking out the word "male" from that part of the Constitution which confers the right of voting, to make all women over the age of 21 years, who are residents and citizens of the State, competent voters at all elections.

The number of votes cast at the general election of 1892, was in round numbers one million and a quarter. If this amendment is adopted, the addition of an equal number of women, will make the number of voters about two million and a half.

The question is, is this immense increase in the voting population of the State desirable? Is it necessary for the protection of women? Would it be beneficial to the State? Unless these questions can be answered in the affirmative, I think we will all agree that the experiment which the Convention is asked to make, ought not to be tried.

In discussing this question, it is well to consider, what have been the rights of women, and what they are.

Women, as such, have never been discriminated against in this State as to life, liberty or property. Single women, whether spinsters or widows, have always had precisely the same rights as man. But married women were at the common law, which was the law of this State on this subject until 1848, under certain disabilities in regard to controlling and disposing of property and making contracts.

These disabilities all resulted from the doctrine that the husband and wife were one, and that the wife's legal existence was merged during marriage in that of the husband. This principle of the common law was based upon what seemed to be plain declarations of the Bible. But these disabilities have all been removed. The laws have been made more and more favorable to married women, until now their rights are equal in all respects so far as relates to the control of property, and to the custody of children, to those of married men, and in some respects, superior. If I have real estate, I cannot convey it and give a good title to my grantee, unless my wife joins in the deed. I cannot, by my will, dispose of my real estate so as to deprive my wife, against her will, of her right of dower. But she can by deed, or will, dispose of her entire estate, real and personal, whether I consent or not, and give good title. A father cannot now apprentice his child, or make a valid appointment of a testamentary guardian, without the consent of the mother, if she be living. The wife can carry on business on her own account, and is entitled to all the profits and earnings in that business, and may contract as if she were unmarried.

But it is said that these changes in the common law have been brought about by women. If this is so, they have been caused by them without the ballot. They have effected these changes by their influence upon men, their husbands, sons, fathers and brothers. The men have done better for them than they would have done for themselves. For, if they, with their well-known modesty and magnanimity, had been men,
ers of the Legislature, they would hardly have put themselves on a better footing as to property, than men. If women, by their influence merely, without the ballot, and without political power, have been able to accomplish such great results, why should they be bothered with the ballot? Why should they be obliged to expose themselves to the foul language, disgraceful contests and bloody noses which you have heard Father Walworth describe this evening as frequent accompaniments of elections?

But it is said that the right to vote is a natural right. I do not know exactly what is meant by this claim. It has never been esteemed a natural right. No man could vote in this State prior to 1822 unless he possessed certain property qualifications. No matter how bright and well informed a young man who has not reached the age of twenty-one is, he cannot vote. The Declaration of Independence in its enumeration of the inalienable rights of man, did not mention or in any way include the supposed right to vote. Voting is only a means to an end. The end is a government which shall protect all in their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, in which last is included the right to acquire and enjoy property. Women have these rights now just as completely as is possible. No amount of legislation could give them more or greater rights. What possible good will it do them to vote?

But it is said that women pay taxes, and to deprive them of suffrage is "taxation without representation." But taxes are not conditioned upon the right to vote. The property of women is protected by the laws just as much as that of men. Taxes are necessary, in order to defray the expenses of government, in protecting the lives, liberties and property of citizens, whether men or women. But women are represented. The fact that by women's influence, laws have been passed putting them in an equal or superior position to that of men, shows that they have been represented. It is absurd to say that a woman, a member of a family, is not represented by her father, her son, her brother or her husband. Our forefathers complained of "taxation without representation," because taxes were imposed upon them by a parliament sitting three thousand miles away, in which there was no representation whatever of the colonies. There is not the slightest analogy between their case and this. Taxation is not in our State a condition of the right of suffrage. If it were, the man paying heavy taxes would have more votes than the man paying none. But as it is, Mr. Astor or Mr. Vanderbilt has no more power at the polls than the man who has not money enough to buy a five cent breakfast, unless he uses his money to buy votes. Then there is in taxation no discrimination against women; nor does anybody apprehend that there ever will be such discrimination. No tax law could ever be passed which undertook to discriminate against women in favor of men. No such law was ever suggested. There are many cases where people are taxed who cannot vote. For instance, if a citizen of New York owns land in another State, he will be taxed in that State, although he cannot vote there. If an Albanian has real estate in Boston, he must pay taxes there, and he cannot resist the payment on the ground that he is not allowed to vote in Massachusetts. Taxation is the price which citizens pay for the protection of their property, their lives and their liberty. It is in no sense a compensation paid by them for the privilege of voting.

There is another point which must be looked in the face. We cannot turn our eyes from facts that bear on the subject, because they are unpleasant. There are in the city of New York, a multitude of women whose number is variously estimated at from 30,000 to 50,000, who get their living by a life of shame. They sell themselves daily, soul and body. Every city in the State adds to the number of this disreputable army. The number of these women is so great that in a close election, they would hold the balance of power. Of course, their votes would be for sale, and they would be controlled not by moral or respectable men, not by the better element in politics, but by the most unscrupulous, immoral and degraded of the male sex. Is the introduc-
tion of these disreputable women into the political arena going to elevate or purify practical politics? Do the respectable women of the community wish to be brought in contact with this degraded class? Will not the inevitable effect of making women, good and bad, voters, be to give to this class of women an influence and power which they do not now possess? Will not the conferring of the suffrage upon them tend to demoralize multitudes of young men and young women, who will thus be brought in contact with these degraded women? It has been argued by some that the number of respectable women is so much greater, that this class could easily be outvoted; but the difficulty will be just as it is now, with the male voters, that the good women will not unite. Respectable women will be divided in politics probably in about the same way that their husbands and sons and brothers are now, and this disreputable and purchasable element will control.

The great danger which now threatens republican institutions comes from bribery and corruption. Does anybody believe that a less proportion of women will be found susceptible to bribery than of men? Unless it can be shown that women, taken as a whole, are less susceptible than men to bribery and similar influences, then the doubling of the voting population will certainly not tend to diminish bribery and corruption.

This demand for female suffrage is not new. There was a convention held in this city beginning in 1857, of which I had the honor to be a member, which had this subject before it. Precisely the same amendment was offered in that convention—to strike the word “male” from the section which confers the right of suffrage. That amendment was advocated by one of the most brilliant men of this generation, for whom all the members of that convention, myself included, entertained the greatest admiration—George William Curtis. He made, perhaps the most powerful and eloquent speech on that side of the question, which has ever been made. The result was that when the vote was taken, 19 votes were recorded in favor of the amendment, while there were 125 against it. It may be said that the 125 who voted against it were unenlightened men, who were behind the age. Possibly this is so; but among the negative votes, were three men who afterwards became judges of the Court of Appeals, including its present Chief Judge and its first Chief Judge. There were among them such men as Senator Kernan, of Utica, Judge Comstock, of Syracuse, Judge Parker, of this city, Horace Greeley and Prof. T. W. Dwight, of New York, and many others who are generally supposed to have been among the most intelligent and enlightened men of their day and generation.

But this question is not to be determined by authority. It must be conceded that very many intelligent and public spirited men and women are in favor of the change. I think they are mistaken; and that they do not correctly foresee the results which would follow if the change should be made. But we must give them credit for sincerity, and meet what they suppose to be arguments, by reason and not by denunciation.

I think in many of their speeches, the advocates of woman suffrage show great lack of self-restraint, and an unfortunate tendency to exaggeration. For instance, one of the most distinguished advocates of this change is reported to have said in a recent speech in this city that there is but one slave in New York, and that is woman. When we consider what are the necessary elements of slavery: that a slave has no rights of property; that a slave can be sold and separated from his or her family; that his or her children can be sold away without any possibility of interference on his or her part; it is difficult to see how any intelligent person can say with sincerity that there are any elements of slavery in the condition of women at this time. If women are slaves, I would like to know who are their masters. Men are bound to support them. They are not bound to support their husbands. Men are bound to protect them. Women have the right of absolute disposal of their own property, the absolute control of their own liberty; equal rights with their husbands to the custody of their children; and still
we are informed by women who are advocating the extension of suffrage to women, that women are slaves!

The advocates of woman suffrage often show a singular want of knowledge as to the actual state of the law. In one of the newspapers in this city, some days ago, was an article which was moderate and fair in tone. The writer in alluding to the unpleasant fact that I have mentioned, the existence of this large class of women who lead bad lives, said in substance that the men were responsible for licensing places in which these women were kept. The writer was evidently intelligent, and supposed that places of this kind were licensed by law, but she was all wrong. The truth is that such places are forbidden by law. The laws on the subject are strict enough. The difficulty is that they are not enforced. If these women should control legislation, they would perhaps pass laws even stricter than those now on the statute book, prohibiting all forms of sin and immorality; but they would be as ineffective as a law would have been which was introduced in our Legislature under peculiar circumstances. A member of Assembly from somewhere in the "southern tier" of counties, asked unanimous consent to introduce a bill which he desired to have read for the information of the Assembly, as he said there could be no objection to it: it was very short, consisting of only two sections, and could be read in a minute. Therupon the bill was presented and read, as follows: "Section 1. Immorality of every kind is hereby abolished. Section 2. This act shall take effect immediately." Although the bill was not objected to, it did not become a law. If it had, it is hardly to be supposed that the millennium would have begun at once. Legislation to be effective must be practical. Sin cannot be exterminated by act of Legislature. The argument that women, if elected, would pass laws which would abolish all forms of evil, has no foundation in practical common sense.

It may be conceded that there are many women whose intelligence and integrity would qualify them to vote, and who are much better qualified to vote than many men who exercise the franchise; but it by no means follows that the suffrage should therefore be conferred upon women. Universal male suffrage cannot be said to have been entirely a success. Ignorance, bribery and corruption, bigotry and intolerance prevail to a great extent even now, and very greatly impair the usefulness of a republican form of government. Instead of these evils being mitigated by extending the suffrage to women, it is my belief that they would be greatly increased. The success of the woman suffrage movement would not tend, in my judgment, to purify politics or elevate the tone of public life: but the reverse. The question, however, is one upon which the deliberate sentiment of the women themselves, will ultimately be conclusive. As long as a majority of the intelligent and respectable women of the country believe that conferring the suffrage upon them will not benefit them or the State, there is little danger that they will, by constitutional amendment, be made voters, and compelled to assume the responsibility which the right of suffrage necessarily carries with it.

Anti-Suffrage Pamphlets may be obtained at 13 Elk Street, Albany.
Protest Against Woman Suffrage.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY

The Rev. FATHER WALSH, of Troy,

At a Mass Meeting called by the Anti-Woman's Suffrage Association of Albany, N. Y.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—A gentleman of our city with more tact than intelligence, on being asked to express an opinion on woman suffrage, met his questioner with this remark: "This is a woman's question and must be decided by women."

Unhappily for women, though it is a woman's question, it is to be decided by men only—by men in the Constitutional Convention, and by the men voters afterward, if this convention decide to adopt it. For this reason men will by courtesy and necessity take part in these preliminary meetings whether called to promote or defeat female suffrage.

Before this audience of the gentle women of this city, convened for the purpose of voicing opposition to any amendment to the Constitution investing women with the right of suffrage, I crave a religious reverence for woman. In opposing what we believe to be a movement calculated to degrade woman, we are impressed altogether by the danger lurking under an assumed privilege, and right, which threatens the position and character of this being, whom we would have like Caesar's wife—without suspicion or reproach.

No one here can forget his indebtedness to woman. To her as mother, sister, wife or friend, we owe the tenderest emotions of life—the noblest elements of character—the purest aspirations and the sweetest sympathy in joy and sorrow. Into her arms we are born. Watching her lips we begin to speak; led by her hand we learn to walk in obedience of law. In painting, sculpture and poetry, she gives us ideals of innocence and beauty. Innocence is a woman; chastity is a woman; charity is a woman. I and you do not wish to lose this ideal woman.

I belong to a church where woman has been clothed with high responsibilities, and even the right to vote. In all our religious orders of women, sometimes all the subjects, and sometimes a few, exercise this right in the selection of their superiors.

Is there then inconsistency in my present position?

In the sphere of morals, to vote or not to vote, is a neutral duty. It is the surroundings which may lead to demoralization and degradation—not the mere act of casting the ballot. If I can be convinced that the right of suffrage granted to women may be exercised as innocently, as harmlessly, amidst all the filth, obscenity, blasphemy and perjury of our modern polling-booth as in the peace, solitude and purity of the cloister, then I am willing to be recorded as in favor of woman suffrage.

If I can be convinced that this enfranchisement of woman is needed to idealize woman still more, or make her more womanly, or secure her in greater purity and innocence, or deepen her sympathetic and religious nature, or strengthen her maternal and domestic instincts, then I will gladly lift my voice, and exert my influence, in behalf of granting this boon to woman.
I have yet to learn that a single advocate of female suffrage has contended for the measure for the reason that its concession will improve and strengthen and safeguard the female character. Much declamation is indulged in on the plea that it is a hurtful discrimination between "male" and "female" in the Constitution—or that women will never enjoy the full measure of liberty till they can vote, or that women owning property are unjustly taxed by others; and they have a fondness for the axiom, "No taxation without representation."

Can there be serious disagreement as to the result of her enfranchisement? Rum and politics are the ruin of vast numbers of our citizens. Incurable and deepening corruption is the condition of politics to-day. Polling places are pestilential spots, seething with perjury, bribery, unclean language and rowdism. I have never yet cast a ballot that I did not blush for shame because of this temporary association. I have no hope that these evils will ever be cured till some limitation is placed on the farce of universal suffrage. Parties ambitious of political ascendency or continuance in power will perpetuate them.

These female suffrage fanatics say: "Let the women vote and healing will come to the festering and hideous sores of politics. Let the woman bring all her refinement and delicacy, and intelligence and sympathy down into this noisome vortex, and she will bring peace, orderliness and purity out of confusion, chaos and uncleanness."

Ah! They know little of human nature who talk in this fashion. The best element among our male voters has tried to improve the shame. Have they succeeded? They were so apathetic, owing to repeated failures, that Governor Hill twice in his messages tried to induce the Legislature to enact laws making the suffrage a duty, and not merely a right. And where strong influential men have failed, will women succeed? Who here would wish to see his mother, wife or sister, enter our polling places? And you really believe that the most of the female voters would be proof against bribery, and intoxicants, and, in time, more degrading and iniquitous crimes. They read the history of woman with false lights, who cannot recognize, in her affiliation with public affairs, the marked cause of her deterioration in personal character. There are some few exceptions; but from Deborah to Cleopatra, and Elizabeth of England, and Catharine of Russia, and to the princess claiming the right to the throne of Hawaii, there is an insolent cruelty, and a moral debasement, that shames the worst male profligacy.

Within her own sphere, woman's influence is beneficial and uplifting. When ambition or accident has carried her beyond her sphere, the transfer has wrought evil to man, and wreck to woman. This, then, is my first reason of opposition to female suffrage—in the present debased and corrupt condition of politics. I fear that female participation in the franchise must entail consequences fatal to the legitimate work and destiny of women.

My second reason is close to this. Has not partisanship in politics been carried already to a ruinous extreme in this country? Is not our boasted national unity a farce and a fiction? Have our recent Congressional debates, and measures, affirmed that we are hopelessly divided into opposing industrial camps, and recent political contests proved the fierce enmity of our battling political hosts? I believe that our prosperity, and vitality, depend on the coalition and purification of these hostile forces. I believe that we should be a party to no legislation which would tend further to separate us, and increase the din of battle.

I believe that other more vital interests which cluster about the home, the church, and the school, demand that our large female population be kept aloof from these rivalries and contentions, as a refuge and restraint.
in the day of our direst distress, and with the fervent hope that their unbiased influence may beget a generation of citizens who may be willing to put the nation before the individual, and men and principles ahead of party.

If we clothe our women with the franchise, we increase a thousand fold all the evils and injustice and blindness and selfishness of partisanship. Into the nation we throw a solvent that will be felt down in its lowest foundations. Already, with only men to vote, the heat of a political fight will divide families, and strain and snap friendships of a lifetime. Bring women into the strife, and what home will be secure against discord, and what friendship safe from wreckage?

The more sacred duties of home, religion, and education, will be sacrificed to the more engrossing excitments of politics; and we will have a grotesque, ill-formed nation, where women are never mothers, and where men will know more of the tariff and the election law than of God and the ten commandments. That morbid condition is universal enough now among men. Do you want it also to brand women?

My third reason, which is also my last, though these are only three of a series which might run into many were I the only speaker, is based upon other material. The remark has been made editorially by one of your journals, that this question of female suffrage is not to be determined by female superiority or inferiority as compared with males. The issue at best is ungenerous and ungracious, and yet I cannot avoid it. I would regret to find the question settled without a reference to this issue of comparative ability. Legitimately, it never should be raised; and it would not now if women were not insisting on trespassing on exclusive male territory. Fortunate would we be if we could imitate the gallantry of Horace Greeley, who, when asked, "who was the cleverer, man or woman?" replied, "It depends very much on what man or woman you mean."

If the franchise is conferred on woman, it should co-ordinately confer on her the right to hold any office for which she may vote. If you separate the two, female agitators will never sleep until they worry you into granting this substantial sequence of the franchise. If you now permit her to vote, sooner or later this is the very serious condition you must face. In such an event, her sex should be no bar to her being a governor, a chief justice, United States Senator, or any official within the jurisdiction of the people, or other appointing power of this State. If being eligible to these offices, the mother's and wife's ambition covets them against the protest of husband and children—what then? If to prevent her election, husband and children must vote against her—what then? If during the tenure of office, the duties or functions of motherhood demand her retirement—what then? If, in the distribution of official patronage, she ignore husband and sons—what then?

Women agitators call the franchise, by a gross misnomer, a natural right. The refutation of the absurdity lies in the obtrusive antagonism between this alleged natural right and other real natural duties. Frances Power Cobbe, a vigorous female agitator, confesses there is a period in a woman's life when the duties she owes her sex force her to a complete abandonment of the duties she owes the commonwealth. Is not this a singular anomaly? Because female suffragists will not heed the voice of nature they are unsexing themselves.

It is this possibility of female office-holders that forces on us the feature of female capacity.

Dr. Wm. A. Hammond, the distinguished nerve and brain specialist, after writing harshly of the original female suffrage agitators as short-haired women and long-haired men, says that a woman's brain evolves emotion rather than intellect; and whilst this feature fits her admirably as
a creature burdened with the preservation and happiness of the human species, it painfully disqualifies her for the stern duties to be performed by the intellectual faculties. The best wife and mother and sister would make the worst legislator, judge and police.

The excessive development of the emotional in her nervous system, ingrafts on the female organization, a neurotic or hysterical condition, which is the source of much of the female charms when it is kept within due restraints. In emergencies, or difficult situations, or moments of excitement, or under continued strain, it is liable to explode in violent paroxysms, when all the mental and physical faculties are perverted, and thrown into a condition of startling turbulence. Every woman, therefore, carries this power of irregular, illogical and incongruous action; and no one can foretell when the explosion will come.

A woman lives more in her emotions, and will judge more as she feels than as she thinks. She is bereft of the "judicial mind." She has no idea of abstract justice. Her likes and dislikes are paramount with her. She will sacrifice life, duty, family and character, if necessary, to the man she loves; and punish severely those, who, innocent of crime, may have only aroused her prejudices. A man will judge of things as they are without reference to himself. Only the exceptional woman can do this. Men are strong in those virtues that grow out of the nature of things—women in those that are found in mere sentiment or right feeling.

These differences make their union necessary. They were never intended for rivals. They are complementary to each other, like the voices in a choral harmony; and their wants and differences are the bond of their union. If nature makes them differ, so must the spheres of their action vary.

If an abnormal female ambition, blind to these essential and God-given unlikenesses, craves for activity in an unhealthy, masculine field, let the strong, virile opinion of the State, rebuke the yearning as it would that of an unthinking, wayward child.

Gladly do I endorse your own resolution when you say: "It is our fathers, brothers, husbands and sons who represent us at the ballot-box. Our fathers and our brothers love us; our husbands are our choice and one with us; our sons are what we make them. We are content that they represent us in the corn-field, on the battle-field and at the ballot-box, and we them in the school-room, at the fireside and at the cradle, believing our representation even at the ballot-box to be thus more full and impartial than it would be were the views of the few who wish suffrage adopted, contrary to the judgment of the many.

"We do, therefore, respectfully protest against any legislation to establish woman suffrage, in our land, or in any part of it."

Anti-Suffrage pamphlets may be obtained at 13 Elk street, Albany.
At a meeting of the Committee on Suffrage of the New York Constitutional Convention, held at the Capitol in Albany, on Thursday, June 14th, 1894, Mr. Francis M. Scott of New York City, spoke as follows, upon the amendment under consideration by the Committee providing for the elimination of the word "male" from Article 11, Section 1, of the Constitution:

"I appear before this Committee as the spokesman of a large body of women resident in the county of New York, who are seriously and sincerely alarmed at the mere possibility that this Convention may be induced to take the first step toward the imposition upon the women of this State of new and onerous duties and responsibilities.

In the opinion of those who send me here the experiment which you are asked to endorse would be a most dangerous one, not only for the State, but for woman herself, and they have therefore come forward most unwillingly, but in fulfillment of what they regard as an imperative duty, to protest publicly against so radical and revolutionary an amendment of our fundamental law, as would be implied in the unlimited extension of the suffrage to women.

It is proper at the outset that I should state as briefly as possible how it has happened that these women whom I represent, and who shrink from active and personal participation in public affairs, have, in apparent contradiction to their own professed principles and beliefs, been moved to take part in the public discussion of a question of this character.

The agitation for woman suffrage is no new matter in this country, and there are few of us present to-night who can remember the time when there were not some women, with active, restless minds, who clamored for the right to vote.
Never, until the present year, however, has the agitation for this extension of the suffrage made sufficient headway in this State, as to appear really dangerous, or to seem to warrant active opposition.

Early in the past winter, indeed almost as soon as the members of this Convention had been elected, certain very well known, very estimable and very able ladies in the City of New York began to solicit petitions addressed to this Convention, asking it to recommend to the people an amendment to the first section of Article 11 of the Constitution, to consist of the elimination of the word "male" from that section.

At a time like the present, when the unrestful spirit of Socialism is abroad throughout the land, it is not surprising that they were able to attract to their support many men and women of acknowledged intellectual capacity, many of the women who have acquired a certain kind of prominence by their constant participation in all kinds of public discussion, some women, who by means of their husbands' wealth and their own social prominence had become well-known, by name, in the community, and not a few of that always considerable body of people, who constantly seek some change in the existing condition of affairs, and who, unthinkingly, believe that whatever is new, must for that reason alone be progressive and desirable.

A large number of public and quasi-public meetings were held, many speeches were delivered and pamphlets written, and a vast amount of newspaper prominence was obtained.

For a long time the suffragists, as they have come to be called, had the field to themselves—the subject became the theme of discussion in drawing rooms and over dinner tables, and women's suffrage became the "social fad" of the hour.

At length, only about three weeks before this Convention met, a few earnest and thoughtful women in the City of New York, became aroused to the possible danger that unless some positive steps were taken to present the other side of the question
the agitation in favor of the amendment might succeed by default. They realized how difficult it has become in these days for man to refuse to woman anything that she asks at his hands, and they feared that if this Convention heard only from the women who wished to participate in the politics of the State, it might be misled into the belief that these petitioners represented the sentiments of the women generally.

They also appreciated the fact that many of the advocates of female suffrage were women of signal ingenuity and ability, well primed with specious and plausible arguments, and that you gentlemen, having many matters of great importance to consider and act upon within a very limited time, were entitled to all possible assistance in reaching a conclusion upon a question of such vital importance, not only to womankind, but to the community.

These women, therefore, who were opposed to the extension of the suffrage and who felt very strongly and seriously upon the subject quietly prepared and circulated the protest which has been laid before you.

They refrained from imitating the methods adopted by the suffragists. They held no meetings, made no speeches, conducted no campaign.

They made no effort to impress the Convention by the mere number of names attached to their protest.

They accepted the signatures of no men, of no women under twenty-one years of age, of no aliens or non-residents of the State.

The results has exceeded their most sanguine expectations.

Notwithstanding the very short time allowed for the circulation of their protest, notwithstanding the unaggressive methods adopted by them, notwithstanding the reluctance of many women to take even so much part in public affairs as would be involved in signing a document of this character, they
have already been able to lay before you from the city of New York the names of nearly as many women—within three or four thousand as many—as the suffragists have been able to present from that city after months of effort and an elaborate and aggressive campaign, and to-day I have brought to Albany the names of nearly a thousand women in addition to those already presented.

Nor had these women of New York, until within a very few days, contemplated the presentation of any oral arguments or addresses to you.

They have selected and sent to each member of the Convention some of the best literature upon the subject, in which the unanswerable arguments against female suffrage are ably and convincingly stated.

At the very last moment, however, it has been deemed due to yourselves that the side of the Anti-Suffragists, as they are termed, should be orally and formally presented to you.

I shall, however, be very brief in what I have to say, contenting myself rather with suggesting, than elaborating a few of the most serious and apparent objections to the proposed amendment.

You will not accuse me of seeking to instruct you in your duties, if I begin by quoting from the leading advocate of the amendment, a sentence which, in my opinion, every member of this Convention should keep ever clearly in mind.

Mrs. Jacobi very justly said to you a few evenings ago that "this Convention is no revolutionary tribunal assembled to sap the foundation, or overthrow the structure of existing society."

If then, it can be made clear to you that this proposed amendment is essentially revolutionary, that its inevitable tendency must be to sap the foundations and overthrow the structure of existing society, that it would bestow apparent authority upon those who lack the power to enforce respect for their
authority, that it would tend to destroy that inter-dependence of men and women for which nature has wisely provided and which alone makes social development and progress possible, that it would be, to quote the report of Horace Greeley to the last Constitutional Convention, "An innovation revolutionary and sweeping, openly at war with the distribution of functions between the sexes as venerable and pervading as government itself and involving radical transformations in social and domestic life"—

If you shall be convinced that this proposed amendment is of this character, then your duty with respect to it will be clear and easy.

What then is the proposition now laid before you and for which your approval is demanded?

It is that man, upon whom from time immemorial has devolved the duty of making and enforcing laws for the protection of society, shall now abdicate his position, and, potentially at least, turn over to the women the power of making the laws, reserving to himself only the responsibility of enforcing those laws which she may make, for while it is possible by amendment of the Constitution to confer upon women the power to make laws, a higher power than even this Convention has denied to her the power of enforcing the law.

I have said that the adoption of this amendment involves man's abdication of his right to make laws, and the statement is none too strong. The women always outnumber the men, and owing to the itinerant character of many of man's avocations the voting women would always largely outnumber the voting men.

It may be that we should seldom see all the women on one side of a political question, but we might easily do so, especially upon a question that appealed to sentiment or emotion, and so as I have said, potentially at least, the proposed amendment involves the abdication by man of the power of government.
If that be not revolutionary in its tendencies, I know not what could be.

We have all become so accustomed to defer to woman— to accede to her slightest wish— to extend to her all the privileges that her sex seems to demand— to share with her everything in which she desires to share, that we approach this question with a sort of half formed feeling, that we may, in some way, be deemed ungracious and ungenerous if we refuse to admit her to participation in the suffrage.

But as upon man devolves the power to change the fundamental law of the State, so upon man rests the responsibility of exercising that power in the interest and for the benefit of the community, and it is his duty to approach the consideration of this question with all seriousness and without a trace of sentimentality.

Before the men of this State consent to surrender to women the responsibility for government and the power to change at will its fundamental law, before even we consent to share that power and responsibility with them, we are bound to be fully assured:

First: That to do so will be of benefit to the whole community, and

Second: That there are certain definite benefits to be secured through woman's suffrage, which cannot otherwise be secured.

The great and unsuperable objection to the extension of the suffrage to women is fundamental and functional.

It rests upon the difference that nature has established between men and women.

The basis of government is force— its stability rests upon its physical power to enforce its law. Since the world began no government has ever sustained itself for any length of time unless it controlled the physical force of the nation.
To imagine a government unbacked by the physical power necessary to enforce its laws, is to imagine an anomaly—which must soon develop into anarchy.

And it is for this reason that in all times and all countries the government has been entrusted to the men, because they alone are able, if necessary, to fight for its maintenance.

I am well aware that the advocates of female suffrage refuse to admit the truth of the proposition that the stability of government is dependant upon physical force—they cannot admit it, since to do so would be to admit the weakness of their cause. But it is true, nevertheless, and the more you think of it, the more you turn it over in your minds—the more you consider it from every side—the more certainly must you come to recognize its truth.

The suffragists characterize such a proposition as brutal and revolting—they assert that with the advent of female suffrage human nature and the whole theory of government will change; that a government of reason will supersede a government of force—that bad men and women will consent to be persuaded to observe the law, and that it will no longer be necessary to compel them to do so.

Indeed one of the most enthusiastic, and least logical, of the advocates of female suffrage, ventures the assertion that already there is going on all over the civilized world "a continuous evolution in the form of government from the military type to the industrial type—from government by involuntary co-operation to government by voluntary co-operation—from government by force to government by discussion."

Fine words, indeed but far at variance with the facts.

This is still the age of Bismarck—Europe still resembles nothing more than an armed camp—the echoes of the rebellion have not yet died away, and the pension list still remains to remind us that the government, even of pacific America, can, upon occasion, maintain itself by force.
If we are passing beyond the age when government must rely upon force for its stability, why do we go on year by year developing and improving our militia — why do we erect armories, and not debating halls, why in all the centres of population do we continue to organize and drill bodies of police?

Because we know — you and I know that laws, that cannot be enforced, are worse than useless — that to make laws, and not provide at the same time the means of compelling obedience to them, would be to bring government into contempt — to invite a condition of anarchy — to endanger the safety of the individual, the sanctity of the home, the permanency of all our most cherished institutions. In short, to call down destruction upon the community that it is our duty to defend.

Herein, therefore, lies the fundamental difference between men and women — herein is to be found the ultimate and immutable reason why men should vote, and women should not. It is simply because men can fight and women cannot.

This fundamental fact may be momentarily lost sight of in the clouds of emotional and sentimental rhetoric, but it is your duty as serious men, charged with a grave responsibility, to see to it that you do not permit your vision to be obscured by either emotion or sentiment. You are bound to look the facts in the face and to legislate in the light of the facts, for the benefit of the whole community.

The interests of the community clearly require that the law should have behind it sufficient force to compel respect and observance.

We talk about the "strong arm of the law" — where would be the strength of that arm, if it were only that of weak, non-combatative woman?

The reason why you and I, Mr. Chairman, are entitled to participate in the government, is not because we are intelli-
gent, or educated, or able to pay taxes. We may be none of these and still be entitled to vote. It is because we have back of our votes the physical force necessary to enforce the laws we help to make.

But laws passed by the vote of women would have no force behind them, and consequently could be disregarded with impunity.

The reason why we have adopted, as the foundation of our political system, the rule that the will of the majority must prevail over that of the minority, is that both majority and minority recognize the fact that the majority can, if the minority rebel, force them into acquiescence.

But if the majority were all women and the minority were all men, this would not be true, the minority would soon cease to pay any regard to the will of the majority, and our whole theory of government would be overturned, and government itself cease to be government.

The exception to the general rule that man is combatant, and women non-combatant in no wise affect its application.

I concede that some women are physically able to fight, and that some men are not. I recognize the existence of mannish women, and of womanish men—but in discussing a question of this character we must consider the rule, rather than the exceptions, and even the most ardent suffragist will not venture to assert that the average woman equals in physical power the average man.

I repeat that the only question you have a right to determine is whether, in the interest of both the sexes, it would be conducive to good government to bestow the franchise upon women.

In considering that question you cannot close your eyes to the fact that the result of such a measure would practically be to bestow upon women power without responsibility, leaving to the men merely the responsibility without power.
I am sure that you must conclude that an experiment so revolutionary as that must endanger the welfare and very existence of the State.

If there were any advantages to accrue either to the State, or to woman herself, from the adoption of this amendment, which cannot be obtained without it, it might be your duty to weigh those advantages against the very many and palpable dis-advantages.

If there be in fact any such advantages, the burden of pointing them out, and proving them, clearly rests upon the proponents of this radical measure.

I have read with some care all the obtainable essays and speeches in behalf of the amendment, and have sought in vain for the statement of a single certain, well defined benefit which is to result either to the State or to woman kind. Glittering generalities, fantastic speculations, socialistic theories, populistic fallacies, I find plenty, but I find the statement of no wrong to woman that man has refused to redress—of no provision for her benefit that he has refused to make—I find no business or profession closed to her—no barrier interposed to her development and advance in any direction in which her sex permits her to direct her footsteps.

The law of this State already accords to women, as it rightly should, many special privileges and immunities, and has removed the trammels which in years gone by confined her freedom of action.

If there still be grievances to be redressed, of which we hear no mention, it is to the Legislature that appeal should be made, and until it has shown, as it has not yet done, an disposition to act upon any reasonable complaint, there will be no necessity for an appeal to the ballot box.

It is true that it is said by some theorists that the possession of the privilege of voting would enable working women to
command higher wages and greater consideration from their employers.

If that were true, it would seem that the possession of the franchise by men should by this time have raised to a satisfactory figure the wages of working men. But we all know that it has not yet had that effect.

To-day the newspapers are filled with accounts of labor strikes all over the country, and every striker is a voter.

It is true that among male workers organization and cooperation have in many industries increased wages and lessened the hours of labor, but these concessions have been compelled because the male workers have possessed that which female workers do not and cannot possess, physical force to back up their demands. Practically all these concessions have been gained by strikes, or the fear of strikes, and back of every strike is a possible resort to physical force; not perhaps sufficiently strong to defy the law for very long, but in many cases strong enough to make compromise cheaper and safer than battle.

But it is claimed that the exercise of the suffrage is a natural right inherent in every individual, and that to deny it to woman is to refuse arbitrarily that which she has a right to demand.

No proposition can be more at variance with the theory and history of political government. There is no such thing as an inherent natural right of an individual to vote. The right to say who may and who may not vote has always remained, and must always remain with the State, and, in the nature of things, must be exercised with reference to the interest, not of the individual, but of the State.

In no proper or exact sense is the suffrage a right at all, or even a privilege.

It is a duty imposed upon the individual citizen because it is believed that its exercise by him will make for the best interest of the whole community.
And even if it were, as it is not, a personal, natural, individual right, it would still be perfectly competent and proper to deny it to woman, if by granting it to her the safety or stability of the State would be imperilled.

There is no individual right so sacred, that the State may not, for the benefit of the whole community, deprive the individual of it.

The right of property—of liberty—of life itself may be destroyed if the interest of the community demands it. Private property may be taken for public use—the writ of habeas corpus may be suspended—men may be drafted into the army and sent, unwilling, to meet death upon the field of battle, if the welfare of the State—of the whole community—needs the sacrifice.

It is urged that to refuse the ballot to women is to render them liable to taxation without representation, and this is proclaimed as a gross injustice. To sustain this plea, the Committee has, as I understand, been furnished with elaborate tables purporting to show the amount of property in various countries owned by women and subject to tax.

But those who advance this argument exhibit their entire lack of understanding of the theories, both of taxation and of suffrage, and thus demonstrate that they, at least, are not yet prepared to participate in the suffrage.

The duty, or right if you prefer the word, of voting is in no sense dependent, in this State, and has not been for many years, upon the fact that the voter pays taxes or owns taxable property.

We have founded our government on manhood suffrage, and have conferred the voting power upon our male citizens, not because they own more or less property, or any property at all, but because they are men.

The women would, indeed, have a right to complain if we so far differentiated them from their husbands, their brothers
and their sons as to confer upon them alone a limited right of suffrage restricted by a property qualification.

Nor do we levy taxes as an equivalent for the suffrage, or even in proportion to the population. New York pays more taxes than Albany, not because New York contains a larger voting population than Albany, and is represented by more senators and assemblymen, but because the value of the taxable property in New York is greater than the value of the taxable property in Albany.

Taxes are the involuntary contributions levied and collected by the State for the protection, benefit and advancement of the whole community. They are levied alike and in the same proportion upon the property of voters and non-voters—of aliens and citizens—of infants and adults—of men and women.

In short there is no relation whatever, in fact, or theory between taxation and the voting power.

I have already pointed out that the advocates of the amendment now before you, have failed to indicate any positive definite advantage to be gained by the extension of the suffrage to women.

They refuse to assume the burden of proof which justly should rest upon their shoulders, and content themselves with arguing that no harm is likely to follow upon the proposed experiment.

They undertake to wage an affirmative contest by assuming a negative attitude.

But if needs be we are prepared to meet them upon this field.

The change in our political system contemplated by this amendment is the most far-reaching and radical that has ever been attempted in this State.

It is proposed to interject into the political life of this State, a body of voters, larger than the whole number now entitled to vote, and composed, for this main part, of persons
wholly untrained and inexperienced in public affairs, and who from the very nature of their duties and occupations have had, and will have little opportunity to educate themselves in the many complex questions that most constantly arise in the government of a State like ours.

I beg you to remember that you must consider the probable effect of extending the franchise to all women, not alone to the exceptionally intellectual and brilliant women who have addressed you on this subject.

They constitute but a small fraction of their sex, and are by no means representative, intellectually, of the great body of women in this State—of the women who are engrossed by the cares and duties of maternity and wifehood—of the women who find their home duties so exacting that they have little time for political reading and discussion—of the women whose waking hours are fully and happily filled in rearing their children for the State, and keeping homes attractive for sons and husbands.

Should we not find the average woman divided into two classes.

One which, holding on to her home work, voted unintelligently and blindly, and the other gaining, perhaps, political intelligence at the cost of a neglected home.

Would the State derive benefit from either of those classes?

I know that I am referring to what is an unpopular fact with some female suffragists, when I speak of the home duties of woman, as a possible barrier to her intelligent participation in politics. I have observed a disposition on the part of many of their writers and speakers to resent the suggestion that woman's especial duty in the world lies within the confines of the home.

But we must deal with the facts of life as nature has made them for us, and nature has imposed upon women certain
burdens and duties, which we men cannot relieve them of, even by an amendment of the Constitution.

The chief of these is maternity, and upon the heels of maternity follows the care of children.

The very existence of the State depends upon the birth and care of children, and nature has devolved that function upon woman, while the law, following nature, has imposed upon man the duty of supporting and protecting the mothers and the children. Hence if any advocate of female suffrage is disposed to quarrel with the arrangement which relegates woman to the home duties, her quarrel must be with nature—not with man.

And then there is another large class of women who cannot be left out of account. The densely ignorant, who have neither the education, the mental capacity, nor the desire to acquire political intelligence. Will the extension of the suffrage to them make for the benefit of the community?

It is no answer to say that there is a correspondingly large body of ignorant and unintelligent men who are now entitled to vote. It surely cannot be seriously argued that there is less to be apprehended from two unintelligent votes than from one—from two purchasable votes than from one—yet that proposition must be accepted to justify the extension of the suffrage to such women as these.

And then we have, at least in the cities, that large class of unfortunate women who live outside the law, numbering from forty to sixty thousand in New York alone. Would municipal politics become cleaner and better if all these women were permitted to vote—and you may be entirely sure that every one of them would vote—would be compelled to vote.

You gentlemen of the Constitutional Convention know already, better than most of us can, that there are yet many unsolved problems arising from universal manhood suffrage, especially with regard to the government of large cities.
That they will all be solved in time I presume none of us doubt.

Some of them you will doubtless solve, or at least suggest a solution for, before you adjourn.

Do you think that you would be fulfilling the Trust imposed upon you by the people, if you were now to complicate and multiply these problems by doubling the suffrage—by extending it to a large body of untrained and unready persons, wholly lacking in political experience.

I have endeavored to point out to you some of the dangers to the State and to woman herself which would attend the adoption of this amendment, and I have called your attention to the fact that no one has yet been able to indicate one single positive, certain advantage to either that may be expected to result from it.

I cannot help thinking, however, that all the discussion and consideration now given to the subject is premature.

Surely nothing, but an overmastering public necessity, could justify the imposition of political duties upon the women of this State, until they themselves have expressed a desire to undertake those duties.

No such necessity exists, and there is no evidence whatever that the majority of the women, or even a respectable minority, have the slightest desire for the ballot.

The total male vote of the State at the last presidential election was over 1,300,000. We all know that a considerable number of men neglect their political duties, and refrain from voting at all, and we also know that the women exceed the men in number by an appreciable percentage. It is fair to assume therefore, that this amendment would affect not less than 1,500,000 women.

Up to June 1st., the whole number of women's signatures attached to petitions in favor of this amendment, including
those from the city of New York was barely 44,000, even allowing the claims of the suffragists, for I do not suppose that anyone else has counted them. Not more than three per cent of the whole number of women to be affected. And this too after months of a most vigorous and active campaign.

Does this serve to convince you that the women of this State are really anxious for the adoption of the amendment.

Is it worth while to spend valuable time upon the consideration of an amendment of this character, when only an insignificant minority of the women of the State care enough for it to ask for its adoption.

Will it not be time enough to consider the question seriously when we find at least a majority of the women asking for the imposition of the suffrage.

I beg that you will not be led away by the specious plea that it can do no harm to submit the question for determination by the people.

It would do much harm.

There will be other questions of really serious import to the welfare of the State, upon which the people will have to vote. It would be little short of a crime to distract their attention from the consideration of these subjects, by laying before them a fanciful proposition, foredoomed to defeat.

You cannot shift your responsibility upon the shoulders of the people—to attempt to do so would be cowardly.

Your clear duty is to recommend—not merely to suggest, and unless you are convinced that the public interests require the adoption of this amendment, you cannot in good conscience dignify it with your endorsement.

I cannot more fittingly close than by again reminding you of the wise words of Mrs. Jacobi, that "this convention is no revolutionary tribunal assembled to sap the foundations or overthrow the structure of existing society."
Mr. Scott also read to the Committee, the following letter from Mr. Abram S. Hewitt of New York City:

New York, June 13th, 1894.

My dear Mr. Scott:—

I am very sorry that it will not be possible for me to perform the service requested by the Woman's Anti-Suffrage Committee, but I am glad to learn that your engagements will permit you to appear before the Committee of the Constitutional Convention and present the case from their point of view. I regard the subject as of the greatest possible importance, and therefore venture to call your attention to one or two points which appear to me to be decisive of the whole matter.

The State adopts a constitution in order to secure the greatest good of the greatest number. In order that this result may be achieved, justice must be the basis upon which the structure is reared, but inasmuch as in all human contrivances there is necessarily a conflict of principle, the framers of the constitution are compelled to regard only the larger elements involved in each application of the principles of government, and to neglect all minor considerations affecting only small portions of the community.

In our country suffrage is made the basis of government, and step by step we have practically arrived at manhood suffrage as best calculated to ensure general acquiescence. There are, undoubtedly, evils inherent in manhood suffrage, but public opinion has arrived at the conclusion that these evils are of less moment than the denial of suffrage to those who are without education and without property. It is by no means clear that the best interests of society have been promoted and secured by this extension of the suffrage to all classes of males.

The history of the discussion of this question and present status in the public mind go to show that suffrage has never been and is not now regarded as a personal right or even as a
privilege. It is rather to be placed in the category of a duty to be performed. No doubt public opinion has been influenced by the fact that all men are liable to military duty, and inasmuch as government in the last analysis rests upon force, it seems to have been decided that all who are liable to be called upon to fight should also be compelled to vote, because the law, being the expression of the public will, must be enforced by the military power of the State. The conclusion which has been reached appears to me to be based solely upon public policy and not upon any fundamental principle of justice. I am at a loss to perceive upon what ground any individual can claim the right to vote, but I can well understand that the community at large shall impose this obligation upon all who are likely to be called upon to bear arms in support of the law.

If I am right in this view, the whole claim for woman's suffrage falls to the ground. In the very nature of the case they cannot be called upon to enforce the law, and therefore there is no reason why they should be compelled to take part in the election of representatives who are to make the law, or of officers who are to administer it. To impose this duty upon them is to place them in a false position. Nature has not endowed them with the qualities required for the support and defence of the State. Their duties lie in another direction, equally honorable, and much more important. While undoubtedly there are among women many who would exercise the right of suffrage with more intelligence than the majority of men, yet the majority of women feel that they have no mission in that direction, and they do not desire to have the burden of government imposed upon them in addition to the other burdens which nature requires them to bear. Even if there should be a clear expression of opinion (as there is not) in favor of securing the right of suffrage, the question would still remain, whether the welfare of the State would be promoted by such an extension of the voting population. This is a ques-
tion of practical politics, in which each man has a right to form his own judgment, and must, in the nature of the case, do so.

After carefully considering all the arguments advanced by the advocates of woman's suffrage, I am forced to the conclusion that their case has not yet been made out, and I do not think from the organic difference between men and women that it will ever be shown to be for the advantage of women that they should be forced to take part in political controversies. In fact, I think it would be a great misfortune to them as well as to the human race.

Very truly yours,

Abram S. Hewitt.

Francis M. Scott, Esq.,
EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESSES

OF

The Rt. Rev. Wm. Croswell Doane, D. D.,
BISHOP OF ALBANY.

To the classes graduated from St. Agnes' School, Albany.

June 6th, 1894 and June 6th, 1895.

Published by the Albany Anti-Suffrage Association.
1898.
There must be individuality; the distinct character which differentiates man from man, or machine from machine. For each is "after its kind." And there is no waste of power so great, as when one loses sight of this and sets the day laborer to adjust the niceties of the chronometer, or puts the poet behind the plough. This is the critical question of all. The power of a "Reaper" to tie up sheaves with their own straw, with a delicacy of machinery alive almost to its finger ends, would not be proven, if it were set to break stones on the road. Nor would the capacity of the trip hammer be tested, if it were used to drive the needle of the sewing machine. What is it for? "What wilt thou have me to do?" Purpose as the test of power; object, intention, place and kind of work; this is what I mean by individuality. "What she could;" "what she had;" "what I can." I am sure that there never was a more important time in all the world, to emphasize, and drive home into the minds and consciences of women, this most important lesson. We are living in a period of reaction, and reaction always means a tendency to violent extremes. The slowly working leaven of Christianity for eighteen hundred years, has been lifting women up from the low level into which they fell in Eve, to the higher lines of life and service to which they rose in Mary. One by one, openings and opportunities for congenial and convenient service have been opened up to her. One by one, the bars of the cage have been let down, and the barriers of foolish custom have been taken away, which hindered and held her back from openings and opportunities of usefulness. And one by one, the false restraints and unwise discriminations have been done away; until to-day, by the common consent, by the Christianized instinct, by the chivalrous endeavor, of men, womanhood—and nowhere more than in America—stands fairly out upon that position of correlation and coequality with men, which really was the purpose of Almighty God in the double creation; which in no sense contradicts the divine intention of the primacy of the first created, and the subordination of the second; but which utterly destroys, and does away with, the false theory of superiority and sovereignty on the one side, as meaning inferiority.
and subjection on the other. And now the world is full of agitations, which would destroy, if they could be carried out, that exquisite balance which the revealed purpose of God, and the implanted and inherent differences between men and women, indicate as the wise and true relation between the two. Coequality, side-by-sidehood, divided sovereignty, the mutual superiority and subordination of influence and control, the interdependence of the "man who is by the woman" and "the woman who is of the man;" these are not only truths and theories, but facts and realities; which can not be forgotten or disregarded without serious injury and loss. Nobody who reads the record of the Revelation rightly, or studies history or examines the experience of his own life, can fail to feel that whatever distinctions and differences there may be between the kind of mind, of capacity, of character between the two sexes, there are no differences whatever in the degree. But it is the falsest kind of logic which argues, that, because the two sexes are equal in the sight of God, therefore, they are interchangeable. All that the man can do, the woman can not do. All that the woman can do, the man can not do. And, therefore, the talk to-day of "woman's rights," apart from the falseness of the application of the word—for the rights of either man or woman are fewer and far less important than their duties—has this inherent fallacy; that it presupposes that because their rights are equal, therefore they are the same. Surely, if one takes the other and the better word, it is plain to the blindest, that the duties of men and women are not the same; that the trend of their tastes and capabilities is different; and that if the women are to do the men's duties, their own duties must be left undone, or done by those who are unfitted for and incapable of their discharge. Nothing is wilder or stranger, than the misconceptions and disproportionateness of all this theory. It is contradicted by the whole material world in which we live; and in which, its own functions are given and its own duties assigned to every separate plant and tree and animal. Nor could a wilder confusion be produced than if, by some blind force, these unthinking and unreasoning things should set themselves to tasks, which have not been assigned them; and for which they are not intended by their creation. And why, the highest order of created things, to whom Almighty God has given not only the consciousness of their peculiar and different capacities, but the plain and evident ability of recognizing the fact and reasoning just why these lines of differences are drawn, should prove itself duller and more stupid than the inanimate creation, is difficult to see. Earnestly I beg that this lesson of the personal pronoun "I"—which never in any language changes sex because of the equal individuality of both sexes must be acknowledged as the fundamental principle of character—may plant itself deeply in your conscience. You
may turn into the feminine gender that great sentence, "I can do all that may become a woman; who dares do more is none." You can realize all this by the divinely implanted instincts of your nature, by the limitations or the enlargements of your capacity, by the opportunities and occasions of your providential place in life. And that will be the clue, which you may safely follow, as indicating the lines along which every faculty of your nature is to be set, with utmost intensity and directness of aim, to do "your duty in the state of life into which it shall please God to call you."

I am urging the recognition of such limitations as God has set, first in your sex, which are written in laws so plain and facts so irresistible that only the blindest can fail to read and see them. The utter misconception of equality of position, as though it meant sameness of duty, between men and women, is among the facile follies and the fatal fallacies of the age. Facing great evils, moved in some instances by high motives, women who used to be quiet and content to stand in their lot, are joining in the wretched unrest of the effort, which, until recently, was in the hands of wild and unwomanly fanatics, to unsex themselves and unsettle the peace of the household, and the prosperity of the world. I have a general dislike and distrust of the term woman in the abstract. And in the manner of its use it is most confusing. There are women and women, as there are men and men. And the fond imagination that the evils of unqualified suffrage given to men, which are the most dangerous element in our American political world to-day, can be cured by extending the evil to unqualified women, is the strangest delusion that ever possessed the human mind. If it should be permitted, which God forefend, the abstract woman may rejoice, but it will be in the spirit of the maniac, who has laid waste the homes and marred the happiness and murdered the hopes of women. Privilege, courtesy, chivalry, respect, deference, consideration, will have melted away. And there will come instead unseemly contests, selfishness, the bitterness of partisanship, the dregs of strife and corruption, incrimination and the demoralization of the deepest and highest and dearest relations of society: while in its political effect it will only multiply corrupt and irresponsible ballots, not to equal, but to outweigh the intelligent suffrage of reputable women. Nothing will be altered in results. Nothing will be gained in the issues. And the irreclaimable mischief will have left its blight and scar on our social life. Two-handed humanity (that is the figure of the man and the woman in the body politic) has a right hand and a left hand, each equal to the other, each needful to the other. But the hand that is nearest the heart, the woman, is not used, and is not meant to be used, to grasp the sword, the pen, the reins; nor to seize the rough
difficulties and wring out of them the stern successes, of the strife. They are both hands. They are equally hands. Each is imperfect without the other, but their functions are apart and different. Learn the divine, the human, the instinctive, the evident limitations of your sex. And when you have filled out with "all you can" the sphere of your allotted service, you will have no time, nor strength, nor desire to reach out for other work to do.
One gets sick and tired of the way in which the talk of woman's vocation fills the air, not merely in the wild vagaries of its blatant assumptions, but in the parade and push of its claims for recognition of what are called "its rights." I have had occasion here, a year ago, to say what wrong to womanhood these women's rights would be. And I have no desire to recall a word, to shade down any statement, or to abate a jot of effort to protect the silent many from the noisy few. For the agitators are really in the minority. Numberless names on these modern "millenarian petitions" mean only the thoughtless and good-natured yielding to persistent pursuit; just as legislative majority votes stand, in not a few instances, for a mistaken courtesy or an unmanly cowardice. I believe that God will yet save this State and Nation from the aggravated miseries of an enlarged, unqualified suffrage, which, in its universality of male voters, is our most threatening danger to-day. But if we are to be visited by this infliction, as a well-earned punishment for many national sins, then I believe that, when we have tasted its bitterness, we shall be brought back, perhaps through anarchy and revolution, to a democracy, which shall demand, for its existence, government by men, whom education and actual Americanism of vital interest in the Nation qualify to govern. Meanwhile, when a new Bible shall have been translated into a denial of the original record of creation—a really "reversed Scripture," as one once called "the revised version"—when Constitutions shall have been altered, to disturb the equipoise of the relation between man and woman; when motherhood shall be replaced by mannishness; when neglected homes shall furnish candidates for mismanaged offices; when money shall buy the votes of women, as it does now themselves; when the fires of political discord shall be lighted on the hearthstone of domestic peace; when the arrogant assertion of demanded rights shall have destroyed the instinctive chivalry of conceded courtesies; when "woman," as has been well said, "once the superior, has become the equal of man;" then the reaped whirlwind of some violent political reaction will be gathered "in tears," by those who are sowing the
wind, in the mad "joy" of the Petroleuse of the French revolutions. The vocation of womanhood is the highest and the holiest in the world. Guard it, my dear children, in your own selves, from the desecration that would drag it into the publicity and prostitutions of political strife. Year by year, as the centuries have gone on since the great Partheno-Genesis of humanity, its highness and its holiness have been more and more made clear. Apart from, and in spite of, all the violence of agitation, the duties, the opportunities and the privileges of women have opened out before them: service to the State, in the training of boys and the moulding of men; in influencing great reforms; in organizing charity; in elevating education; in the protected ministries of mercy to the sick, the poor, the fallen; in the adorning and sanctifying of homes. But the shoulder that is unfitted for the musket, and the hand that was not made to guide the plough mean, and mark off, by very physical distinctions, the vocation of women, from the rough and public stir and strife of men. If equality means similarity of rights and duties, then the harmony of nature and the balance of the world would be destroyed. The milch cow and the ploughing ox are not meant for the same service. The herb that ministers healing, and the flower that yields its fragrance to the summer air, have equal and yet most different duties to render to mankind; from the tall wheat which gives its life up for our sustenance, or the great tree which falls to float our commerce on the sea. There is no hive of bees, no field of growing things, no human household, no housing place of cattle, no machine of man's making, with its complex adaptation of each piece to its work, that does not cry out against the mad mistake of confusing and confounding, into likeness, the distinct and different functions, among which there is no unequalness that means inferiority. And never in any age of the world, nowhere in any land, and nowhere in America, so much as now in our own Empire State, was there such absolute unreason, for the clamour which seeks to distract women from the duties of "the vocation to which they are called," into the mad pursuit of the greatest wrong that can be done to their sex, their country and mankind. Forgive me if, all unwilling, I disturb the sacredness of this place and the sweetness of this scene, with such unwelcome thoughts. But the man who is set in public place to-day, to train some of the women of America for their vocation, may not, in times like these, withhold his voice of warning against the dangers and delusions of the hour.

It is what St. Paul calls a high calling; a calling upward, an \( \Lambda \nu \omega \ ΚΑ\nu\deltaις \), my dear children, to which you are called by every inherent indication of your nature—physical, intellectual, moral, spiritual—to the womanhood of womanly service to God and man.
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BY

MRS. FRANCIS M. SCOTT.
We women who are opposed to the Extension of the Suffrage, have felt constrained to appear before this Committee because we believe the Legislative bodies to be under a misapprehension as to the attitude of the majority of our sex toward this, one of the most important social questions of the day.

Every extension of the Suffrage has been a subject of grave debate, but the general feeling of a fundamental similarity between men, has led to Universal Male Suffrage.

Now comes the question of the extension of the Suffrage to women, and we can no more call it a like question to those earlier ones, than we can call women like men. Equal they may be—different they certainly are. I shall very briefly touch upon the points which appeal most strongly to the body of women whom this committee represents.

The question of the right of Suffrage is disposed of by the fact that the State alone holds the power to extend the Suffrage, and she is only justified in extending it when her own best interests can be served thereby.

That the best interests of the State would be served by the extension of the Suffrage to women, we do not believe. Think for a moment of giving the voting power to a majority (we women are in the majority you know), unable to coerce a troublesome minority by physical power. A government unable to compel is no government at all—it is a mere travesty, a farce. We cannot be blind to the fact that civilization in the nature of things progresses by the force of the law, not by its moral suasion.

But civilization goes forward by two roads; one I have mentioned, the other is Philanthropy, and I use the word broadly. By it I cover educational, municipal and charitable work of all kinds, and it has a most important bearing on this question. The fact that women have no political prizes to gain, no offices in view, no constituencies to please, has made them of special value in all this wide field of work. Their ends are more quickly achieved since their singleness of purpose cannot be questioned. Let them be plunged into the arena of political strife and there will be no one left to carry on the work they now sustain so bravely.

There is a ridiculous side to this whole question, which is tacitly avoided in these public hearings, as are other more serious views of the subject, but brief as the time is I propose to touch upon both.

A very slight mention of the ridiculous side will suffice. We women are not supposed to be humorous, I know, but even the most serious of us are obliged to smile when we ask ourselves who will do our work when we are doing the men's!

The obvious reply to that, is that all women will not want to go into political life if they have the ballot, any more than all men do, but all men may and can; it is a matter of choice. Legislation is for the majority, and the majority of women are mothers, whose health and strength must be given to the State, during their best years, only through the medium of those lives in whose preservation and upbringing lies the future of our country. It is these women—the great majority—whom we beg you to protect; the
chivalry of men belongs to them. So sure are thousands of them that you will never place the burden of government upon their shoulders that it is difficult to persuade them that there is any danger of your mistaking the clamor of the suffragists for truth, or that their still small voice should be heard above the din.

It is true that last spring, in less than three weeks, without solicitation, 7,000 names, nearly half of which were those of self-supporting women, were collected and sent to the Constitutional Convention to protest against the amendment you are now considering, but I cannot give you an idea of how difficult it was for many women to gather sufficient courage even to put their names to a public paper. They confessed to a struggle before they could make up their minds to come forward. That may have been a foolish feeling—it is not for me to criticise—it is at least, one which most women understand. These women do not want publicity, they do not want to be mixed up in politics, they just want to be women and do a woman's work, and they are the great majority of our sex, and they should be respected.

This question is often confounded with that of the higher education. Believe me they have nothing whatever to do with one another. The ballot in itself is not an educational force, as you men very well know, nor is it a wand with which to turn all vileness into purity. It is simply a part of the machinery of the State, a very cumbersome part, costing an enormous amount, but the only way we know of giving to a few representative men the power to legislate for all. The laws of the State have given women so much that any attempt to alter her position, would, in the cause of justice, have to begin by taking away, not adding to her rights.

The gradual changes in the laws of this State during the last quarter of a century have taken away every cry of the Suffragists of that earlier time, and what women have asked, men have done, time and time again.

Now in closing, I wish to be very serious. To many young persons, to many emotional persons, change is mistaken for progress. Thus in the train of the women so long identified with the demand for suffrage, who do not realize that the times have outgrown their cause, have followed many who, full of the unrestful spirit of the end of the century are hurrying along, eager only for something different, something more, forgetting the inexorable law which science has laid down; the law we know as the Specialization of Function. In every line of life we see this law ruling development. Where there is specialization there comes to be greater and greater perfection; nowhere is progress accompanied by a diffusion of force, but always by a concentration of effort in special directions. So, since the first development of sex, has specialization of the male and female types gone on; men have grown more manly, women more womanly. Are we alone of all nature to forcibly destroy the work of untold ages, and thrusting men and women together, demand that the work that each is beginning to be perfect in shall be indifferently done by both! And then, there are the assertions of greater virtue made for our sex without foundation. Again, in being equal we differ. Born as we are of man and woman, inheriting the mental and
moral characteristics of both parents, we differ from our brothers only in so far as our physical limitations affect our organizations. Theirs are the robuster virtues, called to growth and strength by rough contact with the world. Theirs the word which serves for the bond; the responsibility which is the foundation of business life; the integrity on which justice rests; the broad mindedness, which gives each man his chance. And to balance all that, women have the spirit of self-sacrifice, the charity which forgives, the personal purity, all of which are essential to the existence of the home, and cause their sons to rise up and call them blessed.

I approach this question of morality with natural hesitation. It, and our physical disabilities are the points I spoke of earlier as being ignored when this question is seriously discussed, and yet unless considered this question cannot be properly dealt with.

Who does not realize the present disinclination for motherhood which possesses so many of our younger generation, and who can see it without alarm? It can be traced to this unrestful desire for life outside the home. When motherhood is spoken of with contempt, when a home-life is considered too dull to be endured; when the ambition of the intellectual life becomes so warped as to be dissatisfied with any outlet but that of public life—what is to become of the future?

Do what we may, say what we can, we cannot break down the barrier of sex which indicates the parting of the ways.

Build up the wall of the law about us, seeking and accepting our counsel meanwhile; protect the homes, which we women alone can make for you; open to us every door for our education and advancement, but do not put upon the shoulders of women the muskets they are too weak to carry, nor the burden of the government which was constituted to protect them; do not force them to undertake an undue share of the world’s work.

I leave this matter in your hands with confidence—I am a woman speaking for my silent sisters, appealing to you to leave us the liberty we might demand, begging you not to give your sanction to a retrogressive action, by breaking down the barrier experience has built between our sexes, but, as you go on becoming nobler, finer, men, carrying on the active part of the world’s work, to let us too progress, becoming every decade abler and more intellectual women, better and better fitted to help and counsel, but never your rivals, never partakers in the eager strife of public life.
Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee on Resolutions:

I appear before you with reluctance and trepidation. I am here to represent a large body of women who do not crave publicity or notoriety, and who, until recently, were content to submit in silence to the demands presented by a few women for the extension of suffrage to the sex; but when the issue was forced upon us either to speak or to become implicated in the suffrage movement through our silence, we felt that we must be heard; and so I was asked to present our protest to your honorable committee:

In the name of nearly one million and a half of women of the State of New York, I protest against any such action being taken by your honorable body as is asked for by Mrs. Blake.

I protest in the name of the Constitutional Convention of New York State, in 1894, a body largely Republican, who, after mature deliberation, decided that "until it is shown that woman may become a politician without losing something of the precious charm of her personality, and that the State may exact her services in that capacity without imperiling its stability and tranquility, it is surely the conservative course of wisdom to retain the existing conditions under which we have achieved our great happiness and prosperity."

I protest in the name of South Carolina, as shown by her action in 1895; of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as shown at the November election in 1895; of Rhode Island's Legislature of 1896.
All the best civilization opposes forced changes; and I take it that such a radical change as adding to the 1,500,000 votes of New York State over 1,500,000 votes more, in direct opposition to the wishes of her people, is something that you are hardly prepared to father; but if you were, there would then be these questions to be answered affirmatively:

Will it be for the best interests of the country to grant the suffrage to women?

Are these certain definite benefits to be secured through women's suffrage which cannot otherwise be secured?

And men of your intelligence, gentlemen, do not need to have me point out the fallacy involved in an affirmative answer.

Permit me to state briefly our objection:

We object to any woman who has only a backing of one thousand six hundred enrolled suffragists in New York State to say that she represents the million and one half of home-loving women of that state.

We believe that the extension of suffrage to a people more than as large again as the present voting population would be to increase the evils that already threaten to overcome the principles for which our fathers fought.

We assert that women to-day are so protected by laws made by men, that they have nothing more to ask for legally. The question of wages never has been, or never will be, governed by the question whether the wage-earner has a vote; wages are always governed by demand and supply. The question of taxation without representation, as applied to women who have no vote, is absurd. Taxes are not conditioned upon a right to vote. When our forefathers complained it was because taxes were imposed upon them by a Parliament sitting 3,000 miles away, in which there was no representation whatever of the colonies. They did not ask for individual representation.

There is no discrimination against women in taxation. Every tax-paying woman in the city of Albany, N. Y., who could be found, signed a protest against striking out the word "male" from the State Constitution. Many men are taxed who have no vote—the wealthy minor and the man why, living in one town, owns property in another. Taxation is the price the citizen pays for the protection of his property, his life and his liberty.

The value of the ballot in itself is largely overestimated. It is but a simple piece of paper, were it not for the force lying behind it.
The truth of Horace Greeley's terse statement to Miss Anthony many years ago, that "behind the ballot lies the bullet," is as powerful to-day as it was when uttered. To imagine a government unbacked by the physical power to enforce its laws, is to imagine an anomaly, or something which must of necessity develop into anarchy. The advocates of female suffrage refuse to admit that the stability of government is dependent upon physical force, because they dare not admit it, since to do so would be to admit the weakness of their case.

But you will recognize its truth, I am sure, gentlemen; otherwise why do you develop and improve your militia; why do you erect armories and organize and drill bodies of police in all the centres of population? To make laws that cannot be enforced is worse than useless; and to grant the right of embroiling the nation in war to a people wholly incompetent to carry it on, would be to bring our government into contempt.

Without doubt I shall be stigmatized as absurd by the women suffragists, but ridicule is not argument; and it is your duty as serious men, charged with great responsibility, to see to it that your vision be not obscured by chivalry, emotion or sentiment.

We are in the midst of hard times. Every industry languishes. Our farmers fail in the markets, and our merchants and bankers go into bankruptcy. There is an undercurrent of anarchy that roils the waters of our social and political life. Everywhere men and wise women are asking, What will be the end? The cry goes up all over the land, How shall we regain our prosperity? To-day you were told that the people were going to ask the Republican party to lead them back to green pastures. Do you think that a solution of the problem that is vexing men's minds and casting shades of gloom over the whole country can be found in adding to the already unwieldy and uncertain quality called male suffrage, the vote of every woman in this land?

For suffrage is not asked only for the women who are here to-day, but for every woman in our land without regard to intelligence or morality.

If there be any among you who believes at all in the extension of suffrage to all women, I ask you, seriously, is this the time for its inception. Have you not to face such problems as have not often vexed men's souls, and do you think it would be wise, at this time,
to throw into the boiling mass of unrest and disquiet the uncertain element of women suffrage?

Gentlemen, without taking up more of your time, in the name of your mothers, who served their country best by being home makers and keepers, and by educating sons to care for their country; in the name of your wives, who are living up to the full the sweetness of the quality of help-meet; in the name of our daughters—I am sure you would wish to keep them out of the mire of political life—in the name of the many hundreds of thousands of women who are silent to-day because they are loving, home women and have confidence in you, and in the name of the many thousands of women in New York State whom I, personally, represent, I asked you to refuse to take action on the question of woman suffrage.
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Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell is a new name to us, but she is evidently made of the right material. Her name indicates this. It has the true old Plymouth Rock ring. It brings to mind the pilgrim fathers and also the pilgrim mothers, who did more for this country than all the equal suffragists that ever drafted a resolution or mounted a platform. We would like to shake hands with Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, and know if it is not true that she descended from that hardy old Governor, John Winslow,—the first native-born Governor of the Old Bay State.

But we would especially like to shake hands with her because of her utterances before the Committee on Resolutions last evening. We admire her courage in protesting against women unsexing themselves. We admire her for her plea for true womanhood. We admire her because, when her opponent, the manish woman, arose and "roasted" her, she still smiled a womanly smile that won every heart.

It is such women as Mrs. Crannell that rule this nation of ours. These are the kind of women that rocked our cradles. These are the kind of women that put the Red Cross on their sleeves and walked the battlefields and hospitals. These are the kind of women who save men's souls, and by saving them save the nation.

We do not know Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell and we are sorry. We should like to know her so that we could say to her personally, how much we admire her and her sentiments. And we believe that ninety-nine women out of every hundred will say amen to every word she has uttered.
St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 17, 1896.

A WOMAN SPIKED THEIR GUNS.

The Sub-Committee on Resolutions Jumped at the Chance to Ignore the Demands of the Suffragists.

While the sub-committee of the Resolutions Committee was busy Tuesday night drafting the platform, a few members of the general committee met in the ladies' ordinary at the Lindell House to give the Suffragists, Young Women's Christian Association and representatives of Republican clubs an opportunity to speak.

President Blake had just completed an eloquent talk to temporary Chairman Lew Wallace and his associates on the Committee, asking for the right to vote, and insisting upon the Republican party going on record as favoring the submission of the question to the voters of the several States.

All the other suffragists were preparing to leave when Chairman Wallace announced that Mrs. Crannell was present on behalf of a large number of women to oppose suffrage.

There was a stir among the women and a ripple of applause from the Committee as Mrs. Crannell came forward.

She said that she protested against suffrage in behalf of one million and a half women in New York. She was also authorized to speak for Massachusetts, Rhode Island and North Carolina. She asserted that President Blake was backed by only 1,600 enrolled suffragists in New York State, and that the movement was opposed by the home-makers and home-keepers.

Mrs. Crannell created consternation among the distinguished suffragists who had come from all over the country to present their appeal to the Republican Convention. They were astounded at Mrs. Crannell's audacity, dismayed by the spirit in which it was received by the committee and annoyed at the applause which came from different parts of the room.

But the bombshell of the New York anti-suffragist had its effect. The would-be voters were ruffled in temper, while the committee secretly rejoiced that the game had taken this turn.

Many of the members openly congratulated Mrs. Crannell. She wore her honors meekly.

Perhaps no woman ever created a bigger sensation before a Committee on Resolutions.
The Woman Suffrage Question.

Opinion of an Eminent Leader Regarding the So-Called Woman's Rights Plank in the Republican Platform.

[From St. Louis Star, June 19, 1896.]

Henry B. Blackwell, of Massachusetts, the veteran advocate of female suffrage, whom the women designated as the "husband of the late Lucy Stone," is evidently as much disappointed over the setback given to his adopted cause as any one of the candidates who got left in the race for national honors.

Mr. Blackwell said when asked if he was satisfied with the "rights of women plank" in the Republican national platform:

"The cause of woman’s suffrage was never so decidedly ignored and so completely sat down upon as it was by the committee on resolutions, and in the recently adopted platform of the Republican party.

"Following the division of the suffragists came the representative of the anti-suffrage movement of the East, Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, who defeated them in their efforts before the resolutions committee at a single blow. Members of the committee looked upon this woman from New York as one sent especially to help them in their embarrassing situation. The combined ability of a number of prominent suffragists became as nothing when one woman, who represented a large following, asked of the committee not to grant their request. It was a protest more forceful than the protest of a thousand men. It was unfortunate that these singular conditions presented themselves at this time. It will require years to regain the lost ground."
Address of Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, 

Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Suffrage Association of the 3d Judicial District of the State of New York, before the Committee on Resolutions of the Democratic National Convention, at Chicago, July 8th, 1896.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee on Resolutions:

I scarcely expected when I heard the cause of Woman Suffrage presented at St. Louis to the Republican Convention, that I should be forced to protest against it before your honorable body; for it was distinctly stated at that time that the suffragists either were, or were willing to be, Republicans; and that women suffragists everywhere, had worked to save the country from what they then termed "Democratic and Populistic misrule." This fact is substantiated by the plank that they succeeded in getting into the Republican platform; which was written by a prominent suffragist, was approved by all of the suffragists present, and which runs:

"The Republican party is mindful of the rights and interests of women. Protection of American industries includes equal opportunities, equal pay for equal work, and protection to the home. We favor the admission of women to wider spheres of usefulness, and welcome their co-operation in rescuing the country from Democratic and Populistic mismanagement and misrule."

And now they ask you, who they claim have mismanaged and misruled the country, to give them the franchise that they may still further work against you. If they were honest in their wording of the Republican plank, then they would have no right to appear before you; if they were not honest, then they certainly have no right to appear, because one of the reasons for which they ask the franchise, is that they intend through it to purify politics; and if this be the manner of purification, it must be based upon the homeopathic principle of Similia Similibus Curantur.

You know enough about politics, gentlemen, to take at its true value the assertion that women, by voting, could change the existing condition of things. But if they could, would you want your wives or your daughters, your mothers or your sisters, to take active part
in the primaries and caucuses, at the polls, and even in the conventions, for the purpose of making them what it is claimed they would be "social centers?" And after politics were purified by women, who would purify the women? Is it not true that womanhood would suffer more than political morality would gain? And while the purification is going on who is going to do the home work, and the charitable work, that now so fills the lives of good women that they are often overburdened, and break down beneath the strain? It is to build up homes, not to break down their walls, and quench the light upon the hearth stone, that women's best energies should be directed.

Mrs. Stanton-Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, said in a published article, that it was better to let home suffer in order that women should gain economic freedom. "Let the women" she said, "who have not the taste for domestic work turn their children over to other women's care." We have too many servant mothers to-day; and the true duty of woman to woman, as well as to man, is to encourage and upbuild the home life from which we are so sadly drifting; and it is only as women yield themselves to the elevating and purifying influence of Christian teaching concerning marriage and home, that they rise to a higher moral level, and bring men up to that plane with them.

I appear before you unwillingly; but as the representative of the many millions of women who have hitherto proved the "silent majority." I come from New York State where there are only 1600 enrolled suffragists out of nearly 7,000,000 people, or, 29 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her population. I have also been asked to represent the home-loving women of Massachusetts where there are but 51 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her population; of Pennsylvania where there are only 14 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her population; of New Hampshire where there are but 5 suffragists to every 100,000 of her inhabitants; of Connecticut where there are only 23 suffragists to every 100,000 of her inhabitants; of South Carolina where there are but three suffragists for every 100,000 of her people; of Arkansas where there are only three suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; besides being asked to speak by women of prominence in California, where there are but 33 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Illinois where there are but 13 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Michigan where there are only six suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Kentucky where there are but 32 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Iowa where there are only six suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Virginia where there is but one suffragist to every 100,000 of her people; in Maryland where there are only six
suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Maine where there are but 12 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Ohio where there are only 11 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people, and in New Jersey where there are but eight suffragists to every 100,000 of her people. All these requests coming to me unsolicited.

These statistics are taken from an address delivered by Mr. Catt, husband of the National Suffrage organizer, before the National Society, at their annual meeting last January; and published in the Woman's Journal, the suffrage organ edited by Henry B. Blackwell,—better known as the husband of Lucy Stone,—and his daughter, Alice Stone Blackwell. I make this statement so that it may not be subject to contradiction by anyone present.

What are the reasons given for asking you to help the cause of Woman Suffrage?

First; That women who pay taxes should have a ballot. In answer we assert that the women who pay taxes do not want the ballot. That taxes are not conditioned upon the right to vote. That there is no discrimination against women in taxation. That taxation is the price the citizens pay for the protection of their property, their life, their liberty. That many men are taxed who have no vote,—the wealthy minor, and the man who living in one town owns property in another. That the woman who pays taxes will receive no benefit from the ballot which will not be an hundred times counteracted by the ballot of the women who do not pay taxes. That what is needed for the benefit of the tax-paying woman is not an increased but a restricted ballot. That while there are in New York State 144,000 women who pay taxes, there are at least 1,500,000 women who do not pay taxes; and the granting of suffrage to these women would more than duplicate the evils from which the tax-payer now suffers.

Second: That when women have the ballot, they will be employed constantly and at higher wages. The answer is shown in the fact that men vote and are yet unemployed. That no employer is going to pay an increased wage because the employee has the franchise. That while there are, as in the factories everywhere, long lists of girls waiting to be employed at nominal figures, no employer is going to raise the pay of his employees because they ask an hour off to vote on election day.

Third: That the cause of temperance will be helped when women vote. I admire the women who are working for temperance, and wish them God speed, but feel perfectly sure that they are mistaken if they expect to be helped by the granting of suffrage to all women North, South, East and West. Statistics tell us that while the population of the United States has increased but 20 per cent in
the last two decades, the dram drinking and drug taking women have increased 500 per cent. The Christian Advocate is my authority for the statement that before the high license law in Philadelphia, Penn., out of 8,034 saloon licenses 3,696 were granted to women. In Boston, Mass. last Spring, out of 1,100 liquor licenses 491 were applied for by women. The same condition of things prevails nearly all over our country. Would these women work for prohibition?

Let us look carefully at what is asked for: "Equal pay for equal work." That sounds equitable and consequently reasonable. But if the question of wages were to become a matter of legislation, would you be willing to say to the already overburdened and unemployed workman that you believe that his wages should be cut down to those received by women? For it is a fact beyond dispute that the wages paid is always a question of demand and supply; and women have entered nearly every field of labor once a man's sole province; and, by being willing and able to work for lower wages than men, who have families to support, have crowded them out. Now if equal wages for equal work means anything at all, it means that no man shall be paid more for his work than the women are begging to receive. For instance, if that law could be passed and enforced, the merchant could say to his male employe that he could fill his shop with girls at half the price he was paying him, and while he preferred keeping the man at the higher rate, he must either discharge him or lower his wages to that which women were asking to receive. But the whole thing is a farce. You do not ask, in fact, I doubt if any of you care, how much the workman is paid who makes your clothes. I know that women do not; otherwise they would not haggle over prices, and gloat over bargains. This is hard common-sense. It isn't poetic nor imaginative. It is more, it is truth, and you are here to deal with truths and not with fallacies.

The number of votes cast at the general election in 1892 was 12,034,858. To grant suffrage to women would be to more than double that number. Do you believe that at this time, if at any time, when industries languish, and our farmers are being pushed to the wall, while our bankers and merchants go into bankruptcy, that it would be wise to add this immense increase to the voting population?

The facts for the suffragists to prove are that suffrage is necessary for the protection of women, and that it would be beneficial to the State. They have not and cannot prove either. To-day in New York State, and in many of the other States, a woman is protected better by the laws that men have made, than by any she could make herself. A husband cannot sell his real estate unless the wife joins in the deed. He cannot deprive her by will of right of dower. The wife can by deed or will dispose of her entire estate, real or
personal, whether the husband consents or not. A father cannot now apprentice his child or make a valid appointment of a testamentary guardian without the consent of the mother, if she be living. The wife can carry on business on her own account, and is entitled to all the profits and earnings in that business, and may contract as if she were unmarried. Every profession is open to women, and every occupation also. Then what do they want, what will they gain by having the ballot? If men are not capable of managing the affairs of the State and the Nation according to the highest and best ideas of the race, that is of both men and women, will you permit me to respectfully inquire what proper and adequate share of this world's work you can perform? What is your natural place in the order of society? Are you mere hewers of wood and drawers of water? You cannot bear citizens; you cannot care for them in infancy and rear them to manhood. If you cannot govern them with wisdom and justice when they are given into your hands, what is your reason for being? It strikes me that these women who want to retain all the privileges of their sex, and secure besides those, all that they think a man has; who want to be men and yet remain women; have much hardihood in coming to you and saying: 'You do not know how to make laws; how to govern the people; you are corrupt and misrule the nation. Give us the suffrage that we may supplant you.' And they say this not for themselves alone, but for all the women in this great nation, North, South, East and West, without regard to education or morality! They are to purify politics!

Gentlemen, a large number of the leaders of the suffrage party became a revising committee to give to the world what is known as the Woman's Bible. At the present time they have only dealt with the Pentateuch. I need only to quote from its columns to show you its character. It is said: 'The utter contempt for all the decencies of life, and all the natural personal rights of women, as set forth in these pages'—the Bible—'should destroy in the minds of women, at least, all authority to superhuman origin, and stamp the Pentateuch at least as emanating from the most obscene minds of a barbarous age.' The story of the creation is said to 'have been manipulated by some Jew in order to give heavenly authority for requiring the woman to obey the man she married.' When it was found that the Christian women all over the land raised their voices in protest, at the National meeting of the suffragists, it was voted to repudiate the Woman's Bible as a suffrage work, but only by a majority of twelve. They then cast the onus of revision upon Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who is more to be honored for her truthfulness, than are the many women whose names are found among the revising committee, and who betray their leader. Nearly as many of the articles are written by Lillie Devereux Blake as by Mrs. Stanton; and the character of
them will be seen when I tell you that she covers much space to
prove that "the chief point of interest in the parable of Balaam and
his ass, is that the ass belonged to the female sex."

These are the women who are going to give us better laws than
those founded on the Mosaic code, and who are going to purify
politics! Do you wonder, gentlemen, that the mothers appeal to
you; the mothers who have buil ded their homes upon the truths laid
down in the Bible: and who have taught you to reverence it? There
is little enough of reverence left in the world to-day. Take away
from men and women that belief in the Bible that causes them to
strive to do right for righteousness sake, and what have you?
History tells you.

The suffragists speak of what has been accomplished by woman
suffrage in a hazy sort of way. Let us have facts:

Cheyenne, the capital of Wyoming, where women have voted
for a quarter of a century, has a population of less than 12,000. I
am told that in Cheyenne there are 25 licensed gambling houses, and
that saloons are as numerous as any other kind of stores; and it has
been stated that not a single act of legislation aimed at the better¬
ment of the human race, has been passed in Wyoming through
woman's influence. Gen. Thompson, who managed the Democratic
campaign in Wyoming, in 1892, said:—"The women's vote is the
easiest thing in the world to get, and the easiest thing to keep, and
the easiest thing to manipulate of any element in politics." After
six month's residence in Wyoming, divorce may be obtained for any
one of eleven reasons!

The history of woman's influence in the legislative halls of
the other States where woman suffrage obtains, is not a glowing
tribute to their intelligence or probity, and has been in existence too
short a time to be given as precedent for the States East and South.
The partial suffrage referred to is also a thing not to be boasted of
by the women who desire the suffrage. The record of the Mass¬
achusetts vote is that in Boston in 1888, 20,252 women registered in
the interest of school suffrage, and most of them voted, for it was a
warfare of religious sects; a Protestant and a Roman Catholic fight,
such as would appeal to most women. The next year the number
of women registering was reduced nearly one-half. In 1891, 6,008
women registered and 5,428 voted. The same thing was tried in
Connecticut and not two and one-half per cent of the women entitled
to vote exercised that right. Do you imagine for a moment that they
would do better if a full franchise were given them? Who are the
women who would go to the polls in stormy weather? I do not need
to prove to you gentlemen that the women who would vote "early
and often" are not the women to whom you would trust the ballot in
case of need.
It has been stated to you that I have no right to claim that I represent 1,500,000 women of New York. It has also been stated that 400,000 women of New York had signed the suffrage petition. The truth of the matter is, gentlemen, that two years ago when the suffragists made an effort to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution of New York, Miss Susan B. Anthony promised to offer a petition signed by 1,000,000 women of New York; and with that end in view, the suffragists canvassed New York State with that energy for which they are noted. I should not be surprised to learn that not one woman over 21 years of age had escaped having been tried to be cajoled or coerced into signing the petition. The result was a failure so great that they abandoned the idea of getting the women to sign, and so they asked men to come to their help. They paid for signatures sometimes as high as three cents. In one town there were sent in the signatures of more women than there were women in the town, over 21 years of age. They did not succeed even then; so they claimed to have the signatures of 200,000 members of the labor organization, and 50,000 grangers through their respective secretaries. Many members of both of these organizations have denied since then having known of the petition, and also denied having any sympathy with the woman suffrage movement.

They claimed also 75,000 W. C. T. U. members. I have personal friends who are members of the W. C. T. U. and who are bitterly opposed to the granting of suffrage to all classes and conditions of women.

But allowing for the sake of the argument that all these persons signed the petition, they then only claimed 426,000 names; as reported at the time. I quote from an article written by one of the leaders after their defeat before the Constitutional Convention. "We have 200,000 women's names encircled by the great arms of labor and clasped together by the strong arms of the farm", which is poetic at least, but which only claims 200,000 women.

There are 7,000,000 of people in New York State. It is fair to believe that one-quarter of that number are women over 21 years of age, that is 1,750,000. The truth is, that there are several thousand more women than men in New York State. But granting them those figures, I lay claim to only those women who refused to be enrolled as suffragists, when I say I represent 1,500,000 women of voting age in New York State, who do not desire to have suffrage thrust upon them. I am sorry to take up your time to prove my assertion: One more fact and I will close.

The Anti-suffragists have not tried to organize until recently; and then only because we were forced to protest against the cry of this very small minority that claimed "women do not oppose suffrage
even if they do not ask for it". In the city of Albany, N. Y., in one month's time 8,320 women signed the anti-suffrage protest. This will give you an idea of the feeling of the women. In this number were nearly every tax-paying woman in Albany as well as women who work for their daily bread. On my return home from St. Louis, I was delighted beyond expression when I went into one of our largest dry-good shops to have one of the women clerks thank me for the position I had taken at St. Louis, and before I left the shop every girl in the department had expressed her thanks. One of them said: "We signed the suffrage petition; we did not understand what it meant; but when we did we signed the anti-suffrage protest. When I marry I expect to get a husband who can be trusted to make the laws that are to protect me and my children, and until that time, my father will look out for me better than I could for myself."

It is said by the suffragists that I represent women who are slaves; and that we boast of our bondage. Well, gentlemen, if it is to be a slave to be a woman in this part of the 19th century, in the United States of America, where women are so protected by laws made for them by men, that they may enjoy every privilege a man enjoys without annoyance or effort; where men toil from morning till night to provide the women of their households with the luxuries of life as well as its necessities; where ninety-nine men stand ready to chastise the one man who may dare to insult a woman; where nothing that the womenly women ask for legally is denied them by men; then I am proud to belong to that class of women whom the suffragists dub "slaves"; and it is in the name of these women who are living the lives God intended them to live, whose even wholesome existence in the charm of youth, in the bloom of maturity, and in the calm decline of age, proves the wisdom and beneficence of the Creator,—your mothers, your wives, your daughters,—I ask you not to embody in your platform any resolution, that even by the greatest stretch of imagination, could convey a belief that you approved of and favored woman suffrage.

Officers of the Anti-Suffrage Association of the Third Judicial District of the State of New York:

MRS. J. V. L. PRUYN, President.

MRS. WILLIAM J. WALLACE, 1st Vice-President.

MRS. WM. B. VAN RENSSELAER, Secretary.

MRS. JOSEPH GAVIT, Treasurer.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL, Chairman.

Other leaflets may be obtained by applying to the Anti-Suffrage Association, 13 Elk Street, Albany, N. Y.
Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, who spoke against the granting of suffrage to women before the committee on resolutions, was criticised by her opponents for saying she spoke for twelve different States. Since then she has received the following letters:

Cleveland, O.—I heard recently that your Anti-suffrage association is to be represented at the democratic convention in Chicago, and I should like to say that your name may be mentioned as one in sympathy with your movement. As far as I know the women of my State, many of them at least, would also be glad to be known on your side.

MARY H. POMEROY.

From Oakland, Cal., comes the following:

I know there are a great many women, and it seems to me the best class, opposed to political equality, but the Misses Anthony and Shaw have been here a long time and are making a terrible fight for it here. * * * There is an anti-suffrage league in San Francisco. * * * I wish you would include the protest of many California women in your request to the democratic convention. * * * Yours with success and gratitude for the preservation of our woman's birthright.

EMMA C. PERCY.
The following was received from Colorado:

Thank God that there is one woman in this land brave enough to enter her voice in protest against this great wrong sought to be enforced upon woman. I live in Colorado, where I know what woman suffrage means. To-day, if the question arose, it would be defeated by an overwhelming majority, but they tell us we can do nothing to relieve ourselves of this added burden and responsibility. Cannot you suggest a means of escape from this slavery, and show us how to regain our liberty, our freedom? We would be only too glad to follow so brave a leader as you, but to be known would mean the political ostracism of every member of one's household, and so, while we hope you will enter a protest in the name of many thousand of women of Colorado, for the sake of their sisters in other States, I am too much a coward to have my name used. You, with your brave heart, will scorn me from this, but I am sure you will realize what it would mean to me, a woman who finds all her pleasures in her home and family, and who has never even dared to pray in public, to place myself in a position where my name would be tossed from paper to paper, as well as from mouth to mouth, in derision, and to be attacked, as I would be, by the women suffragists. May the God who made us women keep you well and strong to battle for us.

Many telegrams were received by Mrs. Crannell, among them the following:

"The loyal women of Connecticut thank and congratulate our Portia."

"Always true as steel. That is your record of old, and Delaware women thank you."

"You should have for your motto: 'Veni, Vidi, Vici.' Accept the New Jersey women's thanks."

A message from Albany, N. Y., tenders thanks for the work done.
New York State Association

Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Brooklyn Auxiliary.

I would respectfully call your attention to the following quotations from letters received by our Association in answer to inquiries as to whether women have taken advantage of the right to vote on the school question.

Albany, N. Y., January 7, 1899.

Replying to your inquiry of the 6th instant I advise you that so far as we have been able to secure statistics in reference to the participation of women in school meetings throughout the State, we find that less than two per cent. of the women take advantage of the power to vote at school meetings conferred by the law of 1880.

Usually we find that there is not a large attendance of women at the annual school meetings in this State, unless some question of uncommon local interest arises.

Yours respectfully,

Charles R. Skinner,
State Superintendent.

Oyster Bay, L. I., January 31, 1899.

Your letter of January 28th, making inquiries as to the number of women entitled to vote and the number who voted at the last School Meeting is at hand.

I am unable to answer the first. In regard to the second would say that no woman has voted at a regular school meeting. At one or two special meetings, a limited number have availed themselves of the privileges.
Yours respectfully,

C. A. WOODARD,

Head of High School at Oyster Bay.

JAMAICA, L. I., January 6, 1899.

With regard to the statistics concerning the woman's vote on school questions on Long Island, I am unable to go further afield than this town. Very little or no interest has ever been taken by the women in the matter. On one or two occasions, when there was an important issue at stake, they have voted in considerable numbers. Five years ago there was opposition to the appropriation of a new High School building, and many women voted in favor of the appropriation. From what I have been told I think that what is true of Jamaica is true of the other towns on the Island, but I cannot speak positively.

Very sincerely yours,

J. D. BALLARD,

Professor in High School at Jamaica, L. I.

The following is taken from the Annual Report of the Illinois Association:

Number of women in Chicago entitled to vote on the School Question, more than 250,000.

Registered 1894—29,815, less than 80 per cent. voted.

" 1896—5,636, and about 50 per cent. voted.

" 1898—1,488, and about 75 per cent. voted.

Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio.

In 1895, 5,831 women registered, of whom 4,945 voted; in 1896, 2,728 registered, and 1,632 voted; in 1897, 408 registered, and 228 voted; in 1898, 82 registered, and about 20 voted.

It cost the State $15,000 to register these 82 women.

Signed by Chairman, &c.,

and signed by Secretary, &c.
As to Suffrage in New York State.

To the Editor of the Sun:—Sir: Is it expedient to grant suffrage to women in New York State? Will it be for the best interests of the State? Will it be for woman’s best interest?

These are the questions that the people of New York State have had forced upon them since the Constitutional Convention assembled in 1894, when the women desirous of suffrage for their sex asked that the word “male” be stricken from the Constitution, and the women who were opposed to the extension of suffrage woke up from their seeming lethargy and demanded that they should not be forced into the political arena.

The reasons advanced by the “opponents” and “anti-suffragists,” together with the common sense of the great majority of the men who formed the Committee on Revision, led to the defeat of the suffragists. They worked like beavers. They promised to bring the names of 1,000,000 women, over 21 years of age, signed to petitions asking for suffrage; but they failed to get one-half the number, even though they gave their own figures as to results; even though they paid for the collection of names; even though they claimed the vote of large corporations through the signature of one man; even though they cajoled men and boys into signing, and even though they forgot the age limit and let every one sign who could wield a pen.

It was hoped that the action of the Constitutional Convention would settle the matter for twenty-five years, and that the women who had been forced into work that was distasteful might now return in quiet to their round of home duties and divest themselves of the publicity and notoriety thrust upon them.

But the suffragists continued the fight. Last winter, coached by an astute politician, whose name has been recorded on the “anti’s” books for overwhelming defeat if they are ever forced to vote, they, the suffragists, worked cautiously and quietly, and, by buttonholing, flower-giving, and lobbying, succeeded in carrying through both
Houses a concurrent resolution which is to give the people of the State a right to vote upon the question of suffrage for women.

That the men of both Houses realize the objectionable methods of work is made apparent by their passing a regulation which they are enforcing this winter, that no woman shall be permitted on the floor of either House without a card of admission.

There was an error in the wording of the resolution, and the result is that it will still have to pass two consecutive Legislatures, and the work of last winter is null and void.

Why did it pass both Houses last winter? In answer I give the replies of many of the men in both Houses—that, though objecting to woman suffrage, they felt that to relieve themselves from the constant annoyance of the women lobbyists it would be well to let it go to the people and be settled at once for all time. But they did not realize what would be the action of the suffragists even though the people gave an overwhelming defeat to their project, as they did last fall in Massachusetts. What was the result there? They are forcing their claim upon the Legislature again this winter; and when they were denied a hearing by a committee appointed on woman suffrage, they immediately declared their intention of forcing a hearing by three other committees. And that would be the result in New York State if the concurrent resolution were passed and an overwhelming defeat met with at the polls. And so we come back to our original questions, which should be the only ones to influence our legislators.

It is said above that the suffragists of New York State claim to have about half a million names to their petition. At the annual suffrage convention in Washington, held last month, a paper was read on the relative amount of suffrage organization in the different States and the statement was made that there were only 1,600 enrolled suffragists in New York State. In the city of Albany, alone, in one month, there were enrolled upon the anti-suffrage lists more than five times that number.

No reason has ever been advanced showing positively that woman or the State would be benefitted by the vote of women. Wyoming and Utah are held up as patterns for New York? The history of woman suffrage in Wyoming does not give one a great longing to see it in force in New York. And if Wyoming, with a territory twice as large as the State of New York, with a population scattered over it of about 60,000, less than that of one of the smallest
of New York's second-class cities, is what it is to-day through twenty-five years of woman suffrage, New York, with more than 6,000,000 inhabitants, has done well not to follow in the wake of this baby State. As for Utah—well, we all know what Utah was under woman suffrage, or from 1869 to 1886, when the women were disfranchised. What it will be now is only a question of time, but as it has a white population of only about 200,000, it can scarcely, under any circumstances, be set up as a pattern for New York State.

The legislators of New York should not inflict upon the women of the State the unpleasant duty of entering the field in opposition to suffrage, which a vote to allow it to pass to the people for final action would entail. Neither should any legislator who believes that it would not be for the best interests of woman or the State to grant suffrage to women lend his influence by voting to pass it to the people. And it would not release us from suffrage clamor.

The Woman's Journal says editorially: "More than one hundred petitions for woman suffrage have already been forwarded to members of the Massachusetts Legislature. Others are coming in daily."

As there are only 1,600 enrolled suffragists in New York State, and as these are only in part women, should not the desire of the silent majority—a majority of many millions of women—influence our legislators to give an overwhelming defeat to the concurrent resolution when it is again brought up? Until it can be shown by sworn statements that a majority of the women of the State demand suffrage, no Legislature has the right to submit the question to the male vote. And any one familiar with the abuse of the male suffrage will not deem it wise or prudent to more than double the atrocities that are now being perpetrated under the guise of political emergencies. Let the suffragists enforce the laws already made. That will keep them busy and be helpful to the State.

ALBANY, February 22. A. P. P.
A SUFFRAGE LESSON.

The Pittsburg "Chronicle" of January 19, 1897, contains the following:

Now that the women of Colorado have the ballot, they are wondering whether it is worth much. A Colorado woman is quoted as saying:

"The great advantage of suffrage is that it teaches women that they are not one bit better than men. We've sat for years and told men how corrupt their politics were, and men have smiled up at us and told us how superior we are and how we should have suffrage. We've had a large and enthusiastic surprise party. We women have found that our politics are just as corrupt as men's politics and they're just a little trickier. We've been at it two years, and we're scheming and making combinations and doing all the very things we've been finding fault with the men for doing all these years.

"The women of the better classes are getting disgusted and drawing out of politics, just as our men have done, and the women of the other classes have become enthusiastic and have gone into politics just as their mankind have done."

Well, Well, Well! This is most surprising reading. So, woman suffrage does not bring all the reforms, the joy and the purity that were to be expected from the roseate views which were expounded by advocates of giving women the right to vote.

Instead of exalting politics it seems according to this authority, that woman suffrage has developed even a trickier phase of politics than was known when the game was played exclusively by men.

This is very sad. If it be true, it is manifest that the persons who acted as though they were inspired when they arose to advocate granting women the divine right to vote were not inspired at all, but were singularly at fault in all their vaticinations.

Man is inclined to place woman on a pedestal and there adore her, but if women will persist in going about predicting that granting them the privilege to vote will effect the world's regeneration and then come out when the privilege is accorded with the confession that politics under woman's influence has gone from bad to worse, it is feared that man will lose that absorbing affection he has always felt for the other sex and will regard it as composed of very weak and very foolish sisters.—Albany Evening Journal, January 27, 1897.
ANTI-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

ALBANY, N. Y., 1896.

Dear M...

Your name having been given us by it is hoped by the Executive Committee that your interest in the "State Association opposed to the extension of the Suffrage of Women" will be great enough to induce you to start a branch in. The method recommended is the following, but the Committee does not wish to dictate in any way; only to aid you by suggestion.

As large a number of women as can be interested at once, should be gathered together, and from their number an Executive Committee numbering from 5 to 11 should be elected—a Chairman, Treasurer and Secretary being of their number. This Committee can thereafter take practical charge of the work and the chairman of each branch thus formed, becomes a Vice-President of the Albany Association.

All members’ names recorded by the Secretary of your branch should be sent also to the Secretary of the Albany Association, Mrs. Wm. Bayard Van Rensselaer, 14 Washington Ave., Albany. The branch may or may not ask dues of its members, but a certain sum must be raised in some way, as it will be found necessary for the following expenditures—To buy our pamphlets at cost for distributing—(these can be had of
our Secretary)—to pay for typewriting, stationery and postage.

The Suffrage of Amendment has to pass two Legislatures and separate Senates before it goes before the people to be voted upon, therefore the members should be urged to use every effort both to arouse interest in what has become a menace to our social and political life, and to obtain members. Strenuous effort should be used so to present our side of this question to the public that they shall be educated and informed upon it, and to so prepare their minds that they will be ready to use all their influence both with the members of the Legislature for their County, and later the voters, to prevent this mischievous amendment being added to our constitution.

Pray provide yourself at once with a full set of our Literature, as the various pamphlets contain a full statement of the arguments against Woman's Suffrage. We have found the enclosed postal very useful.

Mrs. J. V. L. Pruyn,  
*President.*

Mrs. William J. Wallace,  
*1st Vice-President.*

Mrs. William Bayard Van Rensselaer,  
*Secretary.*

Mrs. Joseph Gavit,  
*Treasurer.*

Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell,  
*Chairman.*

Mrs. Erastus Corning.  
Mrs. William Cassidy.  
Mrs. J. Howard King.  
Mrs. Joel R. Reed.  
Mrs. Wm. O. Stillman.  
Mrs. Frederick Townsend.  
*Executive Committee.*
AS TO WOMEN.

The Idaho Register of Idaho Falls, commenting upon an address given at that place during the suffrage campaign by Mrs. Catt, gave the following personal testimony regarding Wyoming:

"It seems that she has allowed some enthusiast in Wyoming to fill her mind with wonderful stories about the results of equal suffrage in that State, and she, taking them as true statements, tells them as such. From some of them one is led to believe that Wyoming is a paradise.

"She demonstrated that the compulsory education law was responsible for the small percent of criminals in the penitentiary, and of idiocy in the state, and then claimed that this was the fruit of female suffrage.

"One who was not better informed would imagine that the juries and political conventions were mostly composed of women."

"The writer was a resident of Wyoming from 1870 to 1880, and during that time attended every territorial convention, both Republican and Democratic, and every county convention in the two western counties that were held during that time, and no woman ever sat as delegate in any one of them; and it was usually only by urging and stating that others had voted, and their vote was wanted to offset it, that a large portion of the women could be induced to vote."
A Moment with RUSKIN.

"In a recent conversation with Ruskin, touching "our Republican experiment," as he was pleased to call the United States, he said, "The fact of women being elected to mayoralties in Kansas makes me think of certain African tribes that exalt their women into warriors—you want your women to fight your political battles?"

"You evidently hold the same opinion on the subject of equal rights that you expressed some years ago," interposed a listener.

"What did I say?—really I have forgotten."

"You replied to a correspondent, saying: "You are certainly right as to my views respecting the female franchise, so far from wishing to give votes to women I would fain take them away from most men."

"Truly that was a sensible answer. My respect for woman is too great to force upon her increased responsibilities. Then, as for restricting the franchise with men, I am of the firm conviction that no man should be allowed to vote that does not own property, or who cannot do considerable more than read and write. The voter makes the laws, and why should the laws regulating the holding of property be made by a man who has no interest in property beyond a covetous desire, or why should he legislate the education when he possesses none? Then again, women do not bear arms to protect the state."

"But what do you say to Mrs. Carlock, who answers, that inasmuch as men do not bear children they have no right to vote, going to war, possibly being necessary and possibly not, but the perpetuity of the state demanding that someone bear children?"

"The lady’s argument is ingenious but lacks force, when we consider that the bearing of arms is a matter relating to statecraft, while the baby question is Dame Nature’s own and is not to be regulated even by the sovereign."

Apply for more papers to Anti-Suffrage Association, 13 Elk Street, Albany, N. Y.
The new societies which have constituted themselves in the English Colonies of the antipodes, represent in the highest degree all the tendencies, good or bad, of modern civilization. If one applies to Australia the different criterions by which one judges the degree of culture of a country, one is forced to admit that this new world has already distanced all its elders. It is not of literary or artistic development that we mean to speak, for we know that one cannot expect to find either in such a young world. And besides, our attention is more especially given to what will interest the masses who have always disdained the most refined sides and the most elevated of civilization. But as far as the wide-spreading of knowledge and of the material conditions of existence, of the activity of transaction between men, Australia is certainly nearer the ideal than any of its contemporaries. Illiterate people are rare. Letters and telegrams are more numerous, and commerce larger, considering the population, than anywhere else. The standard of life is higher. Life is larger in all classes, if you judge by the statistics of consumption of certain edibles, such as meat, sugar and others. Finally, in spite of the tie which binds them to the British Government, nowhere is Democracy more triumphant than in the Australian Colonies. Nowhere else have social innovations been carried farther, even to emancipating woman from her traditional minority. Nowhere else has the extension of self-government found such powerful champions.

From thence comes the interest which attaches itself to the study of these young societies, which contain all the modern aspirations, durable or not, which have a chance of developing much more than in Europe, where they are hampered by the traditions of
the past. They are for us quite a laboratory of social science, and
the observation of the experiences which their inhabitants undergo
can be singularly useful to the old world. We must bear in mind,
however, the difference of surroundings, the great difference between
that virgin land of Australia, where civilization has only just begun,
and old Europe, where it has grown slowly, and has taken root in
the distant past. Trials more or less happy in one might be fatal to
the other.

The independence of Australian Colonies in social matters, their
disdain for the traditions, or, as they would say, the prejudices, of
the old world has led them into many flights of innovation. So they
have welcomed woman suffrage with as much ardor as they did
socialism. New Zealand in 1893, South Australia in 1895, have
given to women the right to vote, and it will, without doubt, be a
very short time before other colonies do the same. These two
colonies with the exception of the American states of Colorado,
Wyoming and Utah, are the only countries where women have a
right to vote at all the elections. This political emancipation is more
surprising in Australia than in America. In the New World one is
accustomed to see woman absolutely free; she competes with man in
the exercise of so many professions that however opposed one may be
in principle to woman suffrage, one is not at first shocked to see her
exercise it. In Australia the situation of woman is much more like
that of the English woman than of the American, much freer than on
the European Continent, but much less free than in the United
States. The law here has somewhat gone beyond custom, as is often
the case in the antipodes and in all other countries where professional
politicians occupy the stage and try to astonish the spectators and to
create a sensation. If certain classes were agitating themselves and
 clamoring for the extension of the power of voting in the colonies
which have adopted it, as they are still doing in those which have
not decided for woman suffrage, the mass of the public, and of the
feminine public especially, would not care at all about it. In the
higher classes the indifference of women on this subject is absolute.
I have had a chance of speaking with a great number of them at
Melbourne and at Sidney. They have told me without exception
that they did not care at all about their right of voting. In the
lower classes, and especially in the smaller middle class, a great
number cling to it with much interest, but in general, the only
women who really care about political emancipation are women of
letters, professors, governesses, and often those who are separated
from their husbands, whose private life is unhappy and whose dis¬
position is embittered. Usually it is this class that make themselves
heard. The greater number remain silent precisely because they are indifferent.

After all, all this feminine movement is little more than a great humbug, imagined by politicians in quest of new sensations or by fevered brains, but which has yet influenced in Australia two great powers? The first is the working class—because the extremes of democracy always mix the words change and reform—and also because the working women, entirely without political education, vote exactly as their husbands, which is very important for the politicians, while the women of the better class would not vote. The second power, which is very great in America, in England, and in all Anglo-Saxon countries, is the temperance advocates, or rather the prohibitionists, who believe in the complete suppression of the selling or buying of alcoholic drinks, and to which the help of woman is indispensable. If the women in the middle and lower classes are more anxious for suffrage than those in the higher classes, it is because they feel upon their fathers, their husbands and their brothers the fearful influence of alcohol, and that they and their children are the first to suffer from it. However, if the women in Australia are not especially anxious for suffrage, and any keen observer must admit that they are not, yet they use their right with great earnestness as soon as it has been granted to them. At the elections of the 28th of November, 1893, in New Zealand, the first, and until now, the only ones in that colony under the new regime, of 139,915 women over 21 years of age 109,461 which means 78 1/2 per cent had been registered, and 90,290 or 64 1/5 per cent had taken part in the elections. The proportion of men who had voted was a little stronger, being 72 1/2 per cent. The question of the sale of alcoholic liquors had played an important part in the campaign, and the Parliament elected at that time voted new laws controlling more severely the sale of spirits. The prohibitionists had, therefore, obtained part of the results which they desired, and now continue to support in other colonies the suffrage movement. However important it may be to put a stop to the plague of alcoholism, yet it is very grave to make a social and political reform as serious as the admission of woman to the privilege of the ballot, not because of what it is worth in itself, but for the causes which it may produce. The prohibitionists and the working class, without the support of which women never could have obtained their political rights, have seen in this change only greater means to increase their number. This is an example of the greatest evil of modern government—the subordination of all things to the ballot—the voting on graver measures without considering their intrinsic qualities and their future consequences, simply because
of some petty immediate results, and for the little advantage that
they can bring to the parties that have upheld them. That very
enthusiasm of women in favor of prohibition, which has won for them
the sympathies of all temperance parties, does it not come from the
side of their nature which is precisely the one that makes their suffrage
undesirable? Does it not show their tendency to decide, not by
reason but by sentiment, and that they go to extremes without using
any judgment? Is it not, above all, a proof of their love for that
grandmotherly legislation which would like to protect men against
all danger and temptation, carefully surrounding them with all the
cares and watching of their childhood, or in short, to keep them tied
to their apron-strings? Often I have heard Australian women ask,
"If we bring up our children to vote, why should we not vote our¬
selves?" Is it not precisely because, in applying to grown men the
principles which direct the education of small children that one would
necessarily weaken the boldness, the individual energy, the truly
virile qualities, that feminine suffrage is so dangerous? "The people
of this country are incapable of doing anything without the govern¬
ment," said to me with a shade of disdain an American with whom
I was travelling in New Zealand. The elections of 1893, in which
women voted for the first time, have done nothing but strengthen the
socialist element which governs that colony.

There are curious contradictions among the promoters of
suffrage. They are advanced people who have continually in their
mouth the great name of Darwin and the theory of evolution. Why
do they pretend to make in one day woman the equal of man when
her subordinate position for centuries has made her a very different
creature? In New Zealand they are founding now schools or leagues
for the political education of women, and that not at all in the inferior
classes. This was told me by one of them who was president of a
league and who was the wife of an ex-minister and a great advocate
of suffrage. Would it not have been better to begin this education
before putting the ballot in their hands? It is strange also that these
same people who advocate the equality of both sexes and demand the
admission of woman to all professions, on the other hand, protest
strongly against women being employed in manufactories, on the
ground that it is injurious to their health and that it prevents them
from paying attention to their households and destroys the home life.
A simple working woman, however, will have less pre-occupations
and when once her day's work is ended will be freer from care than a
woman who is a doctor, a lawyer or a politician. Besides, nature
does not allow woman to bear children and exercise a trade continu¬
ously. Woman is not inferior to man, but she is different, that is to
say, inferior in certain things and superior in others. Then why not let her exercise her powers in the sphere in which that superiority shows itself to the best advantage?

As we have said the laws have gone ahead of traditions in Australia, and the proportion of women who work outside their homes is less great than in America. The census of 1891 showed that of a feminine population of 1,440,000 persons, of which 1,060,000 are over 15, 318,000 were bread winners, 133,000 were domestic servants, 70,000 were factory girls, 37,000 worked in the fields, 33,000 were in the liberal professions, 23,000 belonged to the commercial class, and 22,000 gave themselves up to different occupations. Unfortunately we do not possess any information relating to the occupations of women in previous times, except in the colony of New South Wales. Nevertheless it can give an idea of the movement which encourages them more and more to make themselves independent. In 1881 the total number of women in New South Wales was 337,000; in 1891 it had increased to 515,000; in that same time the number of women earning their living was almost doubled going from 48,963 to 89,502. The most remarkable increase was that which showed itself in the liberal professions, which in 1881 occupied 4,288 women and in 1891, 10,402. It is on that side especially that woman suffrage encourages them.

Parallel to that movement there is another which is very serious, that is, the lateness of the age of marriage. In 1883 the proportion of young married women under twenty-one was in New South Wales from 28 to 17 per cent, in 1892 it had fallen to 23.55 per cent. The same fact shows itself in Victoria; between 1881 and 1890 the average proportion of young married women under 21 was 21 per cent, and of women between 21 and 25, 43.02 per cent. In 1893 the corresponding figures were only 17½ and 39⅛. In New Zealand, where the married women under age were 29¾ per cent of the total in 1892, they counted only 19 1-7 per cent in 1893. When a woman earns her living herself, and the custom of a country gives a young woman great freedom, she is less anxious to be married and often marriage would oblige her to give up her position. A merchant in New Zealand told me that he employed eighty young women between 20 and 25; they earned from 25 to 30 francs a week; and not one was engaged to be married. And in Australia as in England engagements are often long. If they should get married they would lose their places so why should they be in a hurry? They earn their living easily and are perfectly independent. Only in marrying late children are apt to be less numerous. Without doubt one must not sacrifice the independence of woman or forbid her any outside occu-
pation with the sole object to make child-birth more frequent, but it would not do to exaggerate a tendency, which, legitimate and proper enough if kept within bounds, might become most dangerous if it were exaggerated, and that exaggeration would be inevitably produced by woman suffrage.

The equality of the sexes is only one more social experience for the Australian colonies, and they would not hesitate at any. If they despise the traditions of the Old World, they should however not forget that their own success, the great prosperity which they have so quickly attained, have come from the individual courage and energy of the colonists, and from those very qualities which they would only weaken in placing all their citizens under an effeminate government, and which might help them to overcome the crisis of exaggeration where the daring speculations of many years have thrown them. We would like to hope that this adventurous legislation is only a passing disease due to too quick a growth and that the good practical common sense of the Anglo-Saxon race will prevent Australia from going any farther. If it should continue it would compromise gravely its future, but then perhaps Europe might profit by its example. That is why we have thought that it might be interesting to study the sensational experiences with which the inhabitants of the antipodes are amusing themselves.

Adelaide, South Australia, April 16, 1897. "The Federal Convention, by a vote of 23 to 12, has rejected an amendment to allow women to vote for members of the House of Representatives."

Apply for more papers to Anti-Suffrage Association, 13 Elk Street, Albany, N. Y.
To the Editors of the Outlook:

As it is evident that much has been said in criticism of the article by Priscilla Leonard on "Woman's Suffrage in Colorado," I feel impelled, as a Colorado Woman and a representative of many who share my views on this subject, to dissent from the critics. Barring a few slight errors in fact, which did not essentially affect the argument, I believe it presented truthfully and in a spirit exceptionally fair, the result of the experiment as thus far shown in Colorado. It is a mistake to suppose that a large majority of the women in this State are now enthusiastic believers in woman suffrage. I do not know one who was opposed to it before its adoption—and the number included very many intelligent and conscientious women, unfortunately for the most part silent—who has reversed her judgment as to its advisability in the last three years, while I know many, who at that time favored the movement, who now say openly that they regard participation in politics as a burdensome and uncongenial duty, with no compensating advantage to the sex or the State.

A lady correspondent for a prominent New York daily, summing up her observations after election last November, says: "Of the thirty-five women with whom I talked in the hill districts" (the most intelligent part of Denver) "twenty were directly against woman suffrage. Of the other fifteen, ten were enthusiastic supporters; the others were undecided."

CHARLOTTE M. VAILE.

Denver, Colorado.
Result of Woman's Suffrage in School Elections in the State of Connecticut.

Two Years Experiment.

"New Haven, April, 1895.

With the recent election in Bridgeport the first two years' trial of woman's suffrage in School Elections in this State ends, the Law having been opposed by the Legislature of 1893, after a vigorous and protracted campaign of the woman suffragists. Each of the one hundred and sixty-eight towns in the State has now held two local elections in which women were entitled to vote for school officers.

The results show clearly that the women of the State have a decided unwillingness to vote, and a great lack of interest in politics. Out of probably
150,000 in the State entitled to vote, if registered, probably not more than 10,000 have gone on the registry list during the last two years, and of these a large number registered under the urgency of the woman "workers" rather than by original and voluntary impulse. In many towns there have been very few women registered or none at all, and apart from sectarian movements in each year, the votes of the women have been but from three to four per cent of the whole number entitled to the suffrage."

With these statistics from Connecticut before us, does it not seem to the unbiased reader, that the statement that women desire to vote is incorrect.

Officers of the ALBANY ANTI-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

Mrs. J. V. L. Pruyn,

President,

Mrs. William J. Wallace,

1st Vice-President.

Mrs. William Bayard Van Rensselaer,

Secretary.

Mrs. Joseph Gavit,

Treasurer.

Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, 

Chairman

Mrs. Erastus Corning.

Mrs. William Cassidy.

Mrs. J. Howard King.

Mrs. Joel R. Reed.

Mrs. Wm. O. Stillman

Mrs. Frederick Townsend.

Executive Committee
MRS. CREIGHTON'S APPEAL.

[Mrs. Creighton is the wife of the Bishop who has recently been translated from the diocese of Peterborough to that of London. She is noted for her executive ability, as well as her literary talent. Her History of France and England and her historical biographies are well known. The following extracts are taken from her article on Female Suffrage in the Nineteenth Century:]

The advocates of female suffrage seem to labor under two delusions: First, that the vote is a good in itself; and, secondly, that change is necessarily progress, and must be welcomed, at any price, by all who do not wish to remain hopelessly behind. Mrs. Ashton Dilke, indeed, acknowledges that the vote is not an end in itself, but only a means to an end. But she does not say to what end; she only says that, without a vote, we "risk the loss of all those improvements in the position of our sex" which have been obtained. Such a statement implies a hostility between the sexes from which society seems to be happily free; and it is not easily to believe that the day will ever come when men will take away from women what has been proved to be good both for them and for the whole community. There is surely no need to feel that we have won a position from an active foe, which we must maintain at the risk of our lives.

The vote is supposed to have a certain magical power. Mrs. Dilke even knows why it was originally given, and when she says that the vote "was certainly originally intended to give effect to the opinions of the quiet orderly citizen instead of leaving power in the hands of the strong and warlike," she has solved a problem which has long baffled the ingenuity of the constitutional historian. The attitude of many of the advocates of female suffrage seems to suppose an ideal woman, working side by side with an ideal man in an ideal system of politics. But we have to do with realities; there is a great deal of work to be done, and the practical question is how to do it. It has yet to be proved that giving women the vote will enable them to do better in the future the work which they have neglected in the past.
There is no magic about the vote; it is merely a necessary part of the machinery of government. The act of voting is not, as some would wish to make it, the chief way in which the individual can share in the work of the State for the good of all. The question is not whether women are not as qualified to vote as men. We are very tired of the rich and cultivated lady who may not vote whilst her coachman may. If the vote was the privilege of the wise and the educated, many women might justly claim it. But it is the propelling power of a part of the machinery of government which has always belonged to one sex.

The present organization of society offers an abundant field for the energies of women. The fields are white for the harvest, and the reapers are few. The pursuit of female suffrage as the first aim offers a wrong ideal to women; the desire to play an active part in politics make them neglect their own work. It is perfectly true that women in the last few years have formed political organizations for the purpose of influencing public opinion; but many of them regard such organizations as only a temporary nature, justified by a period of exceptional difficulty. I am not concerned with defending the wisdom or expediency of such societies; but it is no discredit to those who have joined them if they frankly admit that their experience of the results of their activity does not make them wish to extend it universally. There is much to be said for women discussing amongst themselves political and social questions, investigating points concerned with the labour and education of women, and suggesting grievances to be remedied. Their formulated opinion will be sure to meet with respectful attention. But the more women stand apart from the machinery of party organization, the more weighty and influential will be the expression of their opinions.

The more women take an active part in politics the more considerations of sex will be used as one of the means of obtaining political influence. We may try to change society, we cannot change nature; sex will remain. The advocates of female suffrage, indeed, speak of women as a class, and as such demand that they be represented in Parliament. We answer that they are not a class but a sex, and that our representative system knows nothing of classes as such. We urge that women should be content to continue working side by side with men, possessing their own duties and their own opportunities. We think that the questionable advantage of a direct representation of such interests as women may be supposed to have made peculiarly their own, would be dearly bought by an experiment which would shake the very basis of human society.

The present need is that women should do their own work better. For the married and the mothers the path is comparatively plain, but no one could say that they have yet risen to a full sense
of their responsibilities in training useful members of the community. For those who, from circumstances or choice, are compelled to carry on their struggle alone the opportunities of doing useful work are unlimited. I am not speaking now of paid work; there the question is more difficult, and the possession of the franchise would not solve it. But the community can never have too large a number of devoted and unselfish workers in every line. The women who show their capacity for such work never fail to get it. But women need to train their practical abilities, to show their capacity. We want more women guardians, more women on school boards, more women who will investigate the existing conditions of society. What the future may need we cannot say, and it would be rash to say that the time may not come when in an ideal political system the ideal woman may work side by side with the ideal man.

The power of woman's influence cannot be measured. When I speak of influence, I do not mean a conscious definite desire to guide another in some particular direction, but the effect produced upon man by a nature which he believes to be purer, nobler, more unselfish than his own. Sex is a fact—no act of Parliament can eliminate it—and woman, as woman, must be a power for good or evil over man. In her hands rests the keeping of a pure tone in society, of a high standard of morality, of a lofty devotion to duty in political life.

It is given her to make or mar a man's life; she may not care for the power—she may wish she did not possess it; but she cannot escape from its responsibilities. Would not the wise course be, to try to make herself such a woman that her influence may lift all those with whom she comes in contact? She need not have wealth or position to do this. Beside the struggling, toiling women are struggling, toiling men; each lonely worker is a power in her little sphere; she will be a greater power if she is not struggling for her rights, but is trying to live her own life nobly and unselfishly.

Mrs. Dilke says that we who do not want the vote are like those who will not open the door to go into a concert hall to hear beautiful music, but content themselves with the faint echoes that reach them through the windows. We might retort by saying that those women who, not content with what they have, still demand the franchise, are like those who, deaf through misfortune or their own fault, stand within the concert hall but cannot hear the music.
DEFEAT OF WOMAN’S SUFFRAGE IN STATE OF WASHINGTON.


The woman suffrage amendment was buried in the same grave with the single-tax proposition by the voters of Washington on Tuesday. Political suffrage for woman is a slowly dying cause, and it is dying because it is without excuse for further existence. The real wrongs of women which existed when Lucy Stone began her agitation in 1847 have mostly been redressed by legislation. To-day every political principle advocated at the outset is enjoyed by women, save full suffrage, and every legal right sought by Lucy Stone has been granted to women. They are even treated with partiality by the laws, compared with men. Their individuality is not lost in marriage, as it was when Mrs. Stanton, who is now over 80, was a young girl. Every avenue of activity is open to them: they are as free as men to earn their living in any lawful way they please. The conjugal, parental and property rights of women have been recognized and established by the political action of men without the aid of woman suffrage, simply because the vast mass of influential women and public opinion thought that the best way. The present situation is totally different from that of forty years ago, when "woman's rights" was a genuine cause, because there were genuine woman's wrongs to be righted and legal disabilities to be removed. The agitation and the organized effort begun more than fifty years ago had much to do with the recognition and redress of these wrongs, legal disabilities and inequalities: but with the accomplishment of these reforms the cause of woman suffrage has made no real progress. Its modern revival in Kansas, Colorado and Idaho was but the out-growth of the temporary socialistic spirit that prevails in those States.

The lack of the ballot surely robs a woman of no rights of life, liberty or property. The reason why woman suffrage is not favored by the mass of women or the mass of men is because it is a barren ideality. It rights no wrongs, it corrects no disability. Women to-day have without the ballot all the civil and social rights exercised by men. As a natural right, suffrage belongs to neither man nor woman, for the ballot is only the child of an artificial social order to be granted or withheld as a matter of social and political expediency. The mere wish of a few women to vote is of no more consequence to the State than the mere wish of a few women to enlist in the regular army. That Moll Pitcher served her wounded husband's gun at Monmouth is not an argument for the expediency of enlisting women as artillerymen.
Does Suffrage Work Pay?

The annual report of the New York State Woman Suffrage Association shows by the treasurer's report that the receipts for the year were $3,261.77; and the disbursements were $3,061.24; there were 132 membership fees and dues from 28 counties of $450.30. Chautauqua county leads with $79. Albany, the capital county, makes a poor showing with $7. The expenses were largely the salaries paid for organizing and legislative work. Miss Harriet M. Mills received $680; Miss Julia R. Jenny, $25; Miss Harriet A. Keyser, $81.28, and Miss Emma Taylor, $50.25, making an aggregate of $836.53 for organizing during the year. Mrs. Martha R. Almy received $455.75 for legislative work. Miss Anthony received $25, and Mrs. Greenleaf $50, and Mrs. Searing $33, while Miss Babcock was paid $90.89 for press work.

The report on organization is not particularly cheerful for the amount of time and money expended. The chairman organized four counties, eleven locals and four committees; and in answer to the question whether the work was permanent, acknowledges that "experience shows that it is impossible to insure the permanence of many of the new clubs." She speaks of "the apathy of the women," "the unwillingness of women to take office, and above all, the lack of conscience about answering letters."

The chairman of the legislative committee reports that on account of clerical error in the suffrage resolution passed last year, the "final submission" is "necessary postponed" until 1899. But she consoles her hearers with the statement that "in the minds of the committee the chances of carrying the measure at the polls will be better in 1899, or later, than next year."
The chairman of the press committee reports the expenses of her work as $109.30. She says that the articles sent out were received more readily than she had hoped, as the American Press Association thought, in answer to her request that they use suffrage articles, that there was no demand for them; and the publishers of "patent insides" also refused to take articles for the same reason. She then tells of her personal efforts with editors, and she adds, "My plan has been to obtain men and women of prominence to write short articles upon the various phases of the woman question. With some editors the suffrage points must be cunningly disguised, but they are there just the same."

Altogether the report makes interesting reading, even to an Anti—Albany Evening Journal, February 14, 1896.
To the Editor of the New York Tribune:

One of the arguments of the anti-suffragist is that if women be allowed to vote, the corrupt or purchasable vote of women—which even a suffrage fanatic would not be so unwise as to imply would not exist—would be used as the purchasable male vote is now used—to further selfish ends and promote unwise and corrupt legislation.

This is often met by the statement that the women in the country districts will overbalance any preponderance of ignorant and vicious votes that may obtain in our city wards. The fallacy of this argument shows plainly upon the face of it. If the male vote of the country can not counteract or overwhelm the corrupt male vote of the cities, how will the condition of things be bettered by doubling, not only the vote of the country, but that of the city?

But what will the ballot mean to the women in the country? Nothing at all, except physical discomfort. In the first place, it will necessitate their registering, on one of two days, at the place of registry, which, in many instances, will be at least five miles from their homes. The variation of weather, which to-day is one of the elements of political uncertainty, will be a strong factor in the polling of the female ballot, particularly in the country.

If the day of registration be fair, it is just possible that husband, wife, sons and daughters, with the "hired help," male and female, and the baby, and the small children, who cannot be left at home alone, will drive to the village tavern, where the registration is usually held, and register; and that, on the coming "election day," they will all be bundled together again in the farmer's wagon and be driven to the same tavern to cast their ballots.
But what will they do if it rains, or snows, or the baby is ill, or one of the members of the family is an invalid? Will the men drive to the polls and back, and then send the women to register, and again to vote? And what will those women do whose fathers or husbands have no horses, and there are many of those in the little villages in country towns? Even the men often have to beg rides to and from the polling place.

But for the sake of the argument, suppose all the women in the country register and vote, what will be the result? After having talked with scores of country women on the subject, I am willing to affirm that each woman would vote as her father or husband voted, and that the result obtained would be only a double number of Democratic and a double number of Republican votes cast, and these would be expected to offset a doubled ignorant and corrupt vote in the city!

Would not the condition of things to-day obtain in greater force? The intelligent women of the country who have not been bitten by the tarantula of Unrest do not want the ballot, and would not use it if they had it; and this assertion I make advisedly and upon authority.

Albany, March 22, 1896.  

E. S. C.
MR. DEPEW ANSWERED.

His Address to Women Graduates Criticised by an
Albany Woman.

A FLIGHT OF IMAGINATION.

Mr. Depew was guilty of one, Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell says,
when he suggests that man does his work better
than woman does hers, and that women have
always labored and are still laboring
under a terrific disadvantage.

To the Editor of The Albany Argus:

The Hon. Chauncey M. Depew, in an address to the forty-seven
women who received their diplomas as bachelors of law from the
University of the City of New York on April 29, said in part: "The
familiar idea through all time has been that the sphere of woman was
in the house and in the domestic circle." This Mr. Depew deprec¬
cated—"Fortunately for our country and our times," he said, "women
are in evidence in every department of our American life."

Mr. Depew, as an argument to advance his theory, said: "In
the complex conditions of our civilization there are as many women
as men dependent upon their own resources to make a living, or
their own brains and judgment to protect and care for property.
That women fail to receive the same remuneration as their brothers,
that their services are rewarded with starvation wages, and that the
courts are crowded with cases of women of property being defrauded,
deceived and robbed, is due to the continual working of that senseless
and vicious maxim, written large over the doors of employment and
education: 'You cannot pass these portals without becoming
unsexed.' "
I confess myself puzzled by Mr. Depew's own words, for just before saying this he said, as we have quoted above, that "women are in evidence in every department of our American life. They are in literature, in journalism, in the professions, in the trades, in art, and especially in education."

Will Mr. Depew kindly explain then what "doors of employment and education" are closed to women? Those doors, that opened, would relieve them from the terrible condition which he pictures above? Has Mr. Depew forgotten that he said in an address before the Working Women's Protective Union: "There are one hundred thousand working women in this city, and they get on an average only about two or three dollars a week, and they have no other means of support. For two thousand years Christianity has been endeavoring to ameliorate and elevate the condition of women. Among savages they are beasts of burden; among barbarians and Mohammedans they are toys and slaves; but among us, notwithstanding that my friends, the Woman Suffrage Association, have not got all they wanted, woman has every right that man has and every privilege, except the right to vote, and the right to vote would not protect her in just the things that we are looking after to-night."

As the society to whom he spoke has for its object "especially to provide women with legal protection from the frauds and impositions of unscrupulous employers," were not "the things" referred to the same as those to which he refers in his later address?

Mr. Depew said also: "If a brother and sister equally equipped go out into the world for employment, there are ten places open for the brother where there is one for the sister." Does not that fact find solution in the assertion that the men do the work better than women? Mr. Depew continues: "If there are a thousand hands eagerly stretched out for work which requires only a hundred, they underbid one another to the point of starvation. Women have always labored and are still laboring under this terrific disadvantage. Had every avenue of employment and every vocation been thrown open to her, that saddest poem in literature, 'The Song of the Shirt,' could never have been written."

That is a flight of imagination hardly consistent in so thorough a man of business as Mr. Depew. First, I would like to ask Mr. Depew what "avenue of employment and vocation" is not thrown open to women? And next, if there are "avenues of employment and vocations" open to men which are not open to women, and which, if opened to women would work such wonders as Mr. Depew hints
at, why men are unemployed or employed at starvation wages, or why they commit suicide because they can find nothing to do?

There are many unwritten poems that are as sad as "The Song of the Shirt," sunken deep in the hearts of men who have faced want and penury, not through an unwillingness to work, but because of the "thousand hands eagerly stretched out for the work which requires only a hundred."

Mr. Depew, after several flights of imagination nearly equal to the above, says: "When the question of woman suffrage was up in Albany last winter, there were more women who appeared against it than in favor of it. It was the old cry that for women to vote would unsex them. I am not here to advocate on this platform woman suffrage, but I have seen hundreds of women educating and caring for their children, and maintaining worthless husbands." Does Mr. Depew forget that if the women do so it is simply out of their own desire, as the laws of New York State relieve a wife from the support of her husband, while they compel the husband to support the wife? Mr. Depew continues, "The only thing I have known these husbands to do was to vote." The thing for Mr. Depew to advocate under these circumstances is the relieving of such men of the privilege of voting. He cannot, in the face of what he has said before, believing that to add to the already overtaxed women he speaks of, the necessity for educating themselves up to the needs of their country in order to vote intelligently, would in any way ameliorate their condition. Mr. Depew adds: "I know ladies who manage large properties, carry on extensive charities, employ great numbers of men as superintendents, gardeners and workmen, and yet the superintendents, the gardeners and workmen enact the laws which govern and tax the woman whose income, energy and intelligence support them all, and she has no voice in the matter." That reads well; but does Mr. Depew intend to imply that when suffrage is given to the wives, daughters and sisters of the great number of superintendents, gardeners and workmen that a better condition of things would prevail for that woman?

Mr. Depew is mistaken when he says that the opposition to woman suffrage is founded on "the old cry" of unsexing women. The condition of things to-day in the political, social and moral world is such as to appall the earnest thinker. In the political world the ballot of every man whom Mr. Depew employs, no matter what his degree of intelligence regarding any one theory of government and another may be, has as much influence upon public policy as
does that of Mr. Depew; and men whose utmost notion of fidelity to duty at the polls is to cast their ballot as the "boss'" bids outnumber Mr. Depew and the men of his intelligence largely. If this is not so, why do we suffer from corrupt legislation? Mr. Depew derides the attitude of our forefathers regarding women. The people derided the fundamental principle established by our forefathers that the nation's safety must depend upon restricting the suffrage to those who should be, presumably, most competent to exercise and gave suffrage to thirteen millions of men without any restrictive clause as regards intelligence. Does Mr. Depew believe that when as many millions of women possess the power of influencing public policy by their ballot that either the women or the State will be benefited? Does he not know, judging by what universal male suffrage has done for the country, that universal female suffrage would be a hazardous experiment to try? Inasmuch as Mr. Depew says that "women have every right that man has and every privilege except the right to vote."

There are social and moral reforms that women understand, and for which no legislation is needed; or, if it be shown that there is, can be obtained without woman's ballot; these reforms are still to be made. Here is an avenue for the unrest that threatens to "create a new order of things." For these women who do not find their greatest pleasure as well as their greatest duty in the care of their homes, the strengthening and comforting of their husbands to fit them for their outside duties, the education and Christian influencing of their sons and daughters, together with the charitable work that pleads for recognition, there are, as Mr. Depew has said, "every right that man has, and every privilege" awaiting them. They may join their sisters "in literature, in journalism, in the professions, in the trades, in art, and in education," but it were well for wise men and women to pause to ask themselves seriously what condition of things would obtain if all women were given suffrage, before they hold up "the right to vote" as a panacea for want of employment, for low wages, for unrest, and unhappiness.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL.

ALBANY, N. Y., May 1, 1896.
Extracts from an Article by the Rev. J. M. Buckley,

ON

The Wrongs and Perils of Woman Suffrage.

In an argument in favor of giving suffrage to women, a senator of Massachusetts brought forward as an example of intellectual and moral fitness for the franchise Mrs. Clara Leonard, whom he justly characterized as the highest living authority on private and public charities. Mrs. Leonard has recently thus expressed her wisdom on the value of the ballot to woman: "It is the opinion of many of us that woman's power is greater without the ballot or possibility of office holding for gain, when standing outside of politics she discusses great questions on their merits. Much has been achieved by woman for the anti-slavery cause, temperance, the improvement of public and private charities, the reformation of criminals and by intelligent discussion and influence upon man. Our legislators have been ready to listen to women and carry out their plans when well formed.

* * * * *

To her name I add that of "the most useful and distinguished woman that America has produced", whose influence is felt throughout the world upon every sphere of philanthropy and is preserved in the laws of every civilized nation, Dorothea L. Dix. She saw the rise of the American Woman's Suffrage movement, studied it in its advocate's arguments, sentiments and tendencies, and rejected it. Her biographer states that she believed in "'woman's keeping herself apart from anything savoring of ordinary political action. She must be the incarnation of a purely disinterested idea, appealing to universal humanity, irrespective of party or sect'."
Extracts from an Article by the
Rev. J. M. Buckley,

**ON**

The Wrongs and Perils of Woman Suffrage.

Woman suffrage cannot achieve what its advocates expect. They think that it will reform public morals, close the saloon and other places of evil resort, and realize absolute prudence, honesty and economy in management. Laws that do not carry the votes of a majority of the men in a community cannot be enacted. That under ordinary circumstances the instincts of women would be in favor of good laws there is no doubt: but how far their temperaments would affect the character of special enactments, and how far their personal prejudices and prepossessions would affect their political action are practical questions of moment. "Women will always vote against war, and thus put an end to it in the world. They will not send their husbands, fathers, brothers and friends to slaughter." Does history support this statement? Wherever there has been a war women have been as much interested as men. They have even encouraged their husbands, fathers, brothers and lovers to enlist, and would have despised them if they had not. In the last war in this country the women on both sides were more intense and irreconcilable than the men.

* * * * * * *

In England, when women first appeared upon the hustings, they were received with the old chivalry, but in recent elections, the contest being fierce, all respect has disappeared. Noted women were treated most disrespectfully in the very heart of London, and people of all parties agree that England has never seen so much participation of women or such rude treatment of them as in the last election. In Wales, Mrs. Cornwallis West tried to quell a disturbance, but was silenced by yells and hisses, and was finally compelled to retire from the platform.

* * * * * * *

Should the suffrage be extended to women, the grant can never be recalled. Experiments in legislating upon economic questions, even if unwise, need not be permanently harmful, for they may be repealed; but in dealing with the suffrage or moral question, new laws, if bad, are exceedingly dangerous. They will develop a class lowered in tone or deriving personal, pecuniary or political advantages from the new environment, who will vehemently declare that the effect of the innovation is beneficial and resist all efforts to return to the former state. Should the duty of governing in the state be committed to women, it is probable that they will suffer...
There has never within my knowledge been a case in which the franchise has been extended to a large body of persons generally indifferent about receiving it. But here, in addition to a widespread indifference, there is on the part of women who have considered the matter for themselves, the most positive objection and strong disapprobation. Is it not clear to every unbiased person, that before forcing on them what they conceive to be a fundamental change in their whole social function, at least it should be ascertained that the womanly mind of the country is in overwhelming proportion, and with deliberate purpose, set upon securing it? I think it impossible to deny that there have been and are women individually fit for any public office however masculine its character; just as there are persons under the age of twenty-one better fitted than many of those beyond it for the discharge of the duties of full citizenship. In neither case does the argument derived from exceptional instances seem to justify the abolition of the general rule. I for one am not prepared to say which of the two sexes has the higher and which has the lower province. But I recognize the subtle and profound character of the difference between them, and I must again, and again, deliberate before aiding in the issue of what seems an invitation by public authority to the one to renounce as far as possible its own office, in order to assume that of the other. As this is not a party question, or a class question so neither is it a sex question. I have no fear lest the woman should encroach upon the power of the man. The fear I have is, lest we should invite her unwillingly to trespass upon the delicacy, the purity, the refinement, the elevation of her own nature, which are the present sources of its power. My disposition is to do all for her which is free from danger and reproach, but to take no step in advance until I am convinced of its safety. The stake is enormous. The affirmation pleas are to my mind not clear, and, even if I thought them clearer, I should deny that they were pressing.

Very faithfully yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE.
JAMES T. GARDINER, an eminent scientific and business man, spoke in regard to what he has observed in his constant visits to Kansas as to results of woman suffrage.

"The first year or two, women took little interest in the municipal elections. Then one party put up a man of questionable reputation as mayor, the other party nominated a man of spotless character. Soon the latter's friends found that the other party were enlisting all the negro women of the city to their cause by sympathy and by bribes. We then saw that all would be lost if we could not arouse our wives and sisters to their duty as enfranchised women to vote for the pure election. They at first demurred, but we showed them what a disastrous effect upon the city it would be in every way should the other candidate be elected. Soon they became interested and began canvassing around amongst their neighbors. Constantly they increased in enthusiasm and numbers, until finally people who had been friends and neighbors for years would not speak, and the whole history of each candidate, with that of their ancestors and followers, was discussed in every household, even before its youngest members. Women had caught the fever of politics and it raged high and furiously. For over a month before election day, the whole dirty stream of politics flowed over my hearthstone, washing away all the quiet, happiness and peace which had reigned there before. And, as a climax, on election day we saw our wives and daughters driving through the city, picking up women of the lowest possible class and morality, and then walking with their arm around them to the polls to see that they voted rightly. Every means of
intimidation, bribery and cajolery which had been used by men was employed unhesitatingly by women on election day, and yet when the votes were counted the result was no different than if they had remained quietly at home, without the ballot. The effect on Leavenworth society has been most disastrous."

Such is the fear of the Anti-Suffragists of what would occur to New York State, should women vote,
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When about thirty years of age I accepted for a time the doctrine of woman suffrage, and publicly defended it. Years of wide and careful observation have convinced me that the demand for woman suffrage in America is without foundation in equity, and, if successful, must prove harmful to American society. I find some worthy women defending it, but the majority of our best women, especially our most intelligent, domestic, and godly mothers, neither ask for nor desire it. The instinct of motherhood is against it. The basal conviction of our best manhood is against it. The movement is at root a protest against the representative relations and functions by virtue of which each sex depends upon and is exalted by the other. This theory and policy, tending to the subversion of the natural and divine order, must make man less a man, and woman less a woman. A distinguished woman advocate of this suffrage movement says, "We need the ballot to protect us against men." When one sex is compelled thus to protect itself against the other, the foundations of society are already crumbling. Woman now makes man what he is. She controls him as babe, boy, manly son, brother, lover, husband, father. Her influence is enormous. If she use it wisely, she needs no additional power. If she abuse her opportunity she deserves no additional responsibility. Her womanly weight, now without measure, will be limited to the value of a single ballot, and her control over from two to five additional votes forfeited.

The curse of America to-day is in the dominated partisan vote, the vote of ignorance and superstition. Shall we help matters by doubling this dangerous mass? Free from the direct complications and passions of the political arena, the best women may exert a conservative and moral influence over men as voters. Force her down into the same bad atmosphere, and both man and woman must inevitably suffer incalculable loss. We know what woman can be in the "commune", in "riots", and on the "rostrum".

Woman can, through the votes of men, have every right to which she is entitled. All she has man has gladly given her. It is his glory to represent her. To rob him of this right is to weaken both, He and she are just now in danger through his mistaken courtesy.

JOHN H. VINCENT.

Topeka, Kansas, April 18, 1894.
To the Hon. Henry W. Blair, U. S. Senator from New Hampshire.

Dear Sir,—During the last week of the last session of Congress, I received, under cover of your own frank, a copy of your Report of the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage, delivered to the Senate of the United States, Dec. 8, 1886. In it you make a lengthy quotation from a pamphlet of mine, entitled "Letters from a Chimney Corner." It appears to me that in the argument drawn from this quotation you mistake utterly the point at issue, and it is my purpose in this letter to direct your attention to this mistake, and to put the argument upon its proper basis. I shall also comment upon certain other considerations put forth therein.

The quotation referred to is too long for the limits of a letter like this. The argument briefly is, that neither the man nor the woman is individually the representative of the genus home, but that, according to nature and revelation, the two united make one, and that to each constituent of that union certain distinct powers and properties belong, each dependent upon the other, in a minor way, for proper fulfillment. You say, "If upon this account woman is to be denied suffrage, then man equally should be denied the ballot, if his highest and final estate is to be something else than a mere individual."

Now, marriage is that partnership upon which the right order of society and the right of perpetuation of the species depends. The question is, whether each partner shall keep to that line, of labor which Nature has marked out, or whether of woman shall be demanded, not only her own share of the labor, but also a large part of that which belongs to man. For, let us notice, that while it may be granted that woman has the physical capacity to cast a ballot, man has not the physical capacity to bear and nourish children. Nature has made it forever impossible that he should perform that office. If, therefore, he demands of her that she shall participate in those external and general duties, such as labor for the support of the home and for the direction of the state, while he cannot by any possibility relieve her of those most necessary offices and duties which Nature demands of her, he commits a palpable and monstrous injustice.

Nor does it help the matter to say, as you do, that, because woman's nature is purer and nobler than man's, the State would be benefited by her participation in political affairs. If men are not capable of managing the affairs of the State according to the highest and best ideas of the race, that is, of both men and women, will you permit me respectfully to inquire what proper and adequate share of this world's work they can perform? What is their natural place in the order of society? Are they mere hewers of wood and drawers of water? They cannot bear citizens; they cannot care for them in infancy and rear them to manhood. If they cannot govern them with wisdom and justice when they are produced ready made to their hands, what is their reason for being? When a man stands up in the United States Senate, and makes such a statement as that, in regard to the men of this republic, it appears to me that he...
compromises his own self-respect, and the respect due to the dignified and honorable body to which he has been elevated.

You say that you have only proposed the measure because women have asked you to do it. The same plea was made by your great progenitor in the Garden of Eden; but it did not avail him. Moreover, in the case of Adam it was true. In the present instance the plea contains but the minimum of truth. There are fifteen millions of women in this country (I quote your own statistics) of voting age. Will you kindly inform us what proportion of that fifteen millions you have heard from? You say that these women as being governed without their consent. Is it possible that you can sincerely believe that fifteen millions of American women could be governed without their consent? Do you not rather feel assured that if a bare majority of that number did not consent, for what appear to them to be good and sufficient reasons, to be governed by indirect rather than direct representation, there would be a revolution within twenty-four hours? With every right of agitation at their command which man possesses,—free speech, free assembly, the right of petition, a press ever ready to disseminate their views, and many privileges of courtesy besides, that men lay no claim to,—What power could withstand the moral force of any demand which these fifteen millions should unitedly make?

With what show of reason do you compare free-born American women to the degraded and ignorant slaves on Southern plantations, and speak of men as their masters? As a matter of fact the power of men over women is not greater than that of women over men. Nature lays the infant man a helpless creature in the lap of his mother. He is in her power for life or for death, and for the first ten or fifteen years of his existence, and that during the forming and determining period of his career, a period too, in which he is answerable to no other law than that of his home, her power over him, physical, intellectual, and moral, is so nearly supreme, that no power which he can arrogate over her in later years can overbalance it. Under ordinary circumstances the faithful, intelligent mother may make of her son, in all the essentials of manners and morals, whatsoever she will. If American men were to-day the narrow-minded, tyrannical, vicious creatures they are charged with being by the woman suffragists, unfitted to be legislators for the whole nation, it could only be because their mothers had misunderstood or neglected the opportunities which Nature puts into their hands. Such a charge is tremendous indictment against the motherhood of the nation, and, if it could be sustained, ought of itself to bar women from all legislative functions until they can better fulfil that which Nature demands of them in child-bearing and rearing. Moreover, it is the function of slaves to labor; but it is this nation's pride and boast that in no other country that the sun shines on are there so many homes supported by the loyal and untiring industry of men, where women are kept in ease and comfort, in order that they may give their time to the higher duties of rearing children and planning and carrying on enterprises of charity, philanthropy, and reform; and the influence of these homes upon public sentiment is the one irresistible power in American social and
political life. Plainly, if any portion of the American people are slaves it is not the women.

But let us return to the question of physical adaptability of women to the duties of voters. If women vote, they must also hold office and assume the working duties incident to political campaigns. It appears from the published record of your life that you commenced your political career at about the age of thirty. For the next ten or fifteen years you were actively in politics. Now, will you tell me if you think it would have been convenient or agreeable during those years, when you were laying the foundations of your political success, to have been also engaged in bearing and rearing a family? Could you have done what you found it necessary to do politically, and at the same time have attended properly to your duties as wife and mother? You will say that the very suggestion is indecorous, and I agree with you, but the fault is in the situation as proposed by you. The duties and offices of motherhood are all sweet, and pure, and holy, when kept within the sacred precincts of the home. Brought out into the garish light of publicity what do they become?

Nor will it avail you to say that some part of these offices may be delegated to servants. There are too many mothers of that sort in the country now; no political measure can be a wise one which tends to increase their number.

You say in your Report that there are many women who are not wives and mothers. Very true, and when women vote and hold office, there will be more of them. A true regard for the best interests of society demands that their number shall be reduced by all natural and reasonable means; but when political rewards are offered as the price of services in public life, do you not believe that many, and those not of the weak and ignorant, but of the more gifted and intellectual, will be tempted to forgo marriage and motherhood for the sake of winning them? Woe betide the land which thus offers its political trusts as premiums for childless women? The morals of society are corrupt now. What do you suppose they will become when not to be married, not to be a mother, is the prerequisite for a woman's success in a chosen and tempting career? History gives abundant evidence that women are not naturally of purer instincts or more capable of self-control than men. It is only as they are subject to men as in heathen countries, or yield themselves to the elevating and purifying influences of Christian teaching concerning marriage and the home, that they rise to a higher moral level. Emancipated from these restraints, the intensity of their nature often betrays them into surpassing depths of depravity. I speak advisedly, therefore, and in the light of thirty years' profound and prayerful study of social problems, when I say that the direct tendency of woman suffrage would be to form a class of women such as held high court in Greece in the days preceding its downfall: women brilliant and intellectual, but wholly wanting in that steadfast faith and abiding virtue which characterize the Anglo-Saxon ideal of womanhood. I may say the Christian ideal as well.—The wife and mother. Are American men prepared to relegate the wives and mothers of this republic to a secondary and subservient
place, and share the political leadership of this great and free country with an oligarchy of Aspasias?

You say that the passage of the proposed resolution would not commit any person to the support of woman suffrage in the end. But what does it do if passed by both houses? It sends the discussion of this question, backed by the authority of Congress, into every State of this Union. A score or two of the professional advocates of woman suffrage will beat up the entire territory, and, by their noisy persistence, will necessitate either that women shall take the field upon the other side, or else let the question go by default. Home-loving women—the women who stay in their homes and fulfill the duties of their vocation, and these women are in the great majority in all our States and territories—have little taste for public strife, and few gifts with which to win battles in the public arena. Still, if needs must, they can and will defend their homes; but, believe me, they will not exonerate from blame those legislators who, by the advocacy of measures like this which you propose, have thrust the hard necessity upon them.

Do you ask me, then, what shall men do, in regard to this cry, which is coming up all over the land, for purer politics, a worthy conduct of affairs? Men know very well what they ought to do about it. They ought to live daily and hourly in the fear of God and for the honor of good women. They ought steadfastly to practice those principles of purity, honor, uprightness, and patriotism, which it is the duty of every Christian home to inculcate. It is very true that the duty is now too often imperfectly performed in our homes; but, believe me, the remedy for this evil does not lie in the direction of woman suffrage. It is by inciting and helping woman to the more faithful discharge of her own duties that legislators will honor her far more than by dragging her out of the quiet of her own domain, and setting her to perform their neglected and unfulfilled tasks.

Instead of fifteen millions of women voters vainly trying to do the work which God demands of men, there should be fifteen million of happy homes in this broad, fair land; homes supported by the father's labor, made to glow with heaven's own light by the mother's tender love and care; homes where children are being reared who shall become just and upright men, and faithful, conscientious women; where those virtues are being taught which are the only enduring bulwarks of a free, republican government. It is to build up such homes, not to break down their walls, and quench the light upon their hearthstones, that legislation ought to be directed.

There are other and weightier arguments against woman suffrage, but these are such as are suggested by the text of your Report. I commend them to your earnest consideration before you again address the United States Senate as the Champion of Woman.

Very respectfully yours,

THE AUTHOR OF LETTERS FROM A CHIMNEY CORNER.

Papers and pamphlets can be obtained and protest signed at Headquarters of Anti-Suffrage, at 70 North Pearl Street, ground floor, under Kenmore Hotel, Albany.
From N. Y. MAIL AND EXPRESS,  
May 12th, 1897.

The progress that woman's suffrage has made in New Zealand is causing considerable agitating talk in England, especially in view of the fact that the women are voting against the extreme temperance party. In 1893 the New Zealand parliament established full female suffrage, equivalent to that of the men, and it also passed a law giving absolute right of local control, even to the extent of the entire prohibition of the liquor traffic.

The first Parliament and the first local control elections in 1894 were in accordance with the expectations of the reformers, for the women electors came strongly to the poll. They were almost universally in favor of the limitation of the liquor licenses. They supported the advanced radical candidates. The social question came to the front, and men of dubious morality stood little chance in that election. The progressive party and its friends congratulated themselves on the fact that the accession of women to politics was a great gain for the democrats and social reform. But on the second election which has recently taken place, all these calculations were disturbed. Previous to the election extensive canvassing was done by the publicans and prohibitionists. Organizations were formed in all directions; every elector, male and female, was canvassed. Temperance literature was scattered broadcast. The liquor sellers formed what they called Liberty Leagues all over the island and boomed their side. Three distinct issues were presented to the electors: one that the liquor traffic should continue as it is at present, the number of licenses remaining unchanged; another, that these licenses should be greatly reduced, and the third issue was that there should be total prohibition of the sale of intoxicants. In no
one district was the reduction of licenses carried, or were licenses altogether refused. This extraordinary result has only been attained by the shifting of a large part of the women's votes from the temperance to the liquor party, in exact opposition to their votes of three years since.

Sir Robert Stout, writing in the Australian "Review of Reviews" says: "It cannot be said that purity of administration or the character of the candidates loomed larger in the eyes of women than in those of men. The prediction that party zeal and partisan feeling would not blind them to the defects of the character of candidates has not been fulfilled. A few members have been returned to the House whose character for sobriety does not stand high, and women were found supporting them just as much as men. It cannot be said that women were anywise different in their voting from their husbands and brothers. They were carried away just as much by party cries as the men were, and party dominated them. That the influence of women in politics and their voting will not be different from that of their husbands and brothers may be regarded as a foregone conclusion."

For more leaflets, send to 13 Elk Street, Albany, N. Y.
To the Editor of the Argus:

Sir:—In your edition of November 4, you say, editorially, that "there will be no little interest in the official returns from Utah, especially to the advocates of woman suffrage. It is asserted that the number of women registered in Utah exceeded the number of men who voted last year. If the percentage of women voting is equally large, it will, certainly, combat, to a considerable extent, the ancient contention that women would not vote if they could, since they do not where and when they can."

By this date the result of the vote in Utah is known to you. But, possibly, in some of its minute details, to not all of your readers. The women did vote and carried the State by an overwhelming majority for Bryan. This is hardly compatible with the sense of the woman suffrage sentiment, as expressed in the Republican platform. It is probably known to most of your readers that a Utah woman, Mrs. Mattie Hughes Cannon, has been elected to the State Senate. What is not known, perhaps, is that she ran against her one-fourth interest in her husband; and, as the dispatches put it, "licked him out of his boots." It is whispered that the other three wives of Mr. Angus M. Cannon—the husband of Mrs. Mattie Hughes Cannon, as well as of the other three women—voted against Mrs. Mattie, and in favor of their mutual husband.

There can be no such an emergency arising in this Mormon family as might arise in the East, did a wife defeat her husband for the senatorship. Here a question regarding the household arrangements might obtain; there the other three wives can settle that question, and leave Mr. Angus to shine in the reflected light of his better one-fourth.

What I object to in your editorial, Mr. Editor, is the inference that Utah women could in any way establish a precedent for Eastern women. Questions of right and wrong have different values in Utah and in New York. What Utah women do cannot in any way be taken as an indication of what New York women would do.

Regarding the statement that women will not vote when permitted to do so, let me call your attention to school suffrage statistics. The great cry of the suffragists has been that the women should,
at least, have a voice in the selection of those in control of the education of their children, inferentially asserting that men are indifferent as to their children's interests and welfare. This idea has prevailed until in twenty-two States and in two territories women may vote in the selection of school officers. The anti-suffragists have not opposed this, although, personally, I do not approve of it, for obvious reasons:

In Connecticut only two and one-half per cent. of the women voted. In Massachusetts the vote dwindled down from a registration of 20,252 in 1888, when a warfare of religious sects was made, to 3,000 in 1891, and only two-thirds of that number voted. In Chicago, two years ago, the registration of women was, in round numbers, 30,000, and about 24,000 voted. This year the registration dropped to 6,264!

Before men force a duty upon women, they should see to it that they keep themselves in line. A full male vote is an unprecedented fact. Who are the men who do not exercise this wonderful "right?" Are they the ignorant? The purchasable? The fanatics?

If there is nothing to be gained by women from the ballot—and of that there is no doubt in any well-balanced mind—what is the country to gain that will balance the disadvantages and burdens, its imposition would imply? Either every woman of intelligence and probity would have to vote in rain or shine, sick or well, in order to counteract the vote of the other women, or the country would more than lose by their suffrage.

Let us retain our confidence in the men who make our laws, Mr. Editor, and who vote not only for their own interests but for ours, as they are identical. We do not believe men are so black as they are painted when it is asserted that women must vote in order to protect themselves and purify the ballot.

MRS. W. Winslow CRAWELL.
Albany, N. Y., Nov. 7th, 1896.
Prohibition and Woman Suffrage.

The professional workers for woman suffrage are trying to induce women to join their ranks by the statement that women would work for prohibitory liquor laws if they had the ballot. Let us look at Colorado statistics: In 1892 out of a presidential vote of 93,843 the men cast 1,683 votes for the Prohibition Candidate. The next year suffrage was given to the women of that state. In 1896 out of 189,141 votes cast for President, only 1,717 were cast for the Prohibition candidate. So that, although the presidential vote was more than doubled, only 79 more votes were cast for Prohibition, when both men and women voted than were cast by the men only in 1892. It will be well for women to remember this.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL.

ALBANY, N. Y., March 16, 1897.
amendment to the same.

considered and settled by the Constitutional Convention of 1847, to the people to vote on as an

"make" from Article II, Section I, of the Constitution, or of referring a matter so thoroughly
obligations of the ballot upon the women of the State, protest against striking out the word
years of age; believing that it will be against the best interests of the State to impose the

We, women, citizens of the State of New York, twenty-one

GENTLEMEN:

To the House of the Legislature of the State of New York, to meet in Albany, Jan. 1846.

PROTEST.
WAS UNJUSTLY QUOTED.

President Eliot of Harvard University Writes a Letter.

Paragraphs Twisted.

College President Claims that Woman Suffragists Misrepresented His Real Opinion in the Call Issued for the Twenty-Eighth Annual Convention of the Suffragists.

President Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard University, has addressed a letter to Mrs. J. V. L. Pruyn of Albany, in which he severely criticises the call issued for the twenty-eighth annual convention of the National American Association of Women Suffragists, which is to be held in Washington, January 23 to 28.
The part of the call objected to and President Eliot’s references thereto, will be read with interest by those people all over the country who are either for or against woman suffrage.

They are contained in the following, which was furnished The Argus press last night, by Bishop Doane:

THE CALL.

Extract from the call of the twenty-eighth annual convention of the National American Association of Women Suffragists:

"All friends of justice and equal rights are earnestly invited to assemble in the twenty-eighth annual convention of the American Woman's Suffrage association, in the Church of Our Father, Washington, January 23 to 28.

"The present day is bristling with an energy which has for its aim the elevation of our race in mental and moral directions, in every department, indeed, of human life. Living under the law, helped and hindered by its enactments, women are, by every principle of natural justice, as well as by the nature of our institutions, as fully entitled as men to vote and to be eligible to office.

"As the president of Harvard university says: 'The exercise of suffrage stimulates all citizens to reflect on problems outside the narrow circle of their private interests and occupations. The duties of Republican citizenship, rightly discharged, constitute in themselves a prolonged education. The bulwarks of the commonwealth will prove all the stronger and more lasting because women, as well as men, can work on them and help to transmit them, ever broader and firmer, from generation to generation.'"

(Signed,) SUSAN B. ANTHONY, President.

RACHEL FOSTER AVERY, Corresponding Secretary.
MR. ELIOT'S DENIAL.

Extract from a letter of the president of Harvard university:

Harvard University,
Cambridge, Jan. 6, 1896.

The quotation in the call for the twenty-eighth annual convention of the National American Woman's Suffrage association, introduced by the clause, "As the president of Harvard university says," is from an article by me in the Forum of October, 1894, entitled "Some Reasons Why the American Republic May Endure."

The last paragraph in the quotation is separated in the article by ten pages from the preceding paragraphs of the quotation. In the last quoted paragraph "the bulwarks" should be "these bulwarks." "These bulwarks" had just been enumerated in the last paragraph of my article, and the suffrage, whether for men, for women or for both, was not mentioned among these bulwarks.

The list is long and specific, and does not contain the suffrage. The manner in which the quotation is printed in the call, the alteration of "these" to "the," and the misrepresentation of my real opinion make the extracts in the call a perfect example of misleading and unjust quotation.

Your are at liberty to make any use of this article which may seem to you desirable.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

Bishop Doane is strongly opposed to woman suffrage, and is one of its many opponents in this section of the country.
Report of Third Judicial District of New York State Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, from May 1st, 1896, to May 1st, 1897.

In May, 1896, an organization was formed at Hudson, Mrs. J. R. Cady as Chairman. Also in Cohoes, Mrs. David Johnston as Chairman.

In June, 1896, Mrs. Crannell represented the cause at the Republican National Convention at St. Louis, with most satisfactory results. We wrote in regard to this proposed action to New York, Brooklyn and Boston. All thought well of the undertaking, but had no suitable person to go.

In July, 1896, Mrs. Crannell went to National Democratic Convention in Chicago, with most satisfactory results.

New York, Brooklyn and Boston insisted in paying a share of expenses incurred by these journeys.

Too much praise cannot be bestowed upon Mrs. Crannell for her interest, ability, tact and pluck in these undertakings. Her two able addresses are printed as leaflets and have been sent broadcast through the States, and have been written for by a large number of people. We are also very grateful to members of both conventions for courtesy and efficient help.

Mrs. Johnston of Cohoes sent out in May, 1896, fifteen hundred and forty-seven (1547) return postal cards, to operatives in mills of that town.

Through kindness of Mrs. Woolworth, of Castleton, return postals were sent to operatives in mills of that town.

Directly November election excitement subsided, we prepared and circulated through 3d Judicial District, which embraces seven counties, newspaper plates,—three plates sent to every small newspaper—where several were in a town, selecting one Republican and one Democratic. This plan was sure to reach people to whom it was impossible to send leaflets. It went to the newspapers free of all expense, even expressage paid.
In December, 1896, wrote 150 letters and enclosed leaflets to New York State Assemblymen elected in November.

Sent return postal cards to Normal School graduates, in 32 counties, also to Female Academy graduates, also to one hundred religious newspapers of 3d Judicial District.

The spring and autumn general meetings have been held at 13 Elk Street, and Executive Committee has met whenever called by chairman.

During the year some very able papers have been written for leaflets, and we are indebted to Mrs. Wallace, wife of U. S. Judge Wallace, to Mrs. Stillman, to Mrs. Crannell, for their untiring interest in the cause. Some bright newspaper articles we also thank Mrs. Crannell for. We are also indebted to various editors for courtesy both in and out of 3rd Judicial District.

In March, 1897, a delegation of New York, Brooklyn and Albany women appeared before Judiciary Committee of Senate at Albany. Two weeks later they were ready to appear before Judiciary Committee of Assembly. No hearing took place. The matter was killed in Committee too late to notify the ladies not to come.

In the way of outside work, we have tried to send letters and leaflets wherever we read the suffragists were at work. We think the seed sown has borne decided fruit, judging by two defeats in California; three separate bills defeated in Massachusetts; in territories of Arizona and Oklahoma; in states of Vermont; Nebraska; Nevada; Montana; Maine; Delaware in Constitutional Convention; Kansas; New York; Missouri, Connecticut; in Indiana by Judicial decision; in Illinois, where it failed to be the one Constitutional Amendment possible to be adopted; in Halifax, N. S.; then the farce in the British House of Commons in February; later on in the House of Lords, who refused to notice the suggestion; and now in Australia.

In 1896, we wrote letters and enclosed leaflets to the press in various States above referred to.

Press of California, Clergy " Citizens 100 letters with leaflets. 150 " 95 " 84 "
Press of Maine, Citizens of Maine and Jud. Com. 74 "
Press of Maine, Clergy " Citizens 150 " 95 " 84 "
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senate, Members</th>
<th>Assembly, Members</th>
<th>Total, Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press of Iowa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Iowa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>142 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Iowa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Nevada</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Nevada</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Nevada</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Nebraska</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Nebraska</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Nebraska</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Missouri</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Oklahoma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of Oklahoma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>204 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of West Virginia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of West Virginia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>123 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of North Carolina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press of North Carolina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76 letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota Press</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127 letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other letters to people, - - - 250 letters with leaflets.

Letters to Canada, Australia, London
and Scotland, - - - 50 " "

Women’s Bibles sent, - - - 200 copies.

\[
\begin{align*}
1896. & \quad \begin{cases} 
4000 \text{ Letters.} \\
15000 \text{ Leaflets.} \\
200 \text{ Woman’s Bibles.} \\
2000 \text{ Return Postals.}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ANNA PARKER PRUYN,

President 3d Judicial District.
In October, 1897, a general meeting was held at 13 Elk Street, Albany, and in winter of 1898, a general one at Hall of Female Academy. Several meetings of Executive Committee have been held as needed during the year.

The usual interest has been felt in the District, and funds raised.

In the way of work outside of Judicial District much has been accomplished. Wherever the Suffragists have been at work, there we have quietly sowed the good seed.

Letters and numerous leaflets have been sent to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Committee</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislature of Illinois,</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota,</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia,</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina,</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina,</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee,</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia,</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota,</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland,</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State,</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa,</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio,</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Convention Louisiana, twice,</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Body of British Columbia,</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to ladies of Geneva, N. Y.,</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors of Georgia,</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors of various newspapers in above states,</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to individuals,</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to members of Suffrage Committees of Congress in Feb. 1898.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many clever articles have been circulated in the Press written by ladies of the Third Judicial District, and very many leaflets, which are in great demand.

To this statement may be added the fact that the Assembly Judiciary of the State of New York on Feb. 2, 1898, killed in committee the concurrent resolution to amend the Constitution by providing for woman suffrage. On March 3, the Suffragists forced a hearing before the Judiciary Committee, who again voted, 10-3, to not report favorably.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ANNA PARKER PRUYN,
President 3rd Judicial District.
A. O. S. W.
13 ELK STREET, ALBANY, N. Y.

REPORT OF 3rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT
FROM APRIL 1898 TO APRIL 1899.

The usual semi-yearly meetings held and Executive Committee called whenever necessary. Much interest is felt in District at numerous defeats of suffrage throughout the country as well as in New York State. The suffragists did not bring in this year the usual "concurrent resolutions" for a "Constitutional Amendment" but several small bills were introduced in both Houses in relation to taxes, compulsory appointments on school boards, etc., etc.

Delegates from New York, Brooklyn and Albany appeared before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on the 22d of February in regard to Taxation Bill and able papers were presented. Since then the other bills have been defeated in Committees chiefly.

In regard to work outside our district, much has been accomplished in the cause by Massachusetts and New York State organizations granting request of various men and women in South Dakota and State of Washington that Mrs. Crannell should visit those States and assist in organization, etc. Three months she spent in this successful undertaking, and all good citizens must be very thankful to her for the tact and wisdom she displayed.

The 3d Judicial District has been doing missionary work during sessions of Legislatures in States where the agitators were working this winter. Several thousand letters have been sent to Legislators, the Press, Clergy of various religious bodies, and at least twenty thousand leaflets have been scattered in Territories of Oklahoma and Arizona, States of Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, Georgia, Oregon, Washington and South Dakota, etc., etc., and results have been most satisfactory.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ANNA PARKER PRUYN,
President Third Judicial District.
SHALL WOMEN BE BURDENED WITH THE BALLOT?

BY REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER.

Meeting a group of half dozen highly intelligent women. I frankly propounded to them the question, "Do you sincerely desire to be invested with the burdens and grave responsibilities of the ballot and of civil office?" One of the number replied in the affirmative; the others with a decided "No." I suspect that those ladies fairly represented the opinions of thoughtful women in this commonwealth, where the very old question of female suffrage is under new and vehement agitation. Some of the reasons that influence solid and sensible women for refusing the burden of political duties are the following:

1. This is not a question of woman's capacity in the domain of art, literature, science, etc., but of her duties in the domain of civil government. The Creator made man and woman to govern, but in totally different spheres and methods. To man He has entrusted civil headship, the administration of justice, the authority of magistracy with the strong-arm power to enforce obedience to authority when required. The burden of ballot and of baton is laid upon him. Woman has her equally important (perhaps more important) empire in which she is to rule—by persuasion, by captivities of love, by force of character, by a power as gentle as the beneficence of the sunbeam. She has quite enough on her hands now in educating herself and the young immortals committed to her care, in governing home and household, in exercising the gentle but mighty influence without which man would soon degenerate into domestic and social barbarism. Woe be to us men when our mothers, wives, and sisters weary of their beautiful sceptre and snatch after the ballot, the jury-man's seat, and the police baton of civil authority!
(2) When civil power has been entrusted to woman, she has not (with very few exceptions) been successful. For example, in England we find a mischievous Queen Margaret, a bloody Mary, a dull Queen Anne, and several other mediocrities; and even the splendid achievements of Queen Elizabeth's reign were largely due to the great men around her, and in spite of her arrogance, vanity, and frequent duplicity. Motley, Campbell, and other impartial historians have made sad havoc with her fame. The present noble and pure-minded occupant of the British throne reigns, but not governs. Parliament and Premier rule the empire.

(3) It is claimed that women needs the ballot for self-protection. But every intelligent person knows how readily of late years legislation has been granting to women relief from former disabilities and injustice in the matter of property, and of her marital rights. What gallantry and justice to her sex have done, will continue to be done. Her strength is in remaining a woman and not striving to be a man. Homage to womankind is one of the best traits of American character. The grasp at the suffrage might destroy more than it could replace.

(4) There is something quite plausible in the assertion that as woman does so much to purify literature and society, she might also, by accepting the burdens of the ballot and office-holding (for the two are inseparable) do much to purify our unclean politics. But by the time they are through with the dirty job of "purifying" the primaries, the caucus, and the conventions, who shall purify the women? It might save some labor if the dresses of ladies were made long enough to sweep floors and sidewalks, but what about the dresses? I feel quite sure that womanhood would suffer more than political morality would gain.

Then, too, all womanhood is not angelic. The multitude of ignorant women and of depraved women would assuredly be brought to the polls by machine, politicians and demagogues; while the cultured, the quiet, and the Christian class would be reluctant to enter the political arena to out-vote the ignorant and corrupt. And so a new burthen
of responsibility would be thrust upon respectable womanhood. Some of my Prohibitionist brethren insist that female suffrage would shut up the saloons in Brooklyn and New York and other great cities. They forget what an army of beer-drinking women would swarm out of the slums and the tenement houses to reinforce the army of beer-drinking and whisky drinking men in favor of the dram-shop. We suffer enough now from the foreign male vote in our cities; what would it be if the foreign female vote were added likewise?

(5) There is one argument against imposing the burden of civil duties upon woman that delicacy allows us to hint at. It is that the Creator has put an interdict on the participation of a large number of our sister-sex in public affairs through certain physical disabilities which belong to wifehood and maternity. And let me also remind the zealous female suffragist that if perilous passions were to be introduced as an element into politics, it would furnish a new source of corruption and profligacy.

(6) If the ballot is to be imposed upon our mothers and daughters, then with it come office-holding, jury-duty and other political responsibilities. Then will come the necessity for them to study tariffs, currency problems, and all other civil questions in order to vote intelligently at the polls or in the legislative hall. Then will come sharp controversies between husbands and wives that will not minister to connubial peace. Then will come conflicts between the great sacred duties, which God has laid upon woman and the other duties which a false and foolish theory of government has piled upon her overloaded shoulders. For one, I love and honor the sex that gave me the best of mothers and the best of wives too well to be an accomplice in any such outrage.

(7) But, says the vehement female suffragists, "we claim the ballot and political office as a natural right," Madam, you are sadly mistaken. If voting were a natural right, then every young man might exercise it before he reached the age of twenty-one, and every foreigner as soon as
he landed on our shores. The ballot is a privilege delegated by the Constitution to certain persons under certain conditions. It is also a tremendous trust. It is a solemn and exacting trust. It involves a heavy burden of responsibility. Office-holding also becomes more vexatious and oppressive every year. Your Creator has laid heavy loads on woman's head and hand and heart; and the wisest of your sex are seeking more of divine grace to bear them. Beware how you rashly clamor for new burdens which would be "light" only to those who are too weak to understand them, or too wicked to respect their sacred responsibility!

(8) A recent correspondent who is opposed to female suffrage declares that he is "willing to see the experiment tried." If it fails, what then? He must remember that a suffrage once enlarged can never be contracted. We Republicans gave universal suffrage to the southern Freedmen, instead of requiring an educational qualification. It is too late to shut the door now. As long as the great majority of thoughtful and conscientious women do not desire to be voters, jurymen, or office-holders, why force the burdens upon them?

Let the high endeavor of every good woman be to do her full duty to God, to society, to her family and to the commonwealth, in the great sphere in which God has placed her. Woman must do her work for her country as woman and not as a counterfeit man. We do not need her at the polls, but those who do go to the polls need a good mother's training and good home influence. This whole suffrage movement is what Dr. Horace Bushnell called "a reform against nature." There is full scope for a true woman's patience, power, purity, and prayers without attempting to override that divine arrangement which never fitted her to be a soldier, a sailor, a civil engineer, a jurymen, a magistrate, a policeman, a politician.

May, 1894, Published by the "Protest Committee."

Apply for more papers to Anti-Suffrage Association, 13 Elk Street, Albany.
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SOME OF THE REASONS AGAINST WOMAN
SUFFRAGE.

THE POWER OF SEX.

It has been said that the question of the rights and employment of women should be treated without regard to sex. It should rather be said that those who consider it regardless of sex do not consider it at all. It will not do to exclude from the problem the chief factor in it, and deal with women only as if they were smaller and weaker men. Yet these have been the tactics of the agitators for female suffrage, and to them they mainly owe what success they have had. Hence their extreme sensitiveness whenever the subject is approached on its most essential side. If it could be treated like other subjects, and discussed fully and freely, the cause of the self-styled reformers would have been hopeless from the first. It is happy for them that the relations of women to society cannot be so discussed without giving just offense. Their most important considerations can be touched but slightly; and even then offense will be taken.

Whatever liberty the best civilization may accord to women, they must always be subject to restrictions unknown to the other sex, and they can never dispense with the protecting influences which society shows about them. A man, in lonely places, has nothing to lose but life and property; and he has nerve and muscles to defend them. He is free to go whither he pleases, and run what risks he pleases. Without a radical change in human nature, of which the world has never given the faintest sign, women cannot be equally emancipated. It is not a question of custom, habit, or public opinion; but of an all-prevading force, always formidable in the vast number of men in whom it is not controlled by higher forces. A woman is subject, also, to many other restrictions, more or less stringent, necessary to the maintenance of self-respect and the respect of others, and yet placing her at a disadvantage, as compared to men, in the active work of the world. All this is mere truism, but the
plainest truism may be ignored in the interest of a theory or a "cause."

Again, everybody knows that the physical and mental constitution of woman is more delicate than in the other sex; and we may add, the relations between mind and body are more intimate and subtle. It is true that they are abundantly so in men; but their harder organism is neither so sensitive to disturbing influences nor subject to so many of them.

It is these and other inherent conditions, joined to the engrossing nature of a woman's special functions, that have determined through all time her relative position. What we have just said—and we might have said much more—is meant as a reminder that her greatest limitations are not of human origin. Men did not make them, and they cannot unmake them. Through them, God and Nature have ordained that those subjects to them shall not be forced to join in the harsh conflicts of the world militant. It is folly to ignore them, or try to counteract them by political and social quackery. They set at naught legislatures and peoples.

SELF-COMPLACENCY OF THE AGITATORS.

Here we may notice an idea which seems to prevail among the women suffragists, that they have argued away the causes which have always determined the substantial relations of the sexes. This notion arises mainly from the fact that they have had the debate very much to themselves. Their case is that of the self made philosopher who attacked the theory of gravitation, and, because nobody took the trouble to answer him, boasted that he had demolished it, and called it an error of the past.

CRUELTY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The frequent low state of health among American women is a fact as undeniable as it is deplorable.

In this condition of things, what do certain women demand for the good of their sex? To add to the excitements that are wasting them other and greater excitements, and to cares too much for their strength other and greater cares. Because they cannot do their own work, to require them to add to it the work of men, and launch them
into the turmoil where the most robust sometimes fail. It is much as if a man in a state of nervous exhaustion were told by his physician to enter at once for a foot-race or a boxing-match.

POWER SHOULD GO WITH RESPONSIBILITY.

To hold the man responsible and yet deprive him of power is neither just or rational. The man is the natural head of the family, and is responsible for its maintenance and order. Hence he ought to control the social and business agencies which are essential to the successful discharge of the trust imposed upon him. If he is deprived of any part of this control, he should be freed also in the same measure from the responsibilities attached to it.

ALTERNATIVES OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Woman suffrage must have one of two effects. If, as many of its advocates complain, women are subservient to men, and do nothing but what they desire, then woman suffrage will have no other result than to increase the power of the other sex; if, on the other hand, women vote as they see fit, without regarding their husbands, then unhappy marriages will be multiplied and divorces redoubled. We cannot afford to add to the elements of domestic unhappiness.

POLITICAL DANGERS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

One of the chief dangers of popular government is that of inconsiderate and rash legislation. In impatience to be rid of one evil, ulterior consequences are apt to be forgotten. In the haste to redress one wrong, a door may be opened to many. This danger would be increased immeasurably if the most impulsive and excitable half of humanity had an equal voice in the making of laws, and in the administration of them. Abstract right would then be made to prevail after a fashion somewhat startling. A lady of intelligence and admirable intentions, an ardent partisan on principles of pure humanitarianism, confessed that, in the last presidential election, Florida, had given a majority for the Democrats; but insisted that
is was right to count it for Hayes, because other states had been counted wrongfully for Tilden. It was impossible to make her comprehend that government conducted on such principles would end in anarchy. In politics, the virtues of women would sometimes be as dangerous as their faults.

If the better class of women flatter themselves that they can control the others, they are doomed to disappointment. They will be outvoted in their own kitchens, without reckoning the agglomerations of poverty, ignorance, and vice, that form a startling proportion of our city populations. It is here that the male vote alone threatens our system with its darkest perils. The female vote would enormously increase the evil, for it is often more numerous, always more impulsive and less subject to reason, and almost devoid of the sense of responsibility. Here the bad politician would find his richest resources. He could not reach the better class of female voters, but the rest would be ready to his hand. Three fourths of them, when not urged by some pressing need or contagious passion, would be moved, not by principles, but by personal predilections.

THE FEMALE POLITICIAN.

It is not woman's virtues that would be prominent or influential in the political arena. They would shun it by an invincible repulsion; and the opposite qualities would be drawn into it. The Washington lobby has given us some means of judging what we may expect from the woman "inside politics." If politics are to be purified by artfulness, effrontery, insensibility, a pushing self-assertion, and a glib tongue, then we may look for regeneration; for the typical female politician will be richly endowed with all these gifts.

Thus accoutred for the conflict, she may fairly hope to have the better of her masculine antagonist. A woman has the inalienable right of attacking without being attacked in turn. She may strike but must not be struck, either literally or figuratively. Most woman refrain from abusing their privilege of non-combatants; but there are those in whom the sense of impunity breeds the cowardly courage of the virago.

In reckoning the resources of the female politicians, there is one which can by no means be left out. None know better than woman
the potency of feminine charms aided by feminine arts. The women "inside politics" will not fail to make use of an influence so subtle and strong, and of which the management is peculiarly suited to her talents. If—and the contingency is in the highest degree probable—she is not gifted with charms of her own, she will have no difficulty in finding and using others of her sex who are. If report is to be trusted, Delilah has already spread her snares for the congressional Samson; and the power before which the wise fail and the mighty fall has been invoked against the sages and heroes of the Capitol. When "woman" is fairly "inside politics," the sensational press will reap a harvest of scandals more lucrative to itself than profitable to public morals. And, as the zeal of one class of female reformers has been, and no doubt will be, largely directed to their grievances in matters of sex, we shall have shrill-tongued discussions of subjects which had far better be left alone.

It may be said that the advocates of female suffrage do not look to political women for the purifying of politics, but to the votes of the sex at large. The two, however, cannot be separated. It should be remembered that the question is not of a limited and select female suffrage, but of a universal one. To limit would be impossible. It would seek the broadest areas and the lowest depths, and spread itself through the marshes and malarious pools of society.

**Men will give Women the Suffrage if they want it**

Again, one of the chief arguments of the agitators is that government without the consent of the governed is opposed to inalienable right. But most women, including those of the best capacity and worth, fully consent that their fathers, husbands, brothers, or friends, shall be their political representatives; and no exhortation or teasing has induced them to withhold their consent.

Nor is this surprising; for a woman is generally represented in a far truer and more intimate sense by her male relative than is this relative by the candidate to whom he gives his vote, commonly without knowing him; and often with dissent from many of his views.

Nothing is more certain than that women will have the suffrage if they ever want it; for when they want it, men will give it to them regardless of consequences. A more than readiness on the part of men
to conform to the wishes of the other sex is a national trait in America, though whether it would survive the advent of the female politician is matter for reflection. We venture to remind those who demand woman suffrage as a right that, even if it were so, the great majority of intelligent women could judge for themselves whether to exercise it, better than the few who assume to teach them their duty.

**MOST WOMEN AVERSE TO IT.**

The agitators know well that, in spite of their persistent importunity, the majority of women are averse to the suffrage. Hence, the ludicrous terror which the suffragists showed at the Governor's proposal to submit the question to a vote of the women of the State.

**THE WOMAN SUFFRAGISTS HAVE DONE NOTHING TO PROVE THEIR FITNESS FOR A SHARE IN GOVERNMENT.**

A small number of women have spent their time for several decades in ceaseless demands for suffrage, but they have lost their best argument in failing to show that they are prepared to use the franchise when they have got it. A single sound and useful contribution to one side or the other of any question of current politics—the tariff, specie payments, the silver bill, civil-service reform, railroad monopoly, capital and labor, or a half score of other matters—would have done more for their cause than years of empty agitation.

**PERMANENCE OF THE RELATIONS OF THE SEXES.**

The agitators say that no reason can be given why women should not take a direct part in politics, except that they have never done so. There are other reasons, and strong ones, in abundance. But this particular one is nevertheless good. All usages, laws and institutions have risen and perished, and risen and perished again. Their history is the history of mutability itself. But, from the earliest records of mankind down to this moment, in every race and every form or degree of civilization or barbarism, the relative position of the sexes have been essentially the same, with exceptions so feeble,
rare, and transient that they only prove the rule. Such permanence in the foundation of society, while all that rests upon it has passed from change to change, is proof in itself that this foundation lies deep in the essential nature of things. It is idle to prate of the old time that has passed away and the new time that is coming. The "new time" can no more stir the basis of human nature than it can stop the movement of the earth.

The cause of this permanence is obvious. Women have great special tasks assigned them in the work of life, and men have not. To these tasks their whole nature, moral and physical, is adjusted. There is scarcely a distinctive quality of women that has not a direct or indirect bearing upon them. Everything else in their existence is subordinate to the indispensable functions of containing and rearing the human race; and, during the best years of life, this work, fully discharged, leaves little room for any other. Rightly considered, it is a work no less dignified than essential. It is the root and stem of national existence, while the occupations of men are but the leaves and branches. On women of the intelligent and instructed classes depends the future of the nation. If they are sound in body and mind, impart this soundness to a numerous offspring, and rear them to a sense of responsibility and duty, there are no national evils that we cannot overcome. If they fail to do this their part, then the masses of the coarse and unintelligent, always of rapid increase, will overwhelm us and our institutions. When these indispensable duties are fully discharged, then the suffrage agitators may ask with better grace, if not with more reason, that they may share the political functions of men.

IS WOMAN SUFFRAGE A RIGHT OR A WRONG?

It has been claimed as a right that woman should vote. It is no right, but a wrong, that a small number of women should impose on all the rest political duties which there is no call for their assuming, which they do not want to assume, and which, if duly discharged, would be a cruel and intolerable burden. This pretense of the female suffragists was reduced to an absurdity when some of them gravely affirmed that, if a single woman wanted to vote, all the others ought to be required to do so.
Government by doctrines of abstract right, of which the French Revolution set the example and bore the fruits, involves enormous danger and injustice. No political right is absolute and of universal application. Each has its conditions, qualifications, and limitations. If these are disregarded, one right collides with another, or with many others. Even a man’s right to liberty is subject to the condition that he does not use it to infringe the rights of his neighbors. It is in the concrete, and not in the abstract, that rights prevail in every sound and wholesome society. They are applied where they are applicable. A government of glittering generalities quickly destroy itself. The object of government is the accomplishment of a certain result, the greatest good of the governed; and the ways of reaching it vary in different countries and different social conditions. Neither liberty nor the suffrage are the end; they are nothing but means to reach it; and each should be used to the extent in which it is best adapted to its purpose. If the voting of women conduces to the greatest good of the community, then they ought to vote, and otherwise they ought not. The question of female suffrage thus becomes a particular question, and not one of declamation.

What would be the results of the general application of the so-called right to vote, a right which, if it exists at all, must be common to all mankind? Suppose that the populations of Turkey, the Soudan, or Zululand were to attempt to exercise it and govern themselves by universal popular suffrage. The consequence would be anarchy, and a quick return to despotism as a relief. The same would be the case, in less degree, among people more civilized, yet not trained to self-government by the habits and experience of generations. In fact, there are but a few of the most advanced nations in whom the universal exercise of the pretended “inalienable right” to vote would not produce political and social convulsions. The truth is thus: If the exercise of the suffrage by any individual or body of individuals involves detriment to the whole people, then the right to exercise it does not exist.

It is the right and the duty of the people to provide itself with good government, and this great practical right and duty is imperative and paramount; whatever conflicts with it must give way. The air-
blown theory of inalienable right is unworthy the good sense of the American people. The most rational even of the suffragists themselves have ceased to rely on it.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE NOT PROGRESS.

Many women of sense and intelligence are influenced by the fact that the woman-suffrage movement boasts itself a movement of progress, and by a wish to be on the liberal or progressive side. But the boast is unfounded. Progress, to be genuine, must be in accord with natural law. If it is not, it ends in failure and in retrogression. To give women a thorough and wholesome training both of body and mind; to prepare such of them as have strength and opportunity for various occupations different from what they usually exercise, and above all for the practice of medicine, in which we believe that they may render valuable service; to rear them in more serious views of life and its responsibilities, are all in the way of normal and healthy development: but to plunge them into politics, where they are not needed and for which they are unfit, would be scarcely more a movement of progress than to force them to bear arms and fight.

WOMEN IN POLITICS AN ANTIQUATED IDEA.

The social power of women has grown with the growth of civilization, but their political power has diminished. In former times and under low social conditions, women have occasionally had a degree of power in public affairs unknown in the foremost nations of the modern world. The most savage tribes on this continent, the Six Nations of New York, listened in solemn assembly, to the counsels of its matrons, with a deference that has no parallel among its civilized successors. The people of ancient Lycia, at a time when they were semi-barbarians, gave such power to their women that they were reported to live under a gynecocracy, or female government. The word gynecocracy, by the way, belongs to antiquity. It has no application in modern life; and, in the past, its applications were found, not in the higher developments of ancient society, but in the lower. Four hundred years before Christ, the question of giving political power to women was agitated among the
most civilized of ancient people, the Athenians, and they would not follow the example of their barbarian neighbors.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN VOTING AND FIGHTING.

The advocates of woman suffrage have ridiculed the idea of any connection between voting and the capacity to fight. Their attitude in this matter shows the absence of reflection on questions of government, or the inability to form rational judgment upon them. In fact, it is with nearly all of them a matter, not of reason, but of sentiment.

The human race consists of two equal parts, the combatant and the non-combatant, and these parts are separated by the line of sex. It is true that some men are permanently disabled from fighting, and others may be disabled in one year or one month, and fit to bear arms in the next; but the general fact remains that men are the fighting half of humanity, and women are not. Fundamental laws are made in reference to aggregates of persons, and not to individual exceptions; and it would be absurd to exact a surgeon's certificate of military competency from every voter at the polls. It is enough that he belongs to a body which, as a whole, can and will fight. The question remains, What has this to do with voting? It has a great deal to do with it, and above all in a government purely popular.

THE VOTING OF A LARGE NON-COMBATANT CLASS DANGEROUS TO CIVIL HARMONY.

Since history began, no government ever sustained itself long unless it could command the physical force of the nation; and this, whether the form of government was despotism, constitutional monarchy, or democracy. The despot controls the army which compels the people to obey; the king and parliament control the force of the kingdom, and malcontents dare not rise in insurrection till they think they have drawn away an equal or greater share of it. Finally, the majority in a democratic republic feels secure that its enactments will take effect, because the defeated minority, even if it does not respect law, will respect a force greater than its own. But suppose the majority to consist chiefly of women. Then legality would be on one
side and power on the other. The majority would have the law, and
the minority the courage and strength. Hence, in times of political
excitement, when passions were roused and great interests were at
stake, the majority, that is, the legal authority, would need the help
of a standing army. Without such support the possession of the
suffrage by the non-combatant half of the nation would greatly
increase the chances of civil discord. Once in our history a minority
rose against the majority, in the belief that it could out-fight it.
This would happen often if the minority, as in the supposed case of
woman suffrage, had not only the belief but the certainty that it
could master the majority. It may not be creditable to human nature
that if we would have a stable government it is necessary to keep the
balance of power on the side of law; but the business of government
is to shape itself to the actual, and not to the ideal or millennial,
condition of mankind.

Suppose, again, a foreign war in which the sympathies of our
women were enlisted on one side or the other. Suppose them to
vote against the judgment of the men that we should take part in it;
or, in other words, that their male fellow citizens should fight
whether they liked it or not. Would the men be likely to obey?

ANOTHER SOURCE OF DISCORD.

There is another reason why the giving of the suffrage to women
would tend to civil discord. In the politics of the future, the
predominant, if not the engrossing, questions will be to all appear-
ance those of finance and the relations of labor and capital. From
the nature of their occupations, as well as other causes, women in
general are ignorant of these matters, and not well fitted to deal with
them. They require an experience, a careful attention, a deliberation
and coolness of judgment, and a freedom from passion, so rare that
at the best their political treatment is full of difficulty and danger.
If these qualities are rare in men, they are still more so in women,
and feminine instinct will not in the present case supply their place.
The peculiar danger of these questions is that they raise class
animosities, and tend to set the poor against the rich and the rich
against the poor. They become questions of social antagonism.
Now, most of us have had occasion to observe how strong the social rivalries and animosities of women are. They far exceed those of men. If, in the strife between labor and capital, which, without great self-restraint on both sides, is likely to be a fierce one, women should be called to an active part, the effect would be like throwing pitch and resin into the fire. The wives and daughters of the poor would bring into the contest a wrathful jealousy and hate against the wives and daughters of the rich, far more vehement than the corresponding passions in their husbands and brothers.

**PRACTICAL VERSUS SENTIMENTAL GOVERNMENT.**

The real issue is this: Is the object of government the good of the governed, or is it not? A late writer on woman suffrage says that it is not. According to her the object of government is to give his or her rights to everybody. Others among the agitators do not venture either on this flat denial or this brave assertion, but only hover about them with longing looks. Virtually they maintain that the object of government is the realization of certain ideas or theories. They believe in principles, and so do we; they believe in rights, and so do we. But as the sublime may pass into the ridiculous, so the best principles may be transported into regions of folly or diabolism. There are minds so constituted that they can never stop till they have run every virtue into its correlative weakness or vice. Government should be guided by principles; but they should be sane and not crazy, sober and not drunk. They should walk on solid ground, and not roam the clouds hanging to a bag of gas.

Rights may be real or unreal. Principles may be true or false; but even the best and truest cannot safely be pushed too far, or in the wrong direction. The principle of truth itself may be carried into absurdity. The saying is old that the truth should not be spoken at all times; and those whom a sick conscience worries into habitual violation of the maxim are imbeciles and nuisances. Religion may pass into morbid enthusiasm or wild fanaticism, and turn from a blessing to a curse. So the best of political principles must be kept within bounds of reason, or they will work mischief. That greatest and most difficult of sciences, the science of the government, dealing with interests so delicate, complicated, and antagonistic, becomes a perilous guide when it deserts the ways of temperance.
SHALL WE STAND BY AMERICAN PRINCIPLES?

The suffragists' idea of government is not practical, but utterly unpractical. It is not American but French. It is that government of abstractions and generalities which found its realization in the French Revolution, and its apostle in the depraved and half-crazy man of genius, Jean Jacques Rousseau. The French had an excuse for their frenzy in the crushing oppression they had just flung off and their inexperience of freedom. We have no excuse. Since the nation began we have been free and our liberty is in danger from nothing but its own excesses. Since France learned to subject the ideas of Rousseau to the principles of stable freedom embodied in the parliamentary government of England and in our own republicanism, she has emerged from alternate tumult and despotism to enter the paths of hope and progress.

The government of abstractions has been called, sometimes the *a priori*, and sometimes the sentimental, method. We object to this last term, unless it is carefully defined. Sentiments, like principles, enter into the life of nations as well as that of individuals; and they are vital to both. But they should be healthy, and not morbid; rational, and not extravagant. It is not common sense alone that makes the greatness of states; neither is it sentiments and principles alone. It is these last joined with reason, reflection, and moderation. Through this union it is that one small island has become the mighty mother of nations; and it is because we ourselves, her greatest offspring, have chosen the paths of Hampden, Washington, and Franklin, and not those of Rousseau, that we have passed safe through every danger, and become the wonder and despair of despotism.

Out of the wholesome fruits of the earth, and the staff of life itself, the perverse chemistry of a man distils delirious vapors, which condensed and bottled, exalt his brain with glorious fantasies, and then leave him in the mud. So it is with the unhappy suffragists. From the sober words of our ancestors they extract the means of mental inebriety. Because the fathers of the republic gave certain reasons to emphasize their creed that America should not be taxed because America was not represented in the British Parliament, they
cry out that we must fling open the floodgates to vaster tides of ignorance and folly, strengthen the evil of our system and weaken the good, feed old abuses, hatch new ones, and expose all our large cities—we speak with deliberate conviction—to the risk of anarchy.

Neither Congress, nor the States, nor the united voice of the whole people could permanently change the essential relations of the sexes. Universal female suffrage, even if decreed, would undo itself in time; but the attempt to establish it would work deplorable mischief. The question is, whether the persistency of a few agitators shall plunge us blindfold into the most reckless of all experiments; whether we shall adopt this supreme device for developing the defects of women, and demolish their real power to build an ugly mockery instead. For the sake of womanhood, let us hope not. In spite of the effect on the popular mind of the incessant repetition of a few trite fallacies, and in spite of the squeamishness that prevents the vast majority averse to the movement from uttering a word against it, let us trust that the good sense of the American people will vindicate itself against this most unnatural and pestilent revolution. In the full and normal development of womanhood lie the best interests of the world. Let us labor earnestly for it; and, that we may not labor in vain, let us save women from the barren perturbations of American politics. Let us respect them; and, that we may do so, let us pray for deliverance from female suffrage.

Apply for more papers to Anti-Suffrage Association, 13 Elk Street. Albany, N. Y.
Take from your pocket a dollar bill, smooth it out, and look at it. It is handsomely engraved, its declarations are in good legal phrase, it is elaborately numbered, and it carries as a portrait either the strong face of Edwin M. Stanton or the handsome face of Martha Washington. Why is it that that note will buy twenty loaves of bread, or a hundred bricks, or a new novel, or a ticket to the theater, or a forty-mile ride on a railroad? Is it because paper is so precious, and ink so rare? Is it because of the fine engraving, or the legal phraseology, or the interesting portrait? All these circumstances are incidental and intrinsically worthless; the one fact that gives it universal purchasing power is the universal knowledge that somewhere behind it there is a piece of gold whose intrinsic value is equal to that of twenty loaves of bread, or a hundred bricks, or a new novel, or a seat in the theater, or a forty-mile railway ride, and that the holder of it can have that piece of gold whenever he chooses to call for it. Raise in the minds of the holders of those commodities a serious doubt as to the existence or the availability of that piece of gold, and you can no longer get the articles for your twenty-one square inches of printed paper. They will only smile at the portraits and hand them back to you, though Mr. Stanton was for four years the most gigantic purchasing-agent that ever stood on this continent, and Martha Washington is the most revered of American women.

If then, a piece of paper unbacked by metal cannot procure us a bag of salt or a yard of calico, can another piece, equally unbacked by metal, procure the passage and execution of laws, the revision of constitutions, the distribution of property, the regulation of wages, and the security of life?

The most civilized portions of mankind have not yet outgrown the measurement of force for the ultimate settlement of every great question, and the unit of force is the man capable of bearing arms. As the financial world has invented bank-notes, checks, and letters of credit, which pass current for the things they represent, while the savage is still trading only with his actual cowrie-shells, wampum,
and hoop-iron, so various devices have been brought into use by which available force can be measured and the result of a conflict be foretold, so that the destined losers submit without a conflict and thus save life and treasure. This is the philosophy of a popular election. The appeal to reason is made in the preliminary canvass. All the arguments, pro and con, are set forth—generally over and over again—by the orators, the journalists, and the talkers of the club-house and the tavern. Then the ballots are cast and counted, and the result is announced, and the announcement is essentially this: "So many thousand units of military force are enlisted on the affirmative side of this question, and so many thousand on the negative." Then those who find themselves in the minority give up, and permit the majority to have their way; not because they are convinced that they have been in the wrong and their opponents in the right, but because they know that if they do not submit peaceably they will be compelled to do so. And no legal enactment or chartered privilege can forever maintain the opposite state of affairs. We have had some notable instances of attempts in that direction, but all have failed. This was exemplified by the "Dorr war" in Rhode Island. For more than half a century after the establishment of our republic, the government of that State was still based on a charter granted by Charles II. This gave the right of suffrage only to men who had real estate to the amount of $134 and to their eldest sons, and legislative representation was so arranged that Newport had six members, while Providence, with a population three times as great, had only four. In 1842 there was an insurrection of the majority who were thus wronged, and though the forms of law were all in favor of the prescriptive rights of the minority, and the military were called upon to subdue the rebellion, and the National Government recognized existing State authorities, yet the outcome was a new constitution with a proper division of power. This was yielded by the minority, not because they suddenly woke up to the fact that they were doing wrong—all that had been clearly set forth long before—but simply because they recognized the presence of a force that would compel them to. Twenty years later we had another, and vastly greater, experience in which the metallic power behind the paper ballot had to be actually brought into play. Nobody denied that the presidential election of 1860 was fairly conducted and the result correctly declared. But it turned on a very important question, and feeling ran high. Those who found themselves in a minority believed that they were still so numerous and so united, and had so many circumstances in their favor, that they need not submit; and accordingly they refused to do so. Thereupon the majority proceeded to compel them, and though it was an enormous and bloody task, it was carried through to completion, and the
minority were convinced—not that they were in the wrong, but simply that they were a minority of the military power as well as of the ballot-casters. If half of Grant’s army had fired nothing but blank cartridges, Lee never would have surrendered.

And since the civil war we have had another exhibition of the same principle, in a different way, which still remains with us as a gigantic object-lesson showing the impotence of a blank-cartridge ballot. The colored men of the Southern States have the legal right to vote, yet they are not permitted to vote in any place, or to any extent, that would turn the scale of an election. This is not from lack of intelligence; for many of them are well educated, and are quite as intelligent as some of the whites. It is not because they are untaxed; for, although they began in 1865 with absolutely nothing, they now pay taxes on an assessment of ten million dollars in Virginia, twelve million in Georgia, fifteen million in Texas, and similar sums in other States. It is simply because the white men are fully armed, and understand very thoroughly the art of organization. If the time should ever come when every colored man owns a Winchester rifle, and when the race has learned how to organize, then the colored vote will be cast and will be counted.

All this may be very deplorable, but it is the state of affairs that exists, and with it we are compelled to deal. Nor is it confined to our country. When gunpowder came into use, and the man on horseback was unseated, suffrage began to be popularized, and it has been widening ever since, but it only follows the development of the rifle. The successive enlargements of the franchise in Great Britain have all been wrung from the unwilling or hesitating consent of those who, being themselves enfranchised, held the place of an aristocracy, and grudgingly shared their privileges with an awakening and dangerous power. In the United States, every good citizen deplores the naturalization of foreign-born men who have not been long enough in the country to understand its institutions. But the only safety is in making the term of probation inversely proportional to the numbers that are coming, lest we acquire too large an unfranchised population, which by concentrating its strength may in some places overturn the civil order. The true remedy is to restrict immigration, or forbid it altogether for a term of years. The individual man will insist on buying what he wants and can pay for. If you refuse to take his check, he will bring on the gold. So, too, men in classes, communities or parties will insist upon what they think they have the right and the might for. If we refuse to let them stand up and be counted, they will stand up and fight—if they know how, or as soon as they learn how. It is galling to a citizen of education and refinement to see great and some times difficult questions decided by the votes of the new-comer and the illiterate;
but our only safety is manhood suffrage, because the final arbiter is manhood strength.

These considerations lead directly to the conclusion that woman suffrage would be a serious mistake. A ballot put into the box by a woman would be simply a blank cartridge; and already we have more than a million blank-cartridge ballots, all of which are solemnly warranted by law, but all of which counts for nothing, and will continue to count for nothing until each is backed by a pellet of lead and a pinch of powder ready to enforce its decree. Our greatest peril arises from the even division of parties. When we elect a president by a popular majority of less than one per cent. of all the votes, there must always be a temptation to the defeated party to try the experiment of not submitting, and we have seen what this lead to in one notable instance. Nor is that the only instance. When a newly elected legislative body shows an almost even division of parties, there is pretty certain to be an attempt on the part of the minority to seize the place and power of the majority. Then we see a city hall besieged, or the doors of an assembly-chamber battered down with axes. To make any party victorious at the polls by means of blank-cartridge ballots would only present an increased temptation to the numerical minority to assert itself as the military majority. Under ordinary circumstances the law might be allowed to have its way; but sooner or later we should arrive at an extraordinary election, and then—revolution. Doubtless it would be a righteous spectacle to see a million women and half a million men outvoting eight hundred thousand men on some great moral question; but when the eight hundred thousand declined to submit, who is going to make them? "You are to bid any man stand, in the prince’s name. How if he will not stand? Why, then take no note of him, but let him go; and presently call the rest of the watch together and thank God you are rid of a knave. You are to call at all the ale-houses, and bid those that are drunk get them to bed. How if they will not? Why, then, let them alone till they are sober; if they make you not then the better answer, you may say they are not the men you took them for."

"But," says a woman who seeks to be a voter, "I own property, and I pay taxes on it, and I cannot think that taxation without representation is just." This plea has been repeated so often that it is time to point out its fallacy. There are two kinds of taxes—a money tax and a service tax. The money tax is levied on property, men’s and women’s alike, pro rata. The service tax is levied on men alone. It calls for jury service, police service, military service, and every man takes his chances on it. Sometimes one goes through his seventy years without suffering from it at all; again he spends weary hours in the jury room, or he is sworn in as a special
constable to quell a riot and fight a mob, or he is called to camp and battlefield, where he may lose a limb, or an eye, or his life. Representation goes with this kind of taxation, and not with the other. Property is protected by the Government, as women are; but property, whether man's or woman's, has no representation. If it had, it must necessarily be in some degree proportional. Mr. Astor would have hundreds of times as many votes as I, and I perhaps would have twice as many as the man that sweeps out my office. Instead of that, Mr. Astor has one vote, and I have one vote. And the reason is plain and unanswerable; it is because Mr. Astor can carry one musket, the sweeper can carry one musket, I can carry one musket. We are all equal on the ballot, because we are all equal on what the ballot represents. Mr. Astor enjoys his great property because the sweeper and I are ready to shoulder our muskets and protect him in it; the sweeper is secure in his little earnings because Mr. Astor and I are ready to stand by him with our muskets; I find it worth while to be industrious because Mr. Astor and the sweeper make it dangerous for anybody to molest me. Without this protection, our possessions would be of no value; this protection we contribute in equal measure, man for man; and this same protection we extend to our sisters, our cousins and our aunts. Frequently an election is for the purpose of determining under what laws and in what manner this protection shall be exercised; and those who furnish the protection rightfully claim the privilege of dictating its form. The woman-suffragists, so far from suffering taxation without representation, are asking to be represented where they are not taxed.

But cripples and blind men vote. Yes, they do, and simply because they are so few that it has not been thought worth while to bar them out. And many men vote who are not liable to military duty; for regular service in a long campaign, a man more than forty-five years of age, or a man with weak lungs, would not be accepted. But such a man might still be very powerful in creating a riot or in suppressing one, in overthrowing a government or in sustaining one in an emergency, and this fact has to be recognized.

It is not to be wondered at that an educated and patriotic woman frets a little when she sees an ignorant or vicious man going to the polls while she stays at home, nor that she should sometimes assert herself by asking if she is not intellectually and morally superior to him. So is a man intellectually superior to a sledge-hammer; but when he wishes to rend a granite rock he does not pry at it with his fingers; he persuades the sledge-hammer to do his bidding. Similarly, it would be futile for her to go to the ballot box and with her own fair hand throw in a blank-cartridge ballot; but if through argument or entreaty she can persuade a musket-bearer to throw a right ballot instead of a wrong one, she can accomplish something
worthy. And the means of enlightening and convincing voters, through print and oratory, are all quite as free to women as to men. An unenforceable ballot would be as useless as an irredeemable currency, and far more mischievous.

This subject of the suffrage is not a question of courtesy and chivalry toward women—those are abundantly shown in the statutes of nearly every State, which are more favorable to women than to men. It is a question of the stability of our government, and the success of democratic institutions. Universal peace has not yet arrived; the great struggle that has wrenched mankind through the ages is still going on, and one may see it in various phases in our own country as well as in the bristling armies of Europe. Men never have, whether savage or civilized, been accustomed, in fighting their battles, to put the non-combatants in the forefront, whose station in the rear may be quite as honorable and far more useful. Wherever we place the ballot, manhood must necessarily be the power behind it to give it effect; and manhood suffrage is therefore the logical suffrage and the only safe experiment.

The planet on which we live was once a molten mass, and nobody knows how many million years the process of cooling went on before it had a solid crust sufficient to support the various forms of life. That it was far slower than earlier cosmogonists believed is shown by every successive advance of science. A generation ago the geologists told us the crust was about fifty miles thick, now they calculate it at seven miles, and Vesuvius and Krakatoa and Kilauea still mutter their awful warnings. Socially, we are in a similar condition—

For we are ancients of the earth,
And in the morning of the times.

When the good Prince Albert, in 1851, invented world’s fairs and organized the first one, it was hoped that the brotherhood of man had been demonstrated, and the era of universal peace begun; but in three years there was a bloody war that involved more than half of Europe, in which the only thing contended for was commercial supremacy. And many who read this page have seen in our freest of all free countries a million men fighting to the death and spending their last dollar for what they themselves now admit was a mistake. Boast as we may of our inventions, our arts and our learning, our fair gardens, our romantic palaces, and our courts of equity, we have yet but a thin crust of civilization spread over a heated mass of savagery; and organized force is all that saves us from anarchy. Of all the women who are asking for an irresponsible ballot, there is not one who would dare to walk through our metropolis in broad daylight, past its churches, its art-galleries and its court houses, if it were not for the policeman at the corner and
the great armory whose shadow crosses the avenue and falls upon
the steps of the sanctuary; and of the unthinking men who wish to
give it to them from a vague sense of fairness, there is not one
who could go alone into the coal-regions and proclaim his opinion
that the great strike is unjust.

Such is the brutal truth about the suffrage and its basis; and a
brutal truth, when it exists, must be admitted and reckoned with
like any other truth. In our elections as now held, there is no
security for the verdict unless the majority is sufficient to assure
those who are in the minority that if they refuse to submit they will
be coerced. With the proposed extension of the suffrage, if the
votes of the women are so divided as not to affect the result, then
the women might as well not have voted, and their presence at the
polls will be a useless and costly addition to the electoral machinery.

On the other hand, if an election is carried by a preponderance
of votes cast by women, who is to enforce the verdict? When a few
such verdicts have been overturned, we shall find ourselves in a state
of anarchy.

We may admit all that those excellent women say about the
purity of their politics, their determination to educate themselves on
public questions, and the probability that they would vote in the
interests of civilization and good morals. The difficulty is, that the
ignorant are not ignorant enough. When the virtuous woman, the
well-bred woman, the enlightened woman, goes to the polls, she will
meet there no man so ignorant as not to know perfectly well that his
ballot has a metallic basis and must be respected, while hers is nothing
but paper, and he may respect it or not, as he pleases.
THE BULWARK OF INDIFFERENCE.

In spite of the immense array of arguments and statistics marshalled by the opposing forces on the Woman’s Suffrage question, it seems to me that one fact is too little considered. I refer to the fact of woman’s indifference to the ballot. To quote the greatest statesman of modern times: "There has never within my knowledge been a case in which the franchise has been extended to a large body of persons generally indifferent about receiving it!"

Our ears are weary of the cry reiterated by the suffragists: ‘‘If you do not wish the ballot at least permit us to have it.’’ Such has not been the history of great movements! The will of the majority—however perverted, however uninformed—holds the reins of power. The suffragists must confess that in the Eastern States, at least they are but a remnant.” In their own eyes, perhaps, Matthew Arnold’s “incomparable, all-transforming remnant,” but their business as a ‘‘remnant’’ is to convert the majority—then their cause is won! To remove woman’s indifference to a sudden and appalling increase of burdens laid upon her is the only legitimate work of the Suffragists! This besieging of legislatures, this worrying of conventions, the din and clamor with which men of influence are pursued is unworthy and unwise. Every Woman Suffragist knows that if a majority of her own sex demanded the ballot, she would get it. Men, nearly always chivalrous at heart, yield to what they believe women desire.

Why are Women Indifferent?

The fact is, that the last twenty years has opened such new avenues for woman’s activities, the arena stretching before her is already so vast that even in her haste to be on an equality with man she shrinks from the too-multifarious and bewildering duties of political life. She has not yet attained the sure footing in her business and professional life that could make her wish to grapple with the most subtle and difficult problems the twentieth century has to face.

What are her opportunities at present? From a recent census bulletin it is discovered there are 1,025,525 women employed in the manufacturing and mechanical industries of the United States; 679,509 women carrying on agriculture, fisheries and mining, and 268,726 in the professions, 245,230 of which are teachers. In steno-
ography and type-writing women out-number men two to one. There are 129 butchers, 191 carpenters, 83 undertakers, 24 hostlers, 4 locomotive engineers, 59 blacksmiths, 2 auctioneers and 1 pilot. There are 237 female hackmen, 3,949 actresses, 1,235 ministers, 4,555 physicians, 337 dentists, 208 female lawyers, 22 architects, 888 journalists, 6,714 literary and scientific women and 10,810 devotees of the arts. In addition to these are the hosts of those in older occupations, boarding-house keeping, store-keeping, dress-making, and domestic service. It will be seen women do not need the ballot to give them a chance to earn their daily bread!

There are deep causes for the indifference of women to political duties. Active, eager-hearted women pushed by circumstances into the world find their hands more than full in learning to equip themselves for the new careers opened to them in the last twenty years. They are willing to leave to men the field which is peculiarly their own. The exigencies of the time demand a division of labor, and in the political field women are not unmindful that men have in the main been quick to protect their interests. But it is not among the professional women, the business women, the working women where the bulwark of indifference may be said to be the strongest. It is among the thousand home-keeping women of the state, whose busy lives are filled with daily service along the traditional lines of “good mothers,” “good neighbors,” “good wives,” where the indifference, nay shrinking from political burdens, is the greatest. It is this inertia which our friends, the Suffragists, must overcome! Can they do it? Until they have touched what may be termed the heart of the Commonwealth, their cause is not won!

In the closing years of this century, in some respects more restless and turbulent than preceding ones, the bewildered spirit, worn by the jar and fret of endless controversy, finds solace and hope in this bulwark of Indifference, which, representing the conservative instincts of the community, stands as a safe-guard to the reckless encroachments of a “remnant” of the people!

F. R. S.
Woman, whether new or old, has immense fields of culture untilled, immense areas of influence wholly neglected. She does almost nothing with the sources she possesses, because her whole energy is concentrated on desiring and demanding those she has not.

* * *

Her influence on children might be so great that through them she would practically rule the future of the world; but she delegates her influence to school boards if she be poor, and if she be rich to governesses and tutors; nor does she in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred ever attempt to educate or control herself into fitness for the personal exercise of such influence.

* * *

The immense area which lies open to her in private life is almost entirely uncultivated, yet she wants to be admitted into public life.
Women's legislation would be, as that of men is too often, the offspring of panic or prejudice; and she would not put on the dray of common-sense as man frequently does in public assemblies. There would be little to hope from her humanity, nothing from her liberality; for when she is frightened she is more ferocious than he, and when she has power more merciless.

* * * *

The New Woman is a menace to human kind with her fierce vanity, her undigested knowledge, her overweening estimate of her own value and her fatal want of all sense of the ridiculous.

* * * *

The error of the New Woman lies in speaking of women as the victims of men, and entirely ignoring the frequency with which men are victims of women.

* * * *

It never seems to occur to the accusers of man that women are just as vicious and as lazy as he in nine cases out of ten, and need no invitation from him to become so.

* * * *

Woman may help man sometimes, but she certainly more often hinders him. Her self-esteem is immense and her self-knowledge very small. I view with dread of the future of the world, the power which modern inventions place in the hands of a woman. Hitherto her physical weakness has restrained her in a great measure from violent action; but a woman can make a bomb and throw it, can fling vitriol, and fire a repeating revolver as well as any man.
These are precisely the deadly, secret, easily handled modes of warfare and revenge, which will commend themselves to her ferocious feebleness.

Everything which tends to obliterate the contrast of the sexes, tends also to destroy the charm of intercourse, the savor and sweetness of life.

Neither men nor women of genius are any criterion for the rest of their sex; nay, they belong, as Plato placed them, to a third sex which is above the laws of the multitude. But even whilst they do so, they are always the foremost to recognize that it is the difference, not the likeness which makes the charm of human life.

Every word, whether written or spoken, which urges the woman to antagonize against the man, every word which is written or spoken to try and make of her a hybrid, self-contained opponent of men, makes a rift in the lute to which the world looks for its sweetest music.
God Created Man and Woman Somewhat Differently—The Difference cannot Be Obliterated.

The Right Rev. Geo. F. Seymour, D. D., while conversing with a Times reporter said: 'God created male and female in the image of God. The image of God unites them and the hand of God differentiates them in making them two halves of a whole. Each has its place, and the woman has, if one pleases, the better place, as she is the 'better half.'

'Having said this, I wish to add that God, in making woman, implied her place in her physical constitution,
organic functions, and practical duties. These lines are drawn by the divine hand. Human hands may seek to obliterate these lines and succeed in obscuring them, but they cannot destroy them.

"Man may apparently suspend for a time the laws of God by his presumption and folly, but he cannot repeal them, and human genius and ability cannot create a new man, much less a new woman. They may seem to do so in a wretched counterfeit and distortion, which may seem for a time to be a success, and gratify, and perchance amuse those who covet novelties, but in the end it will be, and must be a failure.

"The blessed gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, has steadily emancipated woman from the thraldom under which the brutality and lust of man had brought her, and restored her to the place which God originally assigned her.

"As a son, as a brother, as a husband, I bless God for the place which he gave women in creation, and to which he restored her in the person of Jesus Christ in the blessed gospel. As a woman, as God made her and as Christ dignified her, she is all glorious within, and protected by the reverence and affection of the civilized world. As the new woman, she will be divorced from the home, from her chil-
dren, from her brothers, from her husband, and from her former self, and become a creature indescribable."
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"The New Woman" and the problems of the day.

(From Appleton's Popular Science Monthly.)

As there is a new everything in these days, we suppose it was inevitable that there should be a "new woman;" though why a new woman more than a new man it might not be easy to explain. For our part we believe but faintly in "new woman;" we believe in woman. We believe in progress; we believe that new times call for new measures; we believe that these are new times, and that it behooves both men and women to prepare themselves to meet the demands which the age is making on them. Men and women every¬where have been roused, we might almost say stung, into a sense of individual existence; and, looking round on their changing environ¬ment, they are asking a thousand questions to which as yet no very certain answers can be vouchsafed. Woman is awake because man is awake; the keenness of the times has roused them both; and from both we seem to hear the inquiry made by the jailer at Philippi, when startled from slumber by the trembling of the earth and the flashing of a strange light: "What must I do to be saved?" The difference between the so-called "new woman" and woman without that qualifi¬cation is that the latter would wish to be saved with man and the former apparently without him.

The two principal questions which to-day confront society relate to the future relations of men and women and the education of the rising generation. The allegation is freely made in many quarters that marriage is a failure; and no doubt frequently it is. None the less, however, is it the case that no scheme that has ever been pro¬posed as a substitute for marriage merits a moment's consideration. It is easy to provide theoretically for the gratification of passion and impulse, but not so easy by any means to show how by any union less solemn and abiding than marriage the higher natures of men and women can be duly developed and their lower propensities kept in check. We do not look to any new women for light on this question; but we do look to the best women of to-day to join with the best men in indicating the higher path which the generations of the future may tread. There is a gospel on the subject which has to be preached and
so far as individual action can do it, enforced, the gospel that there is more in marriage than for the most part poets have sung or romancers dreamed, and that the failures of which we hear so much have been, in the main, failures to grasp the true conception of it and to make a right preparation for the duties which it involves.

The hope of the future lies mainly in well ordered homes—homes in which children are trained to be just, reasonable and humane, in which they are taught to look with an intelligent eye upon the phenomena alike of Nature and of society, in which they learn lessons of industry and self-reliance, of honor, purity and self-respect, and are guarded against the vulgar worship of wealth and worldly success. It is for the wise and noble women of our time to help to make such homes, and it is for men to see to it that they are worthy of partnership in so sacred a cause. It is no time for any silly rivalry or futile opposition between men and women, who are as necessary to one another now as at any previous age in the world's history—nay more necessary. On the contrary, it is a time for earnest council and vigorous co-operation on the part of all who have the interest of the present and future generations at heart; and the less we hear of the separate and conflicting claims of men and women the better. There is ample scope to-day for the efforts of all, and if any stand idle in the vineyard, it must be from lack of will, not from lack of opportunity.
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THE SILENT WOMAN.

An Expression of Anti-Suffragist Sentiment—Voting is a Dead Issue—The Leading Women of a Western State Indifferent to the Matter—Suffrage Lectures Ignored—Must the Opposition Break Silence in Order to be Effective?—Future of Suffragists.

A New York woman who has spent the winter in a leading city of one of the middle Western States, enjoying exceptional opportunities for meeting the women who are its leaders in social and club life, was asked recently by the Anti-Suffrage League of New York, of which she is a member, to make an initiatory movement for the organization of a State anti-suffrage society in the city where she was a guest. After laying the subject before the women who might be properly chosen to head such a movement, those identified with the best social and intellectual life, her answer to the Anti-Suffrage League of New York in substance was as follows:

"The women of this city are not interested in the suffrage movement; and they fairly represent the women of the State. They look upon the question as a dead issue. They say—'Why organize to oppose what we care so little about? And then, the anti-suffragists of New-York are settling the matter for the whole country.'"

The New-York woman had noted that the question never came up in the woman's clubs of that middle-west metropolis. She had enjoyed that feature of discussions, after what she had known in the clubs at home—where the political equality of woman was rung in, no matter its remoteness from the subject in hand. Nor was it the indifference of ignorance. Having had enough of the subject it had been dropped. A lecture by a prominent suffragist, before one of the Greek letter societies of the university of the city, the lecturer a graduate of the university, had excited little interest, not even a note of opposition, eloquently as she had depicted the wrongs of her sex, and striven to kindle revolt. It would have been folly to organ-
ize an anti-suffrage league in such a community, and yet, the suf-
fragists are planning a raid upon the town, and possibly the Silent
Woman will yet see that she made a mistake.

It has taken nearly a half century to convince the Silent Woman
of those States where the suffragist has a strong support, and assumes
to speak for all the women of her State, county and town in her
demand for the ballot, that unless she makes open protest against
having the ballot thrust upon her against her will, she may yet find
herself burdened with what she must not only accept but use; and
that her silence is helping the suffragist to win a victory quite as
much as if she signed suffragist petitions and spoke from suffragist
platforms.

The Silent Woman has been forced, in New-York State at least,
to take sides; to protest against being included in the venerable pre-
lude of the majority of suffrage petitions; "We the women of" etc., etc.

As long as the male citizen would speak for her, and vote for
her right to reject the ballot, the Silent Woman had been more than
satisfied not to appear in the arena where the suffragists delighted to
be. But when the male citizen chivalrously bowed himself off the
field, leaving the women to settle their differences of opinion between
themselves, declaring that he was ready to give or withhold the bal-
lot, as a majority should decide, what help was there for the Silent
Woman but to gird herself for battle? to defend her right to be bal-
lotless if so she chose to remain.

Noiselessly, with no flourish of bulletins or platform harangues,
the Silent Woman has been in evidence already, on several notable
occasions, the dexterity of her sudden checkmate a surprise to her
adversary. What did the bulky petition that the suffragist lay be-
fore the New-York Constitutional convention (an unending list of
signatures gathered without discrimination) amount to when offset
by the protest of the Silent Woman—every signature of weight—
"quality counting more than quantity," a protest against having
that word "male" struck out from the Constitution, as the suffragist
pray that it might be. Then, for the first time, the Silent Woman
felt her power; and the suffragist recognized the fact that "tyrant
man" was as nothing in comparison to the Silent Woman. And
when the suffragist confronted the Silent Woman again at the St.
Louis Convention, saw her actually standing up in committee and
protesting in the name of the great majority of the women of the country against the plank the suffragist had ready for the Republican platform (another victory,) what wonder that the suffragist lost her temper quite, and one of the results of that defeat has been the decision to postpone active warfare in New-York State for awhile, "whose conservative ideas and a large illiterate population," (to quote from Miss Anthony) "prevent that State from falling into line as soon as some of the Western States undoubtedly will."

The tactics of the opposing forces have little in common. The suffragist declares that the Silent Woman is a foe in ambush, so secret are her movements, so sudden her descent when least expected. New-York State is now well covered with anti-suffrage leagues; as are some of the New England States. There is no holding of conventions, save parlor conferences, unreported by the press. The Silent Woman is proving that almost any one of the leaders of her cause can do quite as much with a visiting-card as a platform woman can do on the other side in addressing a mass-meeting.

It is the social influence that tells most with the majority of women—something that the suffragist is learning and adopting with considerable success. The Anti-Suffrage Leagues publish and distribute a vast number of leaflets, but they have no special organ; nor does the Silent Woman, like the the suffragist, stop her paper when it advocates what she thinks an injury to her cause; nor has she learned to maintain a "Woman's column" in some prominent daily, a column that she can control so far at least as to give it an anti-suffrage trend, if in only a single item or paragraph.

"I don't want the ballot and I won't have it." That sums up all that the average Silent Woman cares to say upon the subject. She is not to be led into a debate with the suffragist. She knows the suffrage argument by heart. Has she not heard it for nearly 50 years? Why waste breath in denying that she is "the slave of man"; that she is "in financial slavery"; that she is indebted to the suffrage movement for legal rights, and for all the advance made by her sex within the last 50 years? The fundamental statements of the suffragists are fallacies to her, particularly that one before all others a foundation-stone: "Man is bad, woman is good, man is a failure as a politician; woman would be a success; the ballot in the hand of woman will remedy all the ills of higher civilization. . . ."
The Silent Woman knows better; why discuss the subject? She knows how the women voted in the three States where they could at the last Presidential election, and gives thanks that there are no more stars on the suffrage banner. She does not believe in the total depravity of man, nor in the total righteousness of woman. She believes that the vote of the illiterate foreign woman of New York would not hasten the arrival of the millennium, and she knows that she can do more for the advancement of every true reform without the ballot than with it.

There is a pathetic phase in the suffrage ranks just now—an annual eulogizing of the venerable veterans of the movement upon their birthdays—the laying of anticipatory laurels upon their memory. When that is over—when the heroes of the lost Waterloos have disappeared, who is to take their places?

The coming leader of the suffragists has not yet put in an appearance. The signs are that when the veterans are gone, disintegration of the party will follow—petty jealousies dividing it into petty cliques never to be consolidated into a grand army.

The suffrage movement has been a grand safety-valve for the discontented woman in revolt, a type as old as creation, coeval with that of the discontented man. Next? Something must be already emerging from what Carlyle called "the endless vortices of froth-logic," to fill the gap the suffrage movement will leave in its wake.

"The signs of the times cease to alarm me," wrote Lowell to a friend, "and seem as natural as to a mother is the teething of her seventh baby. I take great comfort in God. I think He is considerably amused with us sometimes, but that He likes us on the whole, and would not let us get at the match-box so carelessly as He does unless He knew that the frame of His universe was fire-proof. How many times have I seen the fire-engines of Church and State clanging and lumbering along to put out—a false alarm. And when the heavens are cloudy what a glare can be cast from a burning shanty."

"It may be a false alarm." says the Silent Woman, "but we don't want the ballot and we won't have it—so there."

A. S. W.
The Woman's Bible.

When Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the Rev. Phebe Hanaford, Clara Bewick Colby, the Rev. Augusta Chapin, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Mrs. Mary Seymour Howell, Mrs. Josephine K. Henry, Mrs. Robert C. Ingersoll, Mrs. Sarah A. Underwood, Mrs. Catherine F. Stebbins, Ellen Battelle Dietrick, Mrs. Cornelia Collins Hussey, Lillie Devereux Blake, Matilda Joslyn Gage, the Rev. Olympia Brown, Miss Frances Ellen Burr, Mrs. Chapman Catt, Miss Helen H. Gardner, Mrs. Charlotte Beebe Wilbour, Mrs. Lucinda B. Chandler, Mrs. M. Louise Thomas, Mrs. Louisa Southworth, Mrs. Martha R. Almy, and other prominent women suffragists announced to the world that they had constituted themselves a revising committee of the Bible, or at least to revise "those texts and chapters directly referring to women, and those also where women are made prominent by exclusion;" claiming as a basis for their work that "women's political and social degradation are but an outgrowth of their status in the Bible," no one deemed it more than the utterance of an illogical disputant.

But ever and anon there crept into the press some article bearing reference to the fact that the revising committee was prosecuting its work. And yet the world wagged on in its old way without thought of the tremendous effort going on in its midst. At last it took form and shape. The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse! The woman's Bible, or that part of it known as the Pentateuch, is given to the public! In the introduction is a little fling at Bishop Doane. He probably did not conceive that his name would go down to posterity thus honored.
The book of Genesis is the one first combatted. They claim that when God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" that instead of the Trinity handed down to us there were Father, Mother and Son. That if God created man in His own image, male and female, then He combined Himself the properties of both. It is said that the story that woman was created after man and not simultaneously with him "was manipulated by some Jew, in an endeavor to give 'heavenly authority' for requiring the woman to obey the man she married." Mrs. Stanton says: "It is evident that some wily writer, seeing the perfect equality of man and woman in the first chapter, felt it important for the dignity and dominion of man to effect woman's subordination in some way." Mrs. Blake in following out Mrs. Stanton's idea says that in naming the mother of the race "she shall be called woman" in the ancient form of the word womb-man. She was man, and more than man because of her maternity." (This is the point that the anti-suffragists insist upon; and here is a law not laid down by man, incontrovertible, and defining woman's sphere in life as separate from that of man.)

The story of the fall is used to eulogize woman. Some "serious doubt" is expressed "as to the forbidden fruit being an apple, as none grew in that latitude." But they console themselves with the thought that some man says: "It must have been a quince," as given on page 24. Still, Satan had a profound knowledge of human nature, and saw at a glance the high character of the person he met, "as he did not try to tempt her by brilliant jewels, rich dresses, worldly luxuries or pleasures, but with the promise of knowledge." "Compared to Adam, she appears to great advantage through the entire drama."

We are reminded of a sermon we heard delivered by a country pastor on the Prodigal Son, who was seen by his father on his return, "leaning on the picket fence, whereupon the father laid down the newspaper he was reading, wiped his spectacles, and said," etc., etc.

Mrs. Stanton comments bitterly on the cruelty and injustice of Abraham and Sarah to Hagar, and Clara Bewick Colby takes her to task for it; which shows that great minds do not always run in
the same channel; but despite that, Mrs. Stanton goes on to say of Rebekah that "she, too, is lacking in a nice sense of honor;" and with a truthfulness that carries her beyond the littlenesses of sex, she says of Rachel, her "character for theft and deception is still further illustrated," and "Potiphar's wife surpasses all the women yet mentioned in perfidy and dishonor."

The commandments are "chiefly for men," but the fifth one is a surprise, as it refers to honoring the mother. Passing hastily on, we notice that the "chief point of interest in the parable of Balaam and his ass, is that the latter belonged to the female sex." Abraham is summed up by Mrs. Blake in these words: "Like many a modern millionaire, he was not a self-made man, but a wife-made man," as "he gained wealth at the price of his wife's dishonor." The promises of God of "great fruitfulness" suggest the statement: "If it had not been for polygamy and concubinage, the great harvest so recklessly promised would have been meagre indeed." And we find in closing this remarkable hyperbole: "The utter contempt for all the decencies of life, and all the natural personal rights of women, as set forth in these pages,"—the Bible—"should destroy in the minds of women, at least, all authority to superhuman origin and stamp the Pentateuch at least as emanating from the most obscene minds of a barbarous age."

We think that the general reader will feel convinced that the cause of woman suffrage will not be advanced by this effort of the leaders to bring woman into prominence.
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THE WOMAN'S BIBLE.

Mrs. Stanton and her colleagues have written a collection of commentaries and criticisms on certain Scriptural passages involving the status of womankind, and called it "The Woman's Bible." It commences with this exordium, "'The Bible teaches that woman brought sin and death into the world, that she precipitated the fall of the race, that she was arraigned before the judgment seat of Heaven, tried, condemned and sentenced. Marriage for her was to be a condition of bondage, maternity a period of suffering and anguish, and in silence and subjection, she was to play the role of a dependent on man's bounty for all her material wants, and for all the information she might desire on the vital questions of the hour, she was commanded to ask her husband at home.

Those who have the divine insight to translate, transpose and transfigure this mournful object of pity into an exalted, dignified personage, worthy of our worship as the mother of the race, are to be congratulated as having a share of the occult mystic power of the eastern Mahatmas.'"

Mrs. Stanton's first important discovery is that the Trinity, contrary to general belief, is composed of a Heavenly Father, Mother and Son. This novel theory is based on the first chapter of Genesis, verses 26, 27 and 28. Concerning which she says, "'Here is the sacred historian's first account of the advent of woman; a simultaneous creation of both sexes, in the image of God. It is evident from the language that there was consultation in the Godhead, and that the masculine and feminine elements were equally represented. The first step in the elevation of woman to her true position, as an equal factor in human progress, is the cultivation of the religious sentiment in regard to her dignity and equality; the recognition by the rising generation of an ideal Heavenly Mother, to whom their
prayers should be addressed, as well as to a Father. If language
has any meaning, we have in these texts a plain declaration of the
existence of the feminine element in the Godhead, equal in power
and glory with the masculine."

Mrs. Blake, as might have been expected, is very severe on
Adam, in the episode of the Garden of Eden, and expresses serious
doubts as to the forbidden fruit being an apple, as none grow in that
latitude, but consoles herself with the thought that it may have been
a quince. Referring to the conversation between Eve and the
serpent, she remarks, "The tempter evidently had a profound
knowledge of human nature, and saw at a glance the high character
of the person he met by chance in his walks in the garden. He did
not try to tempt her from the path of duty by brilliant jewels, rich
dresses, worldly luxuries or pleasures, but with the promise of
knowledge, with the wisdom of the Gods. Like Socrates or Plato,
his powers of conversation and asking puzzling questions, were no
doubt marvelous, and he roused in the woman that intense thirst for
knowledge, that the simple pleasures of picking flowers and talking
with Adam did not satisfy. Compared with Adam she appears to
great advantage through the entire drama."

Mrs. Stanton is evidently a disciple of Malthus, for when she
comes to the tragedy of Cain and Abel she writes, "If Adam and
Eve merited the severe punishment inflicted on them, they should
have had some advice from the Heavenly Mother and Father as to
the sin of propagating such an unworthy stock. No good avails in
increasing and multiplying evil propensities and deformities that
produce only crime and misery from generation to generation."

"The critical reading of the ten commandments," observes
Mrs. Stanton, "will show that they are chiefly for men," although
she concedes the wisdom of the fifth one and does not object to the
Golden Rule. Especially contemptuous are the comments on
Aaron's action in depriving the women of the jewels wherewith to make
the golden calf. "To procure the gold he took the jewelry of the
women, young and old, men never understanding how precious it is
to them, and the great self-sacrifice required to part with it. But as
the men generally give it to them during courtship, and as wedding
presents, they feel that they have a vested right therein for emergencies.

It was just so in the American Revolution, in 1776, the first delicacy the men threw overboard in Boston Harbor was the tea, woman's favorite beverage. The tobacco and whisky, though heavily taxed, they clung to with the tenacity of the devil-fish. Rather than throw their luxuries overboard they would no doubt have succumbed to King George's pretensions. Men think that self-sacrifice is the most charming of all the cardinal virtues for women, and in order to keep it in healthy working order, they make opportunities for its illustration as often as possible. I would fain teach women that self-development is a higher duty than self-sacrifice.

We are told many things, among others, speaking of the Ark, "The paucity of light and air in this ancient vessel shows that women had no part in its architecture, or a series of port-holes would have been deemed indispensable.'"

"That if Miriam had planned the journey to Canaan, it would have been accomplished in forty days, instead of forty years.'"

"That the chief point of interest in the parable of Balaam and his ass, is that the latter belonged to the female sex. Her virtues have been quoted in the stately cathedral, in the courts of justice, in the editorial sanctum, in both tragedy and comedy on the stage, to point a moral and adorn a tale. Some of the fairest of Eve's daughters bear her baptismal name, and she has been immortalized in poetry and prose. Wordsworth sends her with his Peter Bell to enjoy the first flowers of early spring.'"

"Though the women were ignored in all the civil affairs and religious observances of the Jews, yet in making wars on other tribes, they thought them too dangerous to be allowed to live, and so they killed all the women and children. The women might much better have helped to do the fighting, as it is far easier to die in the excitement of the battlefield than to be murdered in cold blood. In making war on neighboring tribes, the Jewish military code permitted them to take all the pure virgins, and child women for booty, to be given to the priests and soldiers, thus debauching the
men of Israel and destroying all feelings of honor and chivalry for women. This utter contempt for all the decencies of life, and all the natural personal rights of women as set forth in these pages, should destroy in the minds of women at least, all authority to superhuman origin and stamp the Pentateuch at least as emanating from the most obscene minds of a barbarous age.

We wonder if this work, which purports to represent the coming woman, who is to frame our laws, purify our politics and reform the scheme of creation generally, will bring many converts to her cause.
THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE VOTE.

An Analysis of It by the Man Suffrage Association.

Every County and Every Congressional, Councillor, Senatorial and Representative District Went Against It—A Defeat Twice as Great as That Scored Against Prohibition.

The Man Suffrage Association has analyzed the recent vote of the state on the question of granting municipal suffrage to women, and has summed up its conclusions in a letter to the public. The letter follows:

To the People of Massachusetts:

After 25 years of agitation by the suffragists the question of municipal suffrage for women has been brought to a test. The voters have been asked their opinion and have given an emphatic reply.

Never before has there been so full an expression of opinion upon any question submitted to the people of Massachusetts. The vote for Governor at the state election was 328,121. The vote of the men upon municipal woman suffrage
was 273,976. Over 83 per cent. of those voting for Governor voted upon this question, while upon the most important amendment to the constitution since the war, that abolishing the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, only 61 per cent. of those voting for Governor voted on the amendment.

Never before has any question submitted to the people of Massachusetts received so overwhelming a defeat. The vote of the men was, "No," 186,976; "Yes," 87,000; a "No" majority of 99,976, only 24 short of a round 100,000. The vote in 1889 on the prohibition amendment to the constitution was, "No," 131,062; "Yes," 85,242; a "No" majority of 45,820. So that the majority against woman suffrage in Massachusetts is more than twice as great as that against prohibition.

The vote of the women on the suffrage question—"Yes," 22,204; "No," 864—is as significant as that of the men. By the census of 1895 the number of men in Massachusetts qualified to register and vote on this question is 561,699. The number of women qualified to register and vote on this question was at least 575,000. Of these more than 550,000 declined to vote, and less than four in a hundred voted "Yes," in other words, more than 96 per cent. of the women of the commonwealth either prefer the present status of the suffrage, or are wholly indifferent in the matter.

In 47 towns not one woman voted "Yes," and in 138 other towns the women voting "Yes" numbered 15 or less. As the vast majority of the women opposed to the suffrage expressed their opinion by refusing to vote, the women's vote, for the purpose of tabulation, has little value. In the following statement of votes, therefore, the votes of the men alone are considered.
Massachusetts has 31 cities and 322 towns. Of the 31 cities, every one cast a large majority against women suffrage. The vote of the cities was, 'No,' 120,657, 'Yes' 54,012: a "No" majority of 66,645. Many people have thought that the vote against woman suffrage was disproportionately heavy in the cities, but this is not so. The vote of the 322 towns was "No" 66,319, "Yes" 32,988; a "No" majority of 33,331. The cities of Massachusetts contain two-thirds of the population of the state, and in an even distribution of sentiment, should therefore contribute two-thirds of the "No" majority. That is what they have done, and the closeness of the figures to an exact two-thirds is remarkable. Of the 322 towns, 293 voted "No," 28 voted "Yes," and one was a tie. The 28 towns voting "Yes" were among the very smallest in the state, their vote averaging only "Yes" 51, "No" 42. Every county and every Congressional, councillor, senatorial and representative district in the commonwealth cast a majority against the proposition.

In view of such a result it would seem that further agitation of the question at present is uncalled for. For the executive committee

FRANCIS C. LOWELL, Chairman.
CHARLES R. SAUNDERS, Secretary.

Boston, Dec. 4, 1895.
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The Wrong of Suffrage.

By Heloise Jamison.

From an Article in the American Woman's Journal for May, 1894.

The brave and steady old-time defenders of woman's enfranchisement have added little to their argument for thirty years. In one or another of its bearings, taxation without representation was the basis and almost the extent of their reason for believing that the ballot should be granted to them. The later and more scientific trend of thought is seen in the method used by the new converts to the doctrine. The early suffragist said: "Men alone make the laws for men and women. We want a voice in decisions on our own property." "We are classed by the State with minors and incompetents—criminals, paupers, idiots and women; these are the excluded classes. We want that changed." The purification of politics was much dwelt upon. The argument that citizenship involved military, jury and police duty, was met by the statement that not all men served in any of those capacities, and that the suggestion that such service was involved in the vote was a mere bugbear. To the argument that family life would be disturbed, it was answered that if religious differences had not served to sever domestic relations, political ones would not. As to office-holding, also, they held that, as injustice was done in the withholding of the ballot, if that wrong were righted, adjustment would follow properly in regard to that and to other questions.

The modern recruits to the cause are nothing if not speculative. They treat the theme philosophically. They cast a broad glance over the ages, note the development of the race, and pause at the cradle of Christ to point out the human mother of Divinity as the type of a new life for the free woman. They talk of France and England, and say that broadening of law has been in direct proportion to the enfranchisement of man; that organization and trades-unionism would have no power were it not for the ballot. They say that the most perfect organization—that which has long existed in this country in educational matters, for instance—has not benefited the standing of woman teachers in regard to compensation; that business women and working girls may form themselves into protective companies until doomsday, but without the ballot their appeals are lost. They talk of labor in new terms, and predict that the time is near when not to add to the store of values by effort of the hand or brain will be a disgrace. These new apostles of an old creed present glowing pictures of the progress of women in the latter half of the present century. They point to her kindergartens, her colleges, her clubs, her investments, her accumulations of money and her hospitals, extol her physicians, her lawyers, her clergymen, her novelists, her poets, her painters, her musicians, her actors, her vocalists. They recall the fact that for the first time in our nation's life the government, as such, has recognized woman in appointing a Board of Lady Managers for the World's Columbian
Exposition, and that that board was able to find, in the work of woman architects and decorators, something worthy a place in the glorious pageant which revealed the intellectual, material and moral greatness of our land. There they pause and say: "After this, the ballot. The suffrage movement is not revolution, it is evolution. These are the steps thus far, the next is forward to political enfranchisement." They then pass from the path of accomplishment and enter again the field of speculation. They predict that with the power to vote will come the power to reform law, to command higher wages, to win greater respect for their opinions. They no longer inveigh against man as their enemy, but they would fain be his ally in making civilization effective in all its possible results. Their aim certainly is worthy of regard; is their reasoning true?

First as to the easy, simple thesis: "There should be no taxation without representation." That seems founded in a reality, and the question is: What is taxation and what is representation? Taxation is the charge made for the support of organized society, and representation is the utterance used in guiding the government that is the formulated expression of that organized society. That leads us back to the question: How came there to be a government? When and how did society agree to be represented and to be taxed? The awful story of history, from the record of the slaying of Abel to that of the slaughter of half a million men in the war of secession, is the answer. It never did agree; it has not yet agreed. The struggle of civilization is the effort to make it agree. Implanted in the bosom of man by his Maker is the belief in his individual freedom—of worship as concerns that Maker, of protection as concerns man. Side by side with that was implanted the principle of surrender of that freedom for just cause. Progress, or evolution, has been the development of these contending principles, the learning of the just cause for the maintenance and the surrender of individual freedom. There came a time when men said, "Let us use arguments instead of force, words instead of blows, in these decisions," and some form of vote was instituted. With this they fought and voted by turns, as they set up or knocked down emperors, kings, popes and presidents. The so-called right of suffrage, the ability to vote, was the right that belonged to a man, not as a member of the human family, but as a fighter who believed in self-surrender for the good of organized society, and as the self-surrender principle gained ground could contend for it by force against the principle of individual freedom. War has been changed by progress, because man has changed, but brute force to drive home the truths gained daily on the moral battlefield is still the power behind the throne of the national conscience even in this enlightened land.

If we consider the subject of woman suffrage at all, we must consider it in the light of this tremendous fact. The ballot and the bullet are not only convertible terms, but they are different modes of expressing the same thing. To be a citizen is to be a possible soldier. There is no way of fulfilling the moral part of the duty and leaving unfulfilled the physical. It is cowardly to attempt it. The question comes next, would military duty be impossible for woman? Wouldn't it be wild? The form one
than half the population in many places, a large portion of it in all. Certainly, nurses could go to the battlefield all the more advantageously if they were uniformed and paid by government; and women surgeons, physicians, commissary officers could do effective work only as they were recognized portions of an army. The navy, too, would need such service. This would involve institutions for training government nurses and physicians. But it is puerile to suppose that military service could stop with nursing or catering. Do women intend to demand citizenship, and then shirk the utmost that it involves? Something has been said about chivalry; that men would never wish to see women made soldiers. The movement is not a claim for chivalrous treatment, but for equal rights. Equal rights they demand and should wish to receive. Their husbands and brothers go to war in the ranks, or are summoned to subdue a mob. Shall the wives and sisters who have equal vote in sending them not have equal duty? Before the law there could and should be no distinction on account of race, sex, or previous condition of servitude. The same is true of jury and police duty. It is only the protected classes that have a right to demand release. That suggests another long cry of the advocates of suffrage—the classification of non-voters: criminals, paupers, idiots and women. At the Columbian Exposition they exhibited a picture of the fine face of Frances Willard surrounded by the ideal countenances of the classes named, as an object lesson in the degradation of woman. What did it really represent? The fact that in this conflict of the ages, even in the brutal past, man has guarded the non-combatants with sacred care. They were together as the babe and the grandsire are together, that they might be fought for and not fight. While the unfortunates of the race demand only care and pity, they, the women, were all that made it worthwhile to fight at all. As mothers, they were reverenced; as sisters, they were to be kept from evil hands; as sweethearts and wives, they were to cheer the battle, and inspire to victory. They were the meaning and the moral of the social system; and if they fail now to believe in that interpretation of their grouping before the law, woe betide the criminal, the pauper and the idiot. Woman's chance of saving, elevating, caring for them lies in staying with them behind the barrier that love has raised. Her chance of protecting herself and man is to go with him to the edge of battle, pray for him in the needs-must of public duty, be the incentive for his return, and the reward of his hard endeavor. If this is degradation, will it be removed by the ballot? What moral greatness can she not attain without that, and what will be gained by her subjection to the one condition imposed by it alone?

That leads to the direct consideration of the question of the purification of politics through the votes of women. The arguments that favor her possession of the suffrage say that she will, by her very nature, favor good causes, which will therefore gain great strength, while the contrary arguers urge that she would be politically more easily duped than men. It is held that one advantage would be that as women attend more to the duties laid upon them than men do, and are more zealous, there would be fewer indifferent voters in either sex if they were a spur in the sides of public
These questions take up the subject where it is usually discussed—not as broadly related to the facts of history, but as a matter of present expediency; not as a principle but as a dogma. Let us look at it, therefore, purely as a moral question. Supposing a government could be formed by consent of the governed which should not rest on force; how then would it be, taking all other questions as they are? Here let us consider the attitude of the new reformers—the scientific attitude.

In discussion of the theory of evolution, pure and simple, the exponents of the doctrine come, now and then, to what may be called, in geological parlance, faults. They evolve a whole series of facts, and then skip one that they cannot evolve, in order to go on evolving beyond the chasm. In much the same spirit, though with few facts of experience to evolve from, the new leaders are now discussing suffrage. What proof have they that out of the voting power alone can come industrial liberty? What proof do they show that the payment of higher wages to men results solely from their possession of the ballot? What evidence have they that only the strikes of voters can succeed? Strikes of the non-voters in our kitchens have long been successful. How can they support their affirmation that organizations of working women have been ineffective because their members cannot vote? The marvellous moral, intellectual, commercial progress which they depict as already accomplished by woman they talk of as the stepping-stone to the ballot; but they skip the necessary evolutionary statement as to how she attained thus far without the ballot, and why she cannot go on attaining ad infinitum without it still. Will any defender of the cause assert that progress will stop if the ballot is not given, if even it is shown that it is not wanted?

Has there not been confusion of terms? Would it not be nearer the truth, and more clear in its suggestion, if we spoke of the duty, not the right, of suffrage?

Woman's place is in the forefront of life, that of the family and of the nation. The destiny of the race is in her hands. God and man have placed it there, and it is in no spirit of self praise or gratulation that she must carry on what is, after all these ages, but just begun. Every power in her must awake; she will decide what public work is consistent with this final duty and what is not. Chivalry is no myth of the middle ages, but a truth of the century about to dawn. The names of mother, wife, sister, must not become the foot-ball of sentiment-mongers or of mistaken realists in thought. If the ballot would be a hindrance, we must have none of it. Influence we are fast attaining—shall we endanger it? What law is there that we could not have to-day for an intelligent and united asking? I fear that we could have even the wrong of suffrage, so great is the confidence reposed in us. Let us realize our true position, and know that the advantage may be, and was meant to be, all with us. That man has taken, and meant to take, the brunt of the world's work, that we, in time, might have opportunity to carve out for ourselves and for him, all that in us lies, all the possibilities of life for both. Let us remember and prize the fact that we have the right not to vote.
VIEWs ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Reasons Given by Three Eminent Persons Why Women Should Not Vote.

Herbert Spencer's position on woman suffrage.

Herbert Spencer in "Justice" maintains that there are fundamental reasons for keeping the spheres of the sexes distinct. He had formerly argued the matter "from the point of view of a general principal of individual rights," but he finds that this cannot be sustained as he "discovers mental and emotional differences between the sexes which disqualify women for the burdens of government and the exercise of its functions."

Extract from a letter from Bishop John H. Vincent, the founder of Chautauqua, on woman suffrage.

"When about 30 years of age, I accepted, for a time, the doctrine of woman suffrage, and publicly defended it. Years of wide and careful observation have convinced me that the demand for woman suffrage in America is without foundation in equity, and, if successful, must prove harmful to American society. I find some worthy women defending it, but the majority of our best women, especially our most intelligent, domestic and godly mothers, neither ask
for nor desire it. The curse of America to-day is the dominated partisan vote—the vote of ignorance and superstition. shall we help matters by doubling this dangerous mass? Free from the direct complications and passions of the political arena, the best woman may exert a conservative and moral influence over men as voters. Force her down into the same bad atmosphere, and both man and woman must inevitably suffer incalculable loss. We know what women can be in the commune, in riots, and on the rostrum.

Women can, through the votes of men, have every right to which she is entitled. All she has, man has gladly given her. It is his glory to represent her. To rob him of this right is to weaken both. He and she are just now in danger through his mistaken courtesy."

Views of John Bright on woman suffrage.

John Bright, the patriot, the tried and valued friend of every movement for the general benefit of woman, accustomed to equality of women in Friends’ meetings, was one of those who on May 20, 1867, voted in favor of Mr. Mill’s amendment to strike out of a reform bill the word “man,” and insert the word “person.” Nine years afterward, in March, 1876, he spoke against the enfranchisement of women. When charged with having changed his opinions, he said that he gave Mr. Mill the benefit of the doubt, and sympathized with him in a courageous stand, and in a letter published in “The Woman Question in Europe,” by Theodore Stanton, he wrote:

“I cannot give you all the reasons for the view I take, but I act from the belief that to introduce women into the strife of political life would be a great evil to them, and that
to our own sex no possible good could arise. When women are not safe under the charge or care of fathers, husbands, brothers and sons, it is the fault of our non-civilization, and not of our laws. (As civilization founded on Christian principles advances, women will gain all that is right for them to have, though they are not seen contending in the strife of political parties."

To this he adds personal testimony:

"In my experience I have observed evil results to many women who have entered hotly into political conflicts and discussion. I would save them from it."
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WHAT GOOD WILL SUFFRAGE DO THEM?

Women interested in the suffrage question frequently find among those who have signed the petition asking for the suffrage, many who will say, "I did not want it for myself. I signed it for the sake of women less happy than I, less prosperous than I, for the working women, etc." If such a one has found out for herself by personal effort in investigation, or by study, or upon reliable authority that the working women do both need and wish the ballot, she may be justified in signing her name as she did. But if she has done it upon mere hearsay, or upon acceptance of floating opinion sentimentally held, or with a vague sense that she may be helping someone, somehow, somewhere, sometime, is she not taking a grave responsibility upon herself, this of trying to do something for others when she is not definitely and specifically convinced that it will be what these others need? Many working women, it is true, have been told that the ballot will bring them better wages, protection against the brutality of men, and the sure sympathy and protection of women themselves. But is this true? Does a thoughtful woman believe that these changes can be brought about "in a mechanical sort of a way?" Must not an improvement in wages come about "through social and industrial changes," and not by legislative enactment? There is a noble society in New York, the "Working-Women's
Protective Union," its object being "especially to provide women with legal protection from the frauds and impositions of unscrupulous employers." Let me quote from an address by Hon. Chauncey M. Depew, published in the last report of this Union:

"There is another mission which this society performs, and that is in procuring employment. There are one hundred thousand working-women in this city, and they get, on an average, only about two or three dollars a week, and they have no other means of support. For two thousand years Christianity has been endeavoring to ameliorate and elevate the condition of women. Among savages they are beasts of burden; among barbarians and Mohammedans they are toys and slaves; but among us, notwithstanding that my friends the Women's Suffrage Association have not got all they wanted, woman has every right that man has, and every privilege except the right to vote, and the right to vote would not protect her in just the things that we are looking after to-night." That is to say, does not Dr. Depew say that the right to vote is not what women need to procure them better paid employment and justice at the hands of their employers? And as to this latter subject, Dr. Depew says:

"But it is not alone men who do these acts of fraud and injustice. It is one of those anomalies that I have never been able to account for, that women are more cruel to each other than men are to them; and among the worse oppressors, as I learn from the records of this society, of the poor women of New York are the women employers who have those great fashionable establishments where dresses, cloaks and hats are made."
And upon the same subject, I quote from the address of Mr. Frederic R. Coudert at an anniversary of this same protective union:

"The laws are all right; you can't find any fault with those, so far as equality is concerned. What you want is sympathy; and, hard as it may seem, it is not always the sister that gives this sympathy to the sufferer; it is more frequently the brother that gives it; and when it comes to making the hard bargain with the woman, commend me to the economical and fur-clad lady, who is thrifty in saving six-pences."

(Signed,)

PROTESTANT.

ALBANY, N. Y., May, 1894.

Papers and pamphlets can be obtained, and Protest signed at Headquarters Anti-Suffrage, 70 North Pearl Street, ground floor, under the Kenmore Hotel, Albany.
Why Women Do Not Want to Vote.

TALK TO LEGISLATORS BY A TAX-PAYING WOMAN
NOT NEW AND NOT STRENUOUS.

THE BEST ALBANY HAS HEARD AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

REASON FOR CONTENTMENT.

BUSINESS NEVER ENTRUSTED BY ONE WOMAN TO ANOTHER.

THE SLANDER UPON MEN WHO ARE RIDICULED
FOR WHAT THEY DO FOR WOMEN.

(From the New York Post, March 8, 1905)

Nothing has come from the Judiciary Assembly Committee this morning of the proposal to grant taxpaying women in third-class cities the right to vote at special tax elections. It was put fairly and hard on behalf of women who do not want the suffrage, and the committee had an hour’s hearing which stirred their interest and warmed their hearts as few hearings do. Last year the Woman’s Suffrage Association tried a long time in vain to have some one introduce the same measure, its chairman reporting: “It was offered to a number of senators representing third-class cities or villages where taxpaying women vote, but it was ‘I pray thee have me excused’ with all of them, and the same spirit manifested itself in the Assembly, a most discouraging state of affairs.” It was necessary to wait for Senator Ambler (one of the eldest of the country legislators) to return from the South, and “he secured the services of Assemblyman Bedell,” of railway grab fame, to introduce it in the Assembly.

Yesterday’s hearing developed nothing much except clever and animated opposition, Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, a taxpayer, being
the speaker—a gentle woman of a by no means obsolete sort, who stood at the end of the table and gravely, amiably, with the pleasant fluster that might be expected, began by saying: "This measure is not asked for by the taxpaying women or men of the cities which it affects. The lady who asked Senator Raines to introduce the bill lives in Geneva, where taxpaying women now have the right to vote, through their charter. In fact, seventeen cities of the third-class have obtained the right in this way. Did the other cities which this bill affects, feel the need of, or even desire the extension of suffrage to its taxpaying women, they could easily secure an amendment to their respective charters, as the seventeen before-mentioned cities did."

The committeemen threw away their cigars. Mrs. Crannell went on:

"Is it not true that one reason why each city has its special charter, which may differ radically from that of any other, is that provisions quite necessary for one city would be useless, or worse than useless, in another? Four of the cities legislated for by this bill submit all questions of special appropriations to the Legislature, viz., Schenectady, Lockport, Dunkirk, and Auburn; and Ogdensburg submits to the Legislature all questions of bonding."

**PRESENT CONDITIONS.**

She gave information as to present conditions in the State, saying:

"Four of the cities which come under the provisions of this bill, Olean, Oneida, New Rochelle and Fulton, provide that the husband, though he may not have any property in his own name, may vote upon taxpaying propositions if his wife is the owner of property. This is based on the theory that a large proportion of the property on which women are taxed is virtually the homestead, or property deeded them by their husbands to protect the family against possible loss through business ventures.

"What are you going to do with these nine of the fifteen cities legislated for in this bill? You either take away the husbands' votes in the four cities I have spoken of, or you give those households two votes, for the bill provides: "This act shall not be construed as abridging the right heretofore conferred upon any person to vote at such election." What are you going to do with the other third-class cities that have no tax elections, their Board of Estimate or Common Council deciding all questions?

"There is much being said about 'home rule.' Why abrogate it in a case like this?"
“Where it has seemed expedient to give to taxpaying women the right to vote, it has been granted. If a resident of one of these fifteen cities desired to have its taxpaying women vote, it would only be necessary for her to ask the senator or assemblyman representing her city to introduce a bill providing for such an amendment to the city’s charter, and you, gentlemen, would act upon it, governed by the desire of the citizens of that city, for or against the amendment.

“If it were shown to you, on the contrary, that there was no desire for, and no need of such an amendment on the part of its taxpayers, male and female, but that it was what the present bill is acknowledged to be by its inceptors, simply an entering wedge which shall in the fulness of time cleave its way to the root of our established laws and government, giving full suffrage to all women, regardless of property, education, morality, you would not report it, I am sure. And this is what we claim this bill to be.”

By this time the committeemen, and those who had come to discuss technical subjects of the workings of laws, had wheeled their chairs about, and clerks came from their work to stand and listen. The speaker continued, not in the snippy or severe or insinuating manner of the male attorney, or the positive get-off-the-track manner of the “new woman,” but evenly, with the calm wisdom of fireside women to grown sons:

KERNEL OF THE MATTER.

“Speaking of the discouragement in not having this bill reported last year, the woman suffragist said: ‘While taxation without representation is tyranny, legislation without representation is greater tyranny. Is not that the gist of the matter? Why should one-half of the adult population of this State be governed by a male oligarchy, while women are concerned as deeply as men in the legislation that affects humanity?’ This is the kernel of this ‘equitable measure.’ Not only is the woman taxpayer to vote, whether she wishes to or not, but women everywhere are to vote, and to hold office, that this ‘male oligarchy’ shall no longer govern them or make laws for them. I do not believe that your committee would be more competent to discharge its duties properly if half of its members were women. But that is the ultimate aim of all the bills introduced by the Woman Suffrage Association. In Colorado, Utah, and Idaho women are elected to the Legislature, and serve on its committees. I leave it to the intelligence of any of you as to what conditions might, and probably would, prevail if this Senate and Assembly were a mixed body, a sort of co-legislative affair in which women and men participated.

“Under this bill the non-resident, who may be one of the largest taxpayers of the city, has no vote on taxpaying propositions. Cor-
porations pay large taxes, yet they have no vote. The minor may be taxed for years, yet he has no 'voice' nor 'representation.' If this bill be urged as a matter of equity, why not incorporate in its provisions a vote for these disqualified taxpayers? No such universal maxim in morals or anything else ever prevailed, that everybody who pays taxes shall vote. The Declaration of Independence does not say that all men being born free and equal shall have a right to vote.

"It says that they have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and I leave it to any one if the women of America do not possess that right to its fullest extent.

"It is in order that they may enjoy these blessings that their property is taxed. The rentpayer and the purchaser are taxpayers. If the taxes on real estate be increased, the rent goes up, and the tenant pays the tax, indirectly; and the merchant governs his prices somewhat by the rental he pays. So that this bill discriminates unjustly.

"A few years ago the Legislature gave the taxpaying women of towns and villages the right to vote on taxpaying propositions. In very few instances have they exercised that right; but in one village, in which I am interested as a taxpayer, a proposition which all the large taxpayers deemed not only unnecessary, but unwise, was carried by the female relatives of the men who would profit by the employment the provision would afford!

"The taxpaying women of the cities, as a rule, do not want to vote. They do not, in the majority of cases, take an active interest in municipal affairs, such as the laying out of a new street, the construction of a system of water pipes, of sewerage, electric wires, fire and police departments, providing for schools and the poor, for streets and public buildings. So long as only taxpaying men vote on such propositions, it is absurd to intimate that there has been, or ever will be, a discrimination against taxpaying women. No man will vote to increase his tax in order to oppress some taxpaying woman.

"Women are interested sufficiently to wish all these material things, so they pay their taxes willingly for the protection to life and property, and for the comforts this tax provides; but they leave to men, whose business training and experience fit them for it, the practical solution of the government of a corporation, and the details consequent upon the proper adjustment of expenditures, and benefits received therefrom, incidentally allowing the men to stand between them and the enforcement of the laws, where necessary, on the principle that, with the ballot, there is a duty, a service-tax, that no man may deny. For his money-tax he gets all the things women get, no more, no less; for his service-tax he gets the ballot, behind which may lie the bullet.
"Have you ever heard of an instance where the business management of a great estate was placed in the hands of women by women? In Albany there are five banks that have been in existence nearly one hundred years. Of the five hundred stockholders, two hundred and thirty are women; yet, I am told, no woman has ever entered one of them to cast her vote for the officers who are to have charge of her property. It is so unusual as to be of note for a woman to name a woman as executrix of her will. The husband may name his wife, with the cooperation of some man, but that a woman ever gave the disposal of her property into the hands of other women is open to doubt. And yet, the claim is made that the practical business affairs of cities would be better administered if women voted, and that taxpaying women need the ballot to protect themselves! "Isn't that a slander upon the men of America, who have made the women of this country the envy of all other nations?"

CONSERVATISM AND PATRIOTISM.

"Speaker Nixon is reported as saying that women are 'conservative, considerate, patriotic, and intelligent.' It is this sort of complimentary chivalry that the 'conservative' women are afraid of. We do not want you to give us the ballot because women are all conservative—for they are not. If they were I should not have to appear before you to-day; nor because they are all considerate, patriotic, intelligent, for with all due deference to Speaker Nixon's knowledge of women, I must regretfully say they are not. But even if they were conservative, considerate, patriotic, and intelligent, what would that have to do with this bill, that provides for the changing of the charters of fifteen cities, granting special privileges to the woman who has property, against the woman who has none?"

Then came this feminine anecdote:

"Two women who were neighbors and friends in the East, with their husbands, crossed the plains and built themselves houses in Colorado. One man was a Republican, the other was a Democrat, yet they had lived side by side in the East and in the West for nearly half a century without a dispute. Then suffrage was granted to women, and these two conservative, considerate, patriotic, and intelligent women joined each her husband's party, quarreled over their political differences, and have not spoken to each other for two years! In Wyoming one man said: 'If I find the women of my family are not going to vote as I want them to, I hitch up my team and drive out the side gate early in the morning; and as it is nearly fifteen miles to the polls from my house, they generally don't get there to vote.' "And now, gentlemen, I am asked to say by many women of third-class cities that when they want to vote they will not ask the
suffragists to petition for them; they will ask their husbands, fathers, brothers, and you will be asked to amend their charters respectively, and not in a bunch, without regard to conditions prevailing in the different cities, or possible evils wrought by such action. We ask you, therefore, until such time arrives, to not report this bill."

Mrs. Crannell reached for her coat and was helped on with it, and walked out amid such applause as you do not hear often in committee rooms. What she said is given here at length because it is unusual, and an expression from the side of a question which seldom is heard outside the homes of the land.

Officers of the Anti-Suffrage Association of the Third Judicial District, State of New York: Headquarters at Albany, N. Y.

MRS. J. V. L. PRUYN, Honorary President.
MRS. WILLIAM J. WALLACE, President.
MRS. W. BAYARD VAN RENSSELAER, Secretary.
MRS. JOSEPH GAVIT, Treasurer.

Executive Committee.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL, Chairman.
MRS. J. HOWARD KING,
MRS. JOEL R. REED,
MRS. W. O. STILLMAN,
MRS. FREDERICK TOWNSEND,
MISS LUCY A. PLYMPTON.
When Lovely Woman Stoops to Politics

Her Methods so Up-to-Date that the Male Graduate of the "Practical" School Can Learn From Her.

Testimony in the Case of Representative Shafroth of Colorado, who Resigned His Seat.

Shows that She Drilled Repeaters of Her Own Sex.

Stuffed Ballot Boxes and Easily Bluffed "Mere Man."

[From the New York Times, February 21, 1904.]

When lovely woman stoops to politics she can give man points on fraudulent elections. The testimony in the case of Representative Shafroth of Colorado, who resigned his seat the other day because he was convinced that he had been fraudulently elected, is largely a story of woman suffrage. Women vote in Colorado, and the part played by voters of the gentler sex in the Denver election of 1902 is full of suggestion about the purifying influence exerted on politics by them.

According to this Shafroth testimony, the fair voters not only voted fraudulently, but stuffed ballot boxes, bought votes, and otherwise ran the election in a most up-to-date manner. It is also shown, as bearing somewhat upon the elevating influence of woman in politics, that the masculine allies of these female repeaters bulldozed and assaulted women election officials and prevented women from voting by making at the polling places scenes which no respectable woman would care to enjoy long.

The Democrats had control of the election machinery and committed the frauds. A young woman named Alma Beswick seems to have been the head of the ballot-box stuffing and repeating end of the conspiracy. Her name constantly reappears in the testimony, and she seems to be a young woman of great industry and ingenuity and remarkable aptitude for politics. The only hint of her appearance in the evidence is given by a witness who says that she is "dark complected."
Here is the experience of a woman voter and her husband, shedding some light on the question how women are treated at the polls under woman suffrage. The witness, Edwin V. Brake, describes how a man named Owens and his wife came to register. "They stood from an hour to an hour and a half up next the clerk," says Brake, "and the lady was very courteous and nice, and requested three or four different times to be allowed to register. People were repeatedly put in front of them and they were crowded out. They would be up next the railing; they would be crowded back; two or three people would step in front of them. Finally they got mad and went out."

Here is Brake's description of the beautiful effrontery with which the women voters used the registry books: "I could not get the names of three women that I saw register three times without leaving the room. I could not get the names because they would not let us get the names. They registered them twice before Len Rogers, and the third time they went over to the other side to the other clerk."

The duties of a woman worker seem to be extensive in Denver. Joseph F. Maxwell testified that a number of women were put on the rolls who did not register and were not residents, one of whom, Alice Hitt, was "a girl only seventeen years old." Being asked who vouched for the names when they were put on the rolls he said:

"Miss Alice Donovan, who has been a prominent Democratic worker in that precinct for years. She has been Democratic judge, Democratic clerk."

**Market Price of Women's Votes.**

Maxwell said he discovered a woman voting in one polling-place under the name of Mary O'Leary and in another as Mary C. Bates. He arrested her, and she made a confession which shows that the market rate for women's votes was $1. This woman, whose real name was Harriet Hibbard, and her daughter, were hired by Mary Crilley as repeaters at that rate.

The sort of experience good women had to undergo at the polls is illustrated in the testimony of A. Newton Patton. He brought two girls named Baker, both Republicans, to the polling
place to register. One of them had been ill and was only just able to be about.

The Misses Baker took their places in line and Patton stood talking to friends for twenty minutes. Then his attention was called to the fact that there were as many people ahead of the Bakers as there had been at the outset. "Billy" Green, a Democratic worker, was crowding people in ahead of the two girls. Patton stepped up to the counter and told the clerks that one of the Misses Baker was ill, and that he did not think it right to put late comers in ahead of her.

Green called Patton a name which he would not repeat in his testimony and told him to get out. Seeing that the sick girl was becoming nervous at the prospect of a fight, Patton swallowed his anger and stepped back. In fifteen minutes, the girls still being as far as ever from the counter, one of them beckoned Patton over and said that her sister was so ill that she did not think they could wait. Green again ordered him back. At the end of an hour one of the Baker girls succeeded in getting to the counter, and called Patton to vouch for her; according to law.

Green then used "language too indecent to be used in any place on earth," and told Patton he could not vouch for anybody. "The names that he used and the profanity in the presence of the women I will not repeat." Green then called on some tramps to throw Patton out.

"I replied," says Patton, "that one of those women was very sick, and that I would go in order to avoid trouble."

But they fell on him and threw him out, Green putting his hand on a revolver. The object of the demonstration, of course, was to drive the Baker girls away, and it succeeded. He found them in the street, and tried to get them to go back and register. "They said that they did not want to endanger their lives by going into such a place again, and all my persuasion would not induce them to do so."

Another illustration of the way in which voting was made pleasant for refined women was given in the testimony of Thomas Clarke that a polling place was established in a disorderly house.
No doubt many of the repeaters were women of the lowest class, but not all of them. Witness the testimony of George P. Costigan, Jr., who had been telling about two women repeaters:

Q. Did they look like respectable women?  A. Yes, these two were.

Woman's Clever Trick.

A pleasanter side of women's aptitude for politics is given in the testimony of Mrs. Mary McGrath, a Republican who discovered a way to beat the registration frauds. She took a number of Republican women to register, but the clerks would not allow them to do so. Mrs. McGrath was beaten for a while, but presently she noticed that some men who wore buttons bearing the name of Stimpson, the Democratic candidate for Governor, were promptly registered. "I spoke to Mrs. Ashworth about it, and I said, 'Well, if we had a Stimpson button we would get registered, too, and get waited on in time.' So I got a lot of Stimpson buttons, and we told the women we would not go up with them any more, but gave them the buttons and they went to Democratic headquarters, and they got vouchers for them there and had them registered at once."

Yet this natural-born politician said on cross-examination:

Q. You are a Republican?  A. I have always voted that ticket, because my husband was a Republican; but I don't know anything about politics.

This same Mrs. McGrath detected a number of women repeaters, and gave a thoroughly feminine description of one of them: "She didn't have no headdress on her head, and had such lovely hair that it attracted my attention. It was auburn, with a large purple bow on top of it, and that was very attractive."

James H. Pershing, one of the Republican candidates, saw a carriage driven by a Democratic politician named Bramer and containing four women. Bramer drove to each polling place, and the women would get out and vote, re-enter the carriage, and drive to the next. When Bramer noticed that he was being followed he and some other Democrats held Pershing's horses and kept him a prisoner while the carriage drove on. Bramer's
indignation at being followed was characterized by one delicious picture of woman suffrage in operation:

"They said," testifies Pershing, "that this following their carriage would have to stop. Mr. Bramer said his wife was in that carriage, and that he didn't propose to have her followed by another man."

Some Republicans interfered and the injured husband knocked one of them down and tried to shoot him.

But the testimony of Mrs. Beatrice Muhlemann is the prettiest thing in the two big volumes of evidence. She was a member of the ballot-box stuffing conspiracy; but some of the Democrats testified that she was a Republican spy. On Saturday before election Frank J. Medina took her into a hotel room, locked the door, and asked her if she would work for him "fixing up ballots and getting out repeaters." The price agreed on was $100, and he paid her $50 down.

On Sunday Mrs. Muhlemann, with the industrious Alma Beswick and George S. Granger, a Democratic election judge, went to a place on California street, where they found the ballot box. On the lounge was a package of ballots tied and sealed. Granger and Miss Beswick, after locking the door, opened this package and took out 125 ballots. With these, "a bottle of ink, a bottle of mucilage, and a few pens," they went to the St. Nicholas Hotel and Miss Beswick took a room. When they got in "Miss Beswick locked the door, the curtains or shades were drawn down tight, gas lighted, and then the bundle of ballots was opened by Granger. Then Granger said we should tear off the first or top perforated strip with the number on it of each ballot, and then we took off the second numbered perforated strip, and all the strips were laid on the back of a chair. After they were all off Mr. Granger put them all in his pocket except three, which I took unknown to him.

"Then Miss Beswick said the ballots must be marked as she said. She took perhaps a third of the whole number, and she marked two with the word 'Republican' in the blank space at the top of the ballot where the voter is supposed to write the name of the ticket he votes; another 'Old Soldiers,' one 'Socialist,' one 'People's Party,' and one 'People's Democrat.' Then
we all three wrote in the rest of the 125 ballots in different styles of handwriting, writing the words 'Democrat,' 'Democratic,' 'Democracy,' and 'the Democratic ticket' in the blank space. I wrote two of the ballots with my left hand so as to disguise my handwriting."

**Instructing Women Repeaters.**

They numbered and folded the ballots, and each took charge of some of them. On Monday Miss Beswick came for Mrs. Muhlemann, and they drove around visiting the women who were to do repeating and giving them instructions. A Mrs. Pritchard joined the two women, and they made the ballots correspond with the pollbooks, which they had. The Democratic clerk for the precinct, Johnnie Bremer, came in to get his orders from Miss Beswick. Miss Beswick's last job that day was to arrange a scheme by which the Republican judge of election was to be ousted and a Democrat put in his place. Miss Beswick was to insist that Young, the Republican judge, go to the courthouse to get a registration certificate. While he was gone she would elect Stodgedale, a Democrat, to his place, and when Young came back he would be kept outside the 25-foot limit. Granger reported to Miss Beswick, and that fertile worker told him she had arranged to have twenty-five men start a fight at the polling place in the course of which the Republican watchers and challengers were to be thrown out.

Lucius W. Hoyt saw five girl repeaters go into the same polling place and vote twice within ten minutes. Asked if they were disguised the second time, he said, "Oh, no, the same dress exactly; they hadn't changed it at all. It was a conspicuous dress." Hoyt demanded their arrest, but was told to shut up; whereupon "Bramer shook his fist at me and the girls made faces at me, and some other pleasantries of that sort."

The joyous informality of voting under woman suffrage was thus strikingly stated by Hoyt, his subject being a special constable named Maloney:

"I saw on one or two occasions women apparently going by, and Mr. Maloney would run after them, stop them, have a few minutes' conversation with them, and they would come back and
vote. Apparently as they were going by they didn't know the polling place was there, were going somewhere else, and they would turn around and come back after he spoke to them."

Samuel Wood said that that Alma Beswick brought in the women, whom Hoyt followed, and one of them, Maria Dawson, voted five times. Miss Beswick also "brought in a lot more, and she brought the hackful around that Pershing started to follow. Wood also said that many of these voters did not remember the names under which they were to vote, and Miss Beswick, in such cases, would announce their names for them. Ollie Vaughan, "a girl that keeps a little restaurant," also brought in squads of alleged repeaters.

Miss Beswick's ability was well known to her Republican opponents, and Wood said, "I had heard the day before that she was sick, and she is a pretty good worker, and I was hoping she would stay sick for a day or two."

While women repeaters, as already stated, got $1 per vote, $5 was paid to women not accustomed to this work, for a single vote. Mrs. Mary Aldrich testified that Benny Simon, a Democratic worker, offered her $5 to vote under the name of Margaret Cain, but she did not do it.

Was Not Her Old Beau.

Miss Sarah E. Stout was a Republican challenger, and her testimony sheds a delicious light on the human interest side of woman suffrage. A man came up and attempted to vote in the name of a person named Soco. Miss Stout challenged him as not being Soco at all. The judges were out of patience with her. "Why do you challenge this man's vote?" they demanded. "Here you are making yourself ridiculous, challenging votes all day, and it doesn't do you any good."

"Mr. Soco used to be my beau," was the crushing answer. "This man I never saw before."

"The judges dropped their heads," she adds, in her testimony. But they let the man vote.

Miss Stout's observations about the men who came in to vote under names they had not learned perfectly were acute and enter-
taining. She told about a man who came in to vote under the name of Stephen something. He was a mere boy, and he carefully pronounced his name "Step Hen."

She gave the Democrats a lot of trouble, and at last they resorted to violence. A man attempted to wrest her book from her. "I closed my book, put it down at my side, and he hit me on the other side opposite the book, threw me over against the wall and on the chair, and my book dropped at my side under me, and he grabbed hold of me, jerked me on the floor, then he grabbed my book and wrenched it from my hand, and hollered very loud. No one came to my assistance."

Her book was gone and she was helpless. She went home with a pain in her side and did not come back. So much for the purifying and elevating effect of woman in politics upon the chivalry of man.

"There was a Comstock that lived on Champa street," says this acute witness, "and they were going to have a man vote that name; and as the name was Priscilla, and it was a man who was trying to vote, they could not get it twisted around right; so they told him his name had been voted and he could not vote, and he left."

Another delightful picture of woman exercising the franchise is contributed by William H. Medaris:

"A lady went to vote. She wanted to vote a McKinley ticket. They told her there was no McKinley ticket. She says, I want to vote the Roosevelt ticket. They said there is no Roosevelt ticket. So after she had gone the judges said, 'Well, we beat you out of one good Republican vote there.'"

**When Unlucky Man Intervened.**

At one polling place Mrs. Jane Warns, the Republican judge, appointed Mrs. Lila Fierstone as her clerk. Mrs. Fierstone had come with her husband, a doctor, as escort. The Democratic judges, who had appointed their own clerks, told her she could not be a clerk. She insisted. The Democrats stood her off until the unlucky husband, Dr. Fierstone, was incautious enough to "butt in" with a suggestion that they look up the law. This interference of a man gave the Democrats their opportunity.
Dr. Fierstone went out on his head, losing the buttons off his vest in the mêlée. This, of course, settled the question, and Mrs. Fierstone followed her husband home.

The human interest side of woman suffrage is again indicated in the statement that Ernest Thompson took his sweetheart (now his wife) out of town on election day, and while they were gone two Democrats voted on their names.

Mrs. Warns, as a Republican judge, had plenty of excitement after the Fierstones were routed. While the Democrats were dragging Mrs. Fierstone out by the arm after her husband, Mrs. Warns secured possession of her clerk's book. "When Lunney seen that I had my clerk's book," she says, "he threw me over against the chair and stepped on my foot and smashed my toe all to pieces and jerked the book away from me and threw it over to this clerk, and Steck pushed me one way and he pushed me the other."

As this did not discourage her they resorted to getting between her and the book and crowding her into a corner when she tried to look at it. But she did her work somehow. They stole her poll book and her pad, but she got an old piece of cardboard and wrote on that. Then they abstracted her pencil, but she got a pen.

She caught one of the clerks altering the books and protested. "Then he jumped up and cursed and swore around there—oh, it was just awful language he used." After the ballots were counted she closed the box and prepared to lock it. "Lunney jumps up and tries to take my key away from me. He smashes my nose and bent my key almost double trying to get it away from me, but he didn't get it. And he opened the box and sat down on top of it and I went home."

A woman who had been hustled out of a polling place by Billy Green came to George W. Gildersleeve and said she had been to a good many places, but that was the toughest place she had ever got into.

Frederick T. Armstrong told how the Democrats forced unfortunate women to vote under other women's names, under threats of arrest. One of these women, Alberta Curtis, could not be bulldozed, and when she got to the polling place insisted on
telling what her real name was and declared that she had not registered.

John D. Fleming told how a Republican watcher named Hanson was thrown out by a policeman named Kennedy for challenging a repeater. "Kennedy could hardly stand upon his feet, and he reeled back and explained: 'Because he was acting ondacent, Sergeant; because he was acting ondacent in the priscine of the lady.'"

The only woman present was Rose Finnegan, the Democratic clerk. It will thus be observed that Republican watchers must be careful what they do in the presence of women in Denver.

A colored woman named Mary Walker, who could not read, came to the polling place and fell into the clutches of the celebrated Billy Green, who fixed her ballot for her. Her testimony is just a little bit pathetic:

"I told him I wanted to vote the Republican ticket. I asked the gentleman to get it down right; if he didn't it would be a lie that he would never be forgiven for. That is just what I told him."
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Why Suffrage would not help Women.

"E. S. C." Thinks those Taxpayers would be worse off than now.

To the Editor of the New York Tribune:

When the colonies were taxed by the English Government without having representation in Parliament, and when they were not only taxed without representation of their community, but had special taxes imposed upon them which were not laid upon the people of England, they said justly: "Such taxation without our being represented at all, without our needs, without our interests being represented in Parliament, is tyranny."

Our forefathers objected to the taxation because it was unjust. To-day, women who are clamoring for suffrage have taken up the axiom of our forebears, and twisting it out of all recognition of its original meaning, have placed it on their banner as an incentive to strengthen their ranks.

And who are the women who make all the hue and cry about want of "representation" by taxpaying women? Are they the taxpayers? In very few instances. Should "representation" be claimed for all women because some women are taxed? Will it benefit the taxpaying women to have "representation" when by gaining that "representation" she has put as much power into the hands of thousands that will neutralize her "representation"?

To-day the man who holds taxable property, and who contributes largely to the public coffers, has no more voice as to the amount of money to be raised or its expenditure than the man who pays no taxes at all. The vote of the ignorant and debased has as much weight in determining the policy of the Government as that of the educated man, the man of business, or the man who has devoted his life to studying the problems of government.
The vote of the millionaire is worth no more than the vote of the pauper; and as the percentage of women with taxable property is vastly less than those without, how will the taxed women be benefited, should woman suffrage obtain? They will have nominal representation, but practically they will be more misrepresented than they are at present. Individuals have always had to submit to taxation without representation. The minority is always voiceless.

A taxpaying woman said: "I live in a small town and pay large taxes; next door to me is a man who pays very little. At every meeting called for 'improvements,' which means largely increased taxes for me, this man votes, and I have no voice. Is this right?" She was asked if the man was married, and if he had daughters over twenty-one years of age. She replied that he had a wife and three daughters. When she was asked if she thought her condition as a taxpayer would be improved when, instead of one 'voice' against her interests, she had five, she confessed that she hadn't thought of that.

And that is the trouble; women do not stop to think. They feel the injustice of a law that gives to the pauper the same right to impose obligations upon the property owner as that of the wealthy man himself, and they fail to see that the same conditions would prevail in an aggravated form if all women were permitted to vote, and they forget that the wealthy minor has no "voice;" that the man who, living in one town, owns property in another, has no "voice," and that large corporations pay taxes but have no "voice."

It is not, after all, so much a question of taxpaying women as it is of a body of women who are constantly seeking some change in the existing condition of things, and who use this "voiceless" cry, as we said before, as an incentive to other women.

Taxpaying women do not care to vote. Many of them hold property in corporations, and they always place their proxy in the hand of some man to vote for them, or do not vote at all; and this nullifies the assertion that taxation without representation is tyranny.

Albany, February 29, 1896.

E. S. C.
Woman's Demand for Suffrage.

Unwieldy Millions Already and Ignorance Sufficiently Cumbersome.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

A lady said to me a few days ago: "I am for equal suffrage; I want my freedom, and I want to give my daughters their freedom."
"Freedom from what?" I asked. The lady whom I asked had forgotten to ask that of the suffragists whose special plea had subverted her common sense, and so she could not tell me. One of the favorite expressions of the suffrage leaders is that "women are slaves;" and this in the face of the evidence that legally she has rights superior far to men; that socially she has man at her feet in chivalric attitude; that morally she is where she desires to be, above, or below. There is no legislation needful for her "rights," other than to give her suffrage. And to force her into the political arena; to compel her to take up the burden of an active part in the responsibilities of the administration of government is not to give her freedom, but to curtail her liberty.

We are struggling with hard times. Industries languish. Our farmers pile mortgages upon their lands; and our merchants and bankers go into bankruptcy. Anarchy, like a venomous reptile, lifts its head amid the struggling masses, with a frenzied hiss. Everywhere wise men and women are asking what will be the end? The cry goes up all over the land; how shall we regain our prosperity? The answer varies as in the theatre at Ephesus, agreeing only in this that Congress must come to the Nation's relief. It must "do something." Do what?
Our fathers would have taken the question to a body of experts, wise enough to form, and small enough to express and enact an opinion into a law; for they believed that the Nation's safety depended upon the restriction of suffrage to those who should be most competent to its exercise; but we have the pitiable necessity of submitting the question that touches human welfare at every point to 13,000,000 of people, most of whom are utterly ignorant regarding the absolute need of the times.

And to this unwieldy mass a few visionary people ask that as many millions of women, even more fully uninformed and ignorant, be added—ask that when Patrick O'Flaherty goes to the polls he may be accompanied by his wife, his mother and his daughters; that Gustave Schwartz shall not exercise his "right" of suffrage without the same power being given all of his female relatives, and that Washington Lincoln Freeman shall call on his way to the polls at our kitchen for Dinah and Chloe and Stella.

Then, we are informed, the whole Nation will be enlightened, politics purified, the wheels of Government oiled, and peace and prosperity will settle down upon the land like a dove with folded wings, and women shall have their freedom! God grant the day be far distant!

Albany, April 25, 1896.

E. S. C.
WOMAN AND WHINE.

The world's women have spoken their mind and departed from our midst, and one is at last able to sit down calmly to recall the prevailing note of the International Congress. Day after day the clatter of tongues went on. Five meetings concerned with as many different subjects would proceed simultaneously, and eager women would dodge from one to the other for fear of missing a single idea, making rushes now and again to luncheon parties, receptions, or evening "at homes." It would be difficult to name a subject, from shoes and ships and sealing-wax to cabbages and rings, which did not come within range of the feminine tongue. And yet it is not easy to say what is the outcome of it all. This is perhaps partly due to the multiplicity of the problems which the ladies set themselves to solve; partly, perhaps, to the exuberant verbosity of speakers who found themselves face to face with the chance of a lifetime. For it not infrequently happened that an enthusiastic speaker had reached her time-limit before she had finished her exordium; and you can hardly criticise a sermon of which you have heard no more than the text.

But now that the dust has settled and the tumult subsided, the note that remains in our ear is not, as might be supposed, one of jubilation and triumph at the amazing progress of womanhood to the goal of emancipation, a career, and an income. The note is rather one of complaint, of dissatisfaction, of a wistful regret. Of all the speeches which assailed our ears, that of Mrs. Fenwick Miller will linger longest in our memory. Women are elevating the newspapers, purifying the Post-Office by their presence, and earning very respectable salaries. But just as Mr. Henry George was startled to find that the tramp had appeared in the free and glorious United States, so Mrs. Fenwick Miller is troubled that in the newer and nobler world of which woman is the guiding spirit the lazy husband shows, as it were, the slippered foot. The husband of the woman with a career takes it for granted that his wife should go careering and earn an income; he himself lies upon the sofa at home, reads novels and smokes cigars. He does not even mind the baby and order the dinner. And Mrs. Fenwick Miller complains bitterly that so many women are handicapped by the obligation to support lazy husbands. Now, this aspect of the case is really a very serious one,
for it suggests a difficulty which will certainly have to be faced by
the careering sex. There are, to put it frankly, not enough careers
for everybody to have one. And if our women despatch our tele-
grams, write our novels, tend our libraries, run our farms, and heal
our diseases, there will be by so much the less room for men in the
world of work. The lazy husband will find ample apology in the
fact that his wife insists upon doing the work which should have
fallen to his share.

Perhaps, however, we are not progressing so much as we
imagine. It is true that the speakers at the Congress laid almost
irritating stress upon the "enormous strides made by women." (It
is not an attractive picture of the present-day woman!) But it is
not easy for the individual to determine whether the social move-
ment in which he is borne along is a forward one or a backward one.
And we have no little apprehension that the appearance of the lazy
husband denotes a retrogression to barbarism rather than a progress
towards the millennium. In savage countries the men do not work.
It is the women who bear the burdens and till the ground, while the
men sit calmly by and enjoy their leisure until such time as they feel
like killing somebody. With civilization came the belief that women
should have the easier time, while men did the work. But women,
not knowing when they were well off, demanded a reversal of the
position. It must be allowed that men showed no particular eager-
ness to renounce the responsibility of earning an income for their
womenfolk to spend. When, however, women had seized upon the
positions which their husbands had found anything but easy, one
may understand that the husbands were quite ready to accept the
situation, and return to the barbaric practice of making the women
do the work.

Likewise we may understand the feelings of the woman who,
having got what she wanted, finds that she does not want it at all.
She does not intend, however, to enjoy her newly won privilege of
earning the income of the family without effectual protest, as we
gather from a horrifying suggestion which fell from Mrs. Fenwick
Miller's lips. It appears that women, if they do not get all they
want, more particularly the Parliamentary franchise, are advised to
take it out of their husbands at home. The horrors of civil war
would be nothing to those of a struggle waged by means of ill-cooked
fish, half-cooked *entrees*, and indigestible joints. The power of a
wife to make her husband uncomfortable is almost unlimited, and
his discomforts would come from so many quarters that he would not
know whose hand was smiting him. If only the members of the
discontented sex could decide exactly what they want, and organize
a domestic campaign to get it, the lazy husband could not hold out
for a week. The careering wife would be admitted to the House—
if she were not previously turned out of the home.
Woman Has Many Advantages.

What She Would Lose Should Her Demand for Equal Rights Be Granted.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

The suffragists are claiming that the only property privilege of any consequence "which women have over men," and which they must lose if they lower themselves to the legal standing of men by obtaining the right of suffrage, is "the right of wives to a support," and they claim that in Wyoming, Kansas, and Colorado, where women vote, there has "never been made any effort to abolish this right."

Every lawyer will smile as he reads this statement, and I am willing to believe every man in New York State will recognize its falsity; but women unfortunately do not seem to be aware of their own legal position, as they assume in some instances that the statement given above is correct.

For the benefit of the women of New York State, Mr. Editor, I would like to be allowed the privilege of stating briefly what women would lose if they demanded equal rights. Until the year 1848 married women were subject to certain disabilities in regard to controlling and disposing of property and making contracts. Single women, however, whether spinster or widow, have always had precisely the same rights as men, and the laws have been made so favorable to all women that to-day their rights are not only equal in all respects to man's but in many cases superior.

A man can not sell and give a good title to real estate until his wife joins the deed. She can sell her real estate without her husband's consent and the title is valid. Men realize this often when they
place in the name of their wives real estate that they may in case of future financial embarrassment, have a home provided for them; and many a woman who "is taxed without representation" is so taxed on property that is virtually the husband's. A man cannot dispose of his property by will, so as to deprive his wife of her one-third interest. But she can will all her real and personal estate—even the property he has given her—to any one she desires to, leaving her husband penniless.

A father can not apprentice his child or appoint a testamentary guardian for the child, without the consent of the mother.

If a woman leaves her husband for proper reasons, he is compelled to support her; but if she has the property in her name and he be poor, she need not support him. If a woman sues for divorce her husband must grant her alimony for life, even if she remarries; but she need not do the same by him if he sues for divorce.

Any married woman may carry on any trade or business, and perform any labor or services on her own account, and her earnings are her sole and separate property, and may be used and invested by her in her own name. She may sue and be sued alone. She is joint guardian with her husband of their children. What legal advantage can she then obtain by the ballot? It has been repeatedly shown that the question of wages cannot be affected by legislation, or that, if it could be, it could not be enforced—and yet, even here, discrimination is made in favor of women; for in New York and Brooklyn if any man fails to pay the wages due a female employe up to $50 he is liable to be imprisoned upon a body execution and kept in close confinement without the privilege of bail, while none of his property is exempt from execution.

Do not these facts prove that there are "other privileges of consequence," that women must give up, if they demand and obtain "equal rights" with men?

Albany, N. Y., March 28, 1896. A. P. P.
Women and the Liquor Traffic.

WHY FEMALE SUFFRAGE WOULD NOT AID THE CAUSE OF PROHIBITION.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

In the Christian Advocate the statement is made that in the city of Philadelphia there are 8,034 persons engaged in the retail liquor business, and of that number 3,696 are women.

So far as the statistics in the cities in New York State have been within reach, I have found that the proportion of women engaged in the liquor traffic is about the same as in Philadelphia. In 1,100 applications for liquor licenses in Boston, 491 women are named as copartners. The list is given in three Boston newspapers, and is not yet complete.

Statistics show that, while the population of the United States has increased but 20 per cent in the last two decades, the number of female drinkers and drug-takers have increased 500 per cent.

In view of these facts, does not the theory that suffrage extended to all women would work for the prohibition of liquor selling seem fallacious?

The laws are strict enough. The trouble is that they are not enforced; and the granting of suffrage to women does not mean anything, so far as their enforcement goes. The ballot is simply a piece of paper, valueless except for the force that lies behind it, and that force is the power to enforce its provisions by brute strength, if necessary.

We have seen in so-called prohibition States that prohibition does not prohibit. And we have seen also in Wyoming, where women suffrage has obtained for twenty-five years, that the laws relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors are very lax, that gambling is allowed by law, and that not a single act of legislation aimed at the betterment of the human race has been passed through woman’s influence.

Let the women enforce the present laws. This will be practical and feasible.

E. S. C.

ALBANY, April 4, 1896.
Mrs. Mary Ellen Lease, the famous campaign orator, was introduced to the club called the Society for Political Study, and made an address in which she denounced "man-made" laws, which she said were unjust to women, which prevented women from having control of their children and forbid women holding property. She was opposed to large appropriations for warships, and called attention to the immorality of men throughout the nation. Mrs. Lease's speech was impromptu, but the subjects she brought up had been studied by the Society for Political Study with the greatest care, and they did not therefore meet with either commendation or satisfaction. As a matter of fact, the expression "man-made" laws is incorrect, because laws are the growth of civilization and represent queens as well as kings, able princesses as well as princes, and, above all, the desire of the great statesmen of the world to do the greatest good for their own people. Even the very common law, that which Mrs. Lease reviles, was made to protect women and children, and in the period where it was made did its work with great thoroughness. In the present time it is not true that the old common law, as Mrs. Lease says, prevails in this country in respect to women. In New York alone, which represents over one-tenth of the population of the United States, woman, with the exception of voting, has more rights than man, and on the other hand, has much fewer responsibilities. A man can be taken away from a great business at a loss of thousands of dollars, from the sickbed of his own child, or from a meeting of his favorite club to serve upon a jury in a case involving five cents, while such a thing cannot occur to woman.
A married woman in New York can deed her property or leave it by will without her husband's knowledge or consent, and even against it, but a married man can do neither. A poor man is primarily liable for his wife's debts, even if she has lots of money, but a rich woman is not liable for her husband's debts, not even if they are contracted when he is sick and is supported by her in her own house. The liberality and generosity of the law to woman in New York State has been followed by a majority of the States of this Union, and more especially those of the North. When Mrs. Lease, therefore, says that there are only four States in which the common law does not govern and control the sex she is stating that which is not the fact. There are four States in which women vote, but voting is not a common law right, and has nothing to do with common law. Voting is an arbitrary privilege created and sustained by statute.
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WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

It is not necessary, in entering upon this question, to dilate on its sentimental side. Nothing can add force or tenderness to the names of wife and home. Suffice it to say, that man cannot withhold from woman anything that is good for her, or give her anything that is bad for her, without injuring himself and their children in the same measure.

Shall man make over to woman half of the sovereign power which has hitherto been his, and which, if he chooses, he can keep? This is the question broadly stated. Woman, in making the demand, shows confidence in man's affection. The rule by which the question is to be settled is the joint interest which the two sexes have in good government, not any abstract claim of right. For an abstract claim of right there appears to be no foundation. Power which is natural carries with it right, while it is subject to the restraints of conscience. Weakness cannot be said to have a right to artificial power, though the concession of such power within reasonable limits may be not only kind but wise, just, and beneficial to humanity and civilisation. That to which every member of a community, whether man, woman, or child, whether white or black, whether above or below the age of twenty-one, has a right, is the largest attainable measure of good government. If this or any other political change would be conducive to good government, the whole community has a right to it; if it would not, the whole community, including the women, or those, whoever they may be, whom it is proposed to enfranchise, have a right to a refusal of the change. The number of women who spontaneously sought the change appears to have been small. Great efforts and vehement appeals on the part of
the ladies with whom the movement originated were required to set any considerable part of the sex in motion. This is important as an indication both of the absence of any great grievance and of the unbiased judgment of the sex with regard to its own interests. But were the demand more spontaneous and general it would still be incumbent on the present holders of power before abdicating to consider whether in the common interest their abdication was to be desired.

As to the equality of the sexes, no question is raised; they may be perfectly equal though their spheres are different, that of the man being public life, that of the woman the home. Nor is there any occasion for pitting male or female gifts or qualities against each other. Supposing woman even to be superior, it does not follow that the field of her superiority is public life.

That the tendency of civilisation has been to elevate woman is true. But elevation is a different thing from assimilation to man. We are told, not so much by women, perhaps, as by their champions, that the time for protection and chivalry has past and the time for justice has come. But it is not made evident that the bare justice, which regulates the relation between man and man, would suit the relation between man and woman, or that chivalry and protection on the one side, with the corresponding recognition of them on the other, do not in this case constitute justice.

The woman suffrage movement is a part of a general attempt to change the relations between the sexes, to set woman free from what hitherto have been considered the limitations of her sex, and make her the competitor instead of the helpmate of man. Women are forcing their way into the male professions, including that of law, into the dissecting-room, in company with the male students, into male places of education, and into the smoking-room. Some of them have lately taken to riding astride. From England we hear that ladies have been undergoing military drill; from New York that they

1 See Mrs. E. Lynn Linton on women as social insurgents in the Nineteenth Century of October, 1891.
have been emulating the training of male athletes and the horsemanship of the steeplechaser. We are reminded of the Roman ladies under the Empire who when other excitement had been exhausted took to that of the gladiatorial school.

The old foundations of authority are shaken by the collapse of beliefs on which social order as well as personal morality has hitherto rested, and by the political disturbance attending the advent of democracy. We are in the ferment of a revolutionary age, and of that ferment the Revolt of Woman, as one of the leaders of the movement called it, is a part.

Among the features of a revolutionary era is the prevalence of a feeble facility of abdication. The holders of power, however natural and legitimate, are too ready to resign it on the first demand. They do not take time to consider whether their power is rightful or not, whether it has or has not on the whole been used for good, whether, if in any case it has not been used for good, they cannot amend their course, or whether it is likely to be better employed by those to whom they are called upon to transfer it. The nerves of authority are shaken by the failure of conviction. It is an inherent consequence of the demagogic system that every demand for the suffrage, reasonable or unreasonable, should prevail as soon as it shows strength, because the politician is afraid by opposition to make an enemy of the coming vote.

It is evident that sexual revolution must have its limitations if the human race is to continue. There are some landmarks of nature which cannot be removed, and the females of every species must be the organs of its perpetuation. Women must bear and nurse children; and if they do this, it is impossible that they should compete with men in occupations which demand complete devotion as well as superior strength of muscle or brain. There appears to be a tendency among the leaders of the Revolt of Woman to disparage matrimony as a bondage, and the rearing of children as an aim too low for an intellectual being. Such ideas are not likely to spread widely, or they would threaten the life of the race. They prevail chiefly in the highly educated and sentimental classes, not in
the homes of labour. Nature, it may be said, will look to this and in the end vindicate her own law. No doubt she will, yet the revolt against her may cost us dear.

If it is a question of right, children have their rights as well as women. They have not less right to motherly care than they and their mother have to being fed by the husband’s labour.

At present the demand in England is only for the enfranchisement of spinsters and widows. But this limitation, while it betrays a consciousness that there would be danger to the family in the full measure, is understood to be merely a stroke of tactics. Widow and spinster suffrage is the thin edge of the wedge. From the political point of view there would be manifest absurdity and wrong in making marriage politically penal, and excluding from the franchise the very women who are commonly held to be best discharging the duties of their sex, and would be likely to be its fairest representatives. Already the thoroughgoing section of the party repudiates the limitation. The spinster and widow vote would be an irresistible lever whenever political parties were nearly balanced. When the suffrage had been conceded to all women, as the women slightly outnumber the men, and many of the men, sailors, for example, or men employed on railways, or in itinerant callings, could not go to the poll, the woman’s vote would preponderate, and government, if it was in unison with the votes, would be more female than male. Nor is it by the leaders and chief authors of the movement intended that we should stop here. The woman of the political platform does not limit her ambition to a vote. She wants to sit in Parliament or in Congress. When she gains her first point she will have practically established her claim to the next; those who are qualified to give a mandate, she will say, are qualified to bear it; those who are qualified to decide principles of legislation are qualified to legislate; those who are qualified to dictate a policy are qualified to carry it into effect. In New Zealand, having gained the franchise, she has already preferred the further claim. It might shock our prejudices at
first to see a woman taking part in a Parliamentary debate. It shocks our prejudices at first to see her taking part in a faction fight, mounting the pulpit, or thundering from a platform, as well as to see her in half male attire, or riding in man's fashion. Established sentiment and old ideas of delicacy have been already set aside. The female aspirant to a seat in Parliament or Congress, and to a place in the Cabinet, will have, therefore, little difficulty in proving her claim. She will have no difficulty whatever in enforcing it. That, the woman's vote will do for her. A tenth part of the woman's vote might do it for her if the parties were nearly balanced and the politicians were alarmed. Politics under the party system are a demagogic auction, and an inevitable slide down hill. In the United States, where all qualifications for the suffrage other than that of simple citizenship have been abolished or practically nullified, female suffrage, like male suffrage, would no doubt be universal. That the change thus presents itself at once in its full extent may partly account for the general conservatism of the American people on this subject. But there is also the safeguard of the special process which is required in the States as well as in the Federation for amendments of the Constitution, and which enforces the submission of the question to a constituency beyond the range of the arts and influences to which individual legislators are apt to yield.

Political power has hitherto been exercised by the male sex; not because man has been a tyrannical usurper and has brutally thrust his weaker partner out of her rights, but in the course of nature, because man alone could uphold government and enforce the law. Let the edifice of law be as moral and as intellectual as you will, its foundation is the force of the community, and the force of the community is male. Women have not yet thought of claiming the employment of policemen, nor of petitioning that they may be bound to answer to the call of the sheriff when he summons the citizens to put down disorder. This fundamental fact that law rests on public force may be hidden from sight for the moment by the clouds of
emotional rhetoric, but it will assert itself in the end. Laws passed by the woman's vote will not be felt to have force behind them. Women are the great prohibitionists, having only too strong inducements, many of them, to support any supposed antidote to drunkenness, and not seeing that the taste of a man engaged in heavy labour and exposed to the weather for the stimulus of wine or beer may be as natural as the taste of his home-keeping partner for the stimulus of tea. With woman suffrage we should have Prohibition. Prohibitionists advocate woman suffrage on that account. Behind prohibition of strong drinks begins to loom prohibition of tobacco. We have had proposals from women to extend capital punishment to cases of outrage on their sex. Would the stronger sex obey such laws when it was known that they were enacted by the weaker? Would it obey any laws manifestly carried by the female vote in the interest of the women against that of the men? If it would not, the result would be contempt for the law and anarchy, which would not be likely to enure to the advantage of the weak. Man would be tempted to resist woman's government when it galled him, not only by the consciousness of his strength, but by his pride, which would make itself heard in the end, though its voice for a time might be stifled by sentimental declamation. "In muscle," says the Report of Mr. Blair's Committee of the United States Senate in 1889, "woman is inferior to man. But muscle has nothing to do with legislation or government. In intellect she is man's equal, in character she is, by his own admission, his superior and constitutes the angelic portion of humanity." We have seen reason for thinking that muscle has something to do, if not with the acts of legislatures or governments, with that which gives those acts their force. Mr. Blair might have felt this if, at the time of the strike, he had been at Chicago.

In Dahomey there are female warriors. There may have been Amazons in primitive times. But in the civilised world the duty of defending the country in war falls on the male sex alone, and it would seem that there ought to be some connection between that duty and political power. To this it is answered
that not all men perform the duty, and that women as well as men contribute as taxpayers to the support of the army. In some countries, as in Germany, all men of military age are, and in every country they ought to be, liable to military service. But everywhere the responsibility rests on the men, who would have to meet the necessity if it arose. That some men are old or disqualified for arms signifies nothing; political rules must be general and disregard exceptions. The women, it is said, or such of them as have property of their own, contribute to the military expenses. But so do the men, in addition to the male duty of personal service. Nor is the plea that they send their husbands and sons much to the purpose when the question is as to their own qualifications for serving in war.

At the same time it would be a mistake to think that female rulers have been averse from war, and that if the power were in female hands war would be no more. Women are apt to be warlike because their responsibility is less. In the Southern States at the time of Secession no partisans of the war were fiercer than the women. Few male rulers have been more bellicose than Catherine of Russia, Elizabeth Queen of Spain (the Termagant, as she was called), Maria Theresa of Austria, Madame de Pompadour, and the Empress Eugénie. Nor is it unlikely that female sentiment might be in favour of some war when male sentiment or prudence was against it. French women might have voted for a crusade in aid of the Pope. English women might have voted for armed intervention in favour of the Queen of Naples, whose heroism touched their imaginations at the time. Would the men obey? Would they shoulder their muskets and march or bid the army march? They would not; and here again law and government would break down.

Besides, the transfer of power from the military to the unmilitary sex involves a change in the character of a nation. It involves, in short, national emasculation. What would be the fate of a community in some dire extremity if it were largely ruled by its women? Philanthropy, theosophy, and Utopianism have not yet triumphed. This is the age of
Bismarck, of the Franco-Prussian War, of the War of Secession. How would the North have fared in its conflict with the South if, at each turn of the waver and desperate struggle, it had been swayed by the emotions of its women? One of the ladies whose evidence was taken before Mr. Blair’s Committee, admitted that, in the days of force, when women needed the protection of man, male government may have been justifiable; but these, she said, were piping times of peace. Piping times of peace, when America is paying the pension list of an enormous war and Europe has millions of men in arms! Woman does not in civilised countries need the protection of the individual man except as policeman or escort. But she does need, or may at any time need, the armed protection of the male sex as a whole.

We have had successive extensions of that which is called liberty, but ought, if we would think clearly, to be called political power; for a man may have liberty without a vote and a vote without liberty. But hitherto the changes, though some of them have been blind and dangerous enough, have imperilled only the State. The change now proposed vitally affects the family, which, until the Socialists have their way, will be of fully as much consequence to us as the State. The family is in fact the grand issue. The solidarity of the family it is which the various movements for what is called the emancipation of women tend collectively to subvert. It is easy to draw ideal pictures of husband and wife agreeing to differ on political questions, going at elections to opposite committee-rooms, perhaps speaking on opposite platforms, voting on opposite sides, and then returning to a blissful hearth, with harmony and affection unimpaired. This ideal might be realised in the case of such a couple as Mr. and Mrs. John Stuart Mill. But what are the effects of a faction fight on the tempers of ordinary mortals? In America at the time of the Civil War would unbroken harmony have prevailed between a Unionist husband and a Secessionist wife? Would unbroken harmony prevail between a Unionist husband and a Gladstonian wife at the present day?
Hitherto the family has been a unit represented in the State by its head, and whatever storms may have raged in the commonwealth, the peace and order of the home have remained usually undisturbed. A change which throws the family into the political caldron calls surely for special consideration. In political and economical discussion our attention is commonly turned to wealth, education, or some factor of our well-being which is increased or diminished by government or legislation. We seldom think so distinctly as we ought how large a measure of happiness as well as of excellence depends upon affection. A man who prized his home would probably say that if it was thought fit that his wife should have the vote instead of himself, she might have it, but that he protested against any proposal to give the family more than one vote.

Caution is the more necessary since it is clear that party has laid hold of this question. Each party, or a section of each party in England, fancies that it would gain by the change. Some Conservatives believe that the nature of woman is conservative, and that she would vote under the influence of traditional sentiment, perhaps also under that of her priest. The late leader of the Conservatives in England was in favour of enfranchising the women, as he was in favour of enfranchising the proletariat, with the same expectation of votes. But Conservatives who play this game should remember that the conservative woman as a rule is probably feminine and likely to stay at home, while the radical woman is pretty sure to go forth rejoicing to the fray. Nor would the clerical influence be all on one side. Every Catholic Irishwoman would be brought to the poll by the priest. Assuredly the female character is not unsusceptible of revolutionary violence. France saw the Mænads of the Revolution, and has had her Louise Michel. In New York a female enthusiast has been heard inciting the destitute to armed violence and public rapine. However this may be, when party lays its hand on the home, those who care for the home more than for party receive a warning to be on their guard.

Previous extensions of the suffrage have been to an unrepre-
sented class, and a class which might plead that its special interest would suffer by want of representation, though possibly in some cases those interests were likely to suffer as much by the influence of enfranchised ignorance on government as by any class bias. But women are not a class, they are a sex. Their class interests throughout the scale are identical with those of the man, and are effectually represented by the male vote. It would probably be impossible to devise a case in which a legislature dealing with female interests in regard to property, taxation, or any other subject, could be misled by motives of class.

If property held by women is taxed without being represented, so is that held by men, in the United States absolutely, and in England, saving only the trifling amount of property still required, directly or indirectly, as a qualification for the suffrage.

Have women as a sex any wrongs which male legislatures cannot be expected to redress, so that in order to obtain justice it is necessary that there shall be an abdication by man of the sovereign power? If there are, whether in England or the United States, let them be named. Named hitherto they have not been. The law regarding the property of married women has been so far reformed in the interests of the wife, that, instead of being unduly favourable to the husband, it seems rather inspired by mistrust of him. The practice is still more so. It has become the custom to tie up a woman's property on marriage so that she shall not be able, even if she is so inclined, to make provision for her husband, in case he survives her, in old age, and save him from the necessity of receiving alms from his own children. The lawyers naturally are active in the work which multiplies legal relations and interests. About everything has been done which civil legislation could do to impress the wife with the belief that her interest and that of her husband are not only separate but adverse; that she does not leave her father's home when she is married; that her husband is not one flesh with her; and that all her relations by blood are nearer to her, in interest at all
events, than the man on whose breast she lays her head. Matrimonial superstition has been effectually rebuked by enabling husband and wife to sue each other. The laws of Massachusetts discriminate in favour of women by exempting unmarried women of small estate from taxation; by allowing women and not men to acquire a settlement without paying a tax; by compelling husbands to support their wives, but exempting the wife, even when rich, from supporting an indigent husband; by making men liable for debts of wives, and not vice versa. In the State of New York a husband cannot dispose of his wife’s dower in his lands without her consent, but the wife can, without her husband’s consent, dispose of all her property; a husband can be made to pay for necessaries supplied to a wife, a wife cannot be made to pay for necessaries supplied to a husband; a wife’s dower-right cannot be divested by a will, but a wife can will away all her property without leaving provision for her husband; women are privileged in cases of execution for debt; women are substantially exempt from arrest in all civil cases; while the factory laws and other laws abound in exceptional protection for women. Legal reformers are able to boast that they have “emancipated woman from the domination of her husband.” They must not forget that the domination carries with it maintenance and protection which will not be given without return. Make the marriage contract too onerous to the man, and he in his turn will some day begin to think of emancipation. If he does he is the stronger. Nothing can alter that fact or its practical significance in the long run. Of this the leaders of the Revolt of Woman will do well to take note.

That the administration of the law has been unfavourable to women, few will contend. In jury cases, at least, the difficulty is not for women to get justice against men, but for men to get justice against women. It is doubtful whether the introduction of women into the jury-box, for which women-suffragists contend, could make juries more partial to women

1 See Minority Report of Mr. Blair’s Committee of the Senate of the United States, February, 1889, p. 14.
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than they are; if it did, the failure of justice would be monstrous indeed. In criminal cases mercy has been shown to the woman. "Since I have been in Parliament," said John Bright, "I think I could specify nearly a score of instances in which the lives of women would be spared where the lives of men would be taken." Can it be believed that the efforts which have been made to save Mrs. Maybrick from punishment would have been made in favour of a husband convicted of the murder of his wife? There is no reason for this partiality except one which implies a radical difference between the sexes and the willingness of the weaker sex to accept the protection of the stronger. Nor will the privilege long survive the ground of it; women cannot have both equality and privilege.

Does the grievance consist in any bar to the competition of women with men in the professions or trades? Such bars have by male legislation been largely removed. We have female doctors of medicine everywhere, and if their practice is limited, it is because women themselves in the graver cases seem still to put more confidence in men. Women are being admitted to the law. To their addressing themselves to the feelings of juries there seems to be an objection apart from delicacy, if justice is the object of courts. They have been admitted into male universities, we shall presently see with what effect on the masculine character of the system, while, in spite of the principle on which coeducation is based, female colleges are not yet thrown open to men. They have got the school-teacherships largely into their hands; with doubtful benefit, whatever theorists may say, to the characters and manners of the boys. Government clerkships and offices of all kinds are now filled with women, who are thus made independent of marriage, though this cannot be done without at the same time withdrawing employment from men who might have maintained women as their wives. It is complained that female workers are underpaid, and female claimants of the franchise say that if they had power, they would legislate so as to raise woman's wages. Legislation of this kind would require supplementary enactments forbidding employers and capital to go
WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

out of the trade. But are women underpaid? Are they paid less than the men when their work is of equal value? It may be that in some cases custom has been unjust to them, as it often is to male workers also. This time will redress. It is only the lighter trades that women can ply, and a needlewoman can hardly expect to be paid like an engine-driver or a stevedore. In some trades certain continuance is an element of value, and certain continuance is impossible for woman unless she renounces marriage. Fashionable dressmakers, female artists, singers, and actresses are not underpaid. The gains of prima donnas are enormous; their exactions are notorious, and they stint without compunction the inferior performers of their own sex.

A proof of man's injustice to woman commonly cited was the difference made in the treatment of the two sexes in regard to infidelity. The law can hardly now be said to be unjust; that the social penalty should be the same in both cases is not to be expected, for the simple reason that the offence is not the same. The sin of the woman is a sin not only against her partner, but against the family, into which she brings an adulterine child. A pointsman and the man who tends a furnace may alike fall asleep at their posts without any difference in their moral guilt, but one lets a fire go out, and the other wrecks a train.

All the legislation and all the language on the subject of seduction assume that the blame rests entirely on the man, though there are many cases in which he is more the seduced than the seducer, and in no case where the woman is grown up and is consenting can the guilt be wholly on one side. To assume that the guilt is wholly on one side and that the woman, however freely she consents, must be blameless, is to subvert the safeguard of honour in the female breast.

Mr. Blair's Report indeed proclaims that "without the exercise of the natural and inalienable right of suffrage neither life, liberty, nor property can be secured." If by liberty is meant the exercise of political power, that part of the allegation is undeniably true. To say that neither life nor property
can be secure without the suffrage would be to say that no security for life or property has existed in most of the countries of Europe till within the last half century, nor for the great majority of the people even in England. To the ordinary observer it appears not only that the lives, liberties, and properties of American women are secure, but that they are more secure, if anything, than those of the men; and that the attitude of men in the United States toward women is rather that of submission than that of domination. "Actual and practical slavery," which one of the ladies who gives evidence declares to be the condition of woman without the ballot, has certainly in the case of the American slave disguised itself in very deceptive forms. "No one," says another lady, "has denied to women the right of burial, and in that one sad necessity of human life they stand on an equal footing with men." Such language seems to mock our understandings. Comparisons of the condition of woman denied the suffrage with that of the Negro in the South, have often been made, and in this Report we are told that the exclusion of women from a convention "constituted the startling revelation of a real subjection of woman to man world-wide and in many respects as complete and galling, when analysed and duly considered by its victims, as that of the Negro to his master." The Negro, nevertheless, would not have been sorry to change conditions. The papers the other day gave an account of a raid made upon a saloon by a party of women in masks, who beat the proprietor with clubs. Several such acts of violence on the part of women have been recorded; but they are committed apparently not only with impunity but with general approbation. Resistance to them appears to be proscribed. American women, also, seem to use the cowhide, whenever they think fit, to avenge their personal wrongs. These are not practices in which the Negro was allowed to indulge toward his master before emancipation, or in which he has even been allowed to indulge since. If the men of the United States were called to account for their treatment of the women, and the women at the same time for the performance of their special
duty to the race, it seems doubtful, at least supposing that American writers on these subjects tell the truth, whether before an impartial tribunal judgment would go against the men.

Against wife-beating, or cruelty of any sort to wives, which is commonly confined to the dregs of humanity, the law seems now severe enough; if it were more than severe enough it would be in danger of becoming a dead letter. Male brutality finds vent in bodily outrage, which can be reached by law. The bad wife can make her husband’s home miserable by vexations which no law can reach. Many years ago an English clergyman was convicted of the murder of his wife, but his sentence was commuted when it was learned what his life had been. A man in England narrowly escaped imprisonment as a felon on a false charge of uttering base coin, cast on him by the machinations of a perfidious wife who wanted to live with her paramour. Law could have done nothing in the first case, practically could do nothing in the second. Children are less able to make their wrongs known than are women, yet cases not seldom come to light of cruel ill-treatment of children by women, especially by step-mothers. These cases, like those of wife-beating, are hideous. We punish the criminals when we can, but we do not propose to alter domestic relations. We trust, and in the immense majority of cases with reason, to affection, which is stronger than law. That affection is stronger than law is a fact often forgotten in dealing with these questions. It seems to be thought that the Statute Book is all. Nothing in the Statute Book, it has been truly said, prevents the most courteous of hosts from turning his guests out of his house at midnight in a storm.

That the man should exercise authority in his family may be deemed unnatural and unjust when he ceases to be held responsible for the household. At present the State casts upon him the undivided responsibility. What the leaders of the woman’s rights movement practically seek is, for the woman, power without responsibility, for the man, responsibility without power. But this is an arrangement in which
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man, though he may be talked into it for the moment, is not likely in the end to acquiesce.

Is the marriage tie still too tight? Is divorce not easy enough? One would think that divorce was easy enough in America, when in some States you have a divorce for every ten marriages, when a judge at Chicago can dissolve eight marriages in sixty-two minutes, when wedlock is beginning to be talked of as an experiment which may be terminated if it is not found pleasant to both sides. This does not fall far short of the civilised form of promiscuity the tendency to which one advanced reformer hails, or from the idea of another who lays it down that "there is nothing impure, nothing wrong, in the voluntary sexual act per se though not sanctioned by what we now term marriage." Mormonism, if its polygamy is denounced, has matter for a retort. American legislatures themselves are beginning to recoil. In Great Britain divorce is not so easy, yet it is surely not too difficult if the marriage tie is to be preserved. The children, who cannot fail to suffer by the wreck of the family, are entitled to consideration as well as the parents. Society at large is entitled to consideration. Though marriages are made not in heaven but on earth, it may safely be said that the great majority of them are happy; at least that the partners are happier united than they would have been alone. But their success depends, in ordinary cases, on the permanence of the bond, which enforces restraint of temper and mutual accommodation. If divorce were always open, compatibility would be seldom found; the bond would be broken by the unscrupulous as often as matrimony failed to realise the dreams of courtship. It is easy to paint horrible

1 See Mona Caird's articles in the Fortnightly (Vol. liii.) and Westminster Reviews (Vol. cxxx.). See also Mill's The Subjection of Woman, Chap. ii.

2 It seems that the largest number of divorces are found in the communities where the advocates of female suffrage are most numerous, and where the individuality of woman in relation to her husband, which such a doctrine inculcates, is greatest. The movement, therefore, or at least the tendencies, appear to be connected. See Minority Report, p. 10.

pictures of unwilling union after mutual disappointment. Such things do happen, and very tragical and deplorable they are. The remedy is caution before marriage, not the virtual overthrow of an institution on which, so far as we can see, the order, purity, and happiness of society depend.¹

Marriage may be described from one point of view as a restraint imposed upon the passions of the man for the benefit of the woman. Cold-blooded philosophers choose to speak of the sexual passion in man as brutal. Mighty it is; it is no more brutal than any other passion or appetite gratification of which is necessary to the preservation of life and the race. It is the physical basis of sentiments the most beautiful and refined. At all events it is in most natures imperious. Were it not, man could hardly be induced to take on him the burden of maintaining wife and children. Being imperious, it will be gratified, if not by marriage, in other ways, and woman would not be the gainer by the change.

The matrimonial history of Shelley is instructive and full of warning because he was so highly refined, and raised so much above the animal passions of ordinary men. Shelley, as his admiring biographer frankly tells us, finding after some two years or more of marriage, that his Harriet “did not suit him,” though she “had given no cause whatsoever for repudiation by breach or tangible neglect of wifely duty,” cast her off in an “abrupt de facto manner” and took Mary to his arms. Mary, of course, was of the same opinion. “Shelley,” says the biographer, “was an avowed opponent on principle to the formal and coercive tie of marriage; therefore in ceasing his marital connection with Harriet, and assuming a similar relation to Mary, he did nothing which he regarded as wrong, though as far as anything yet published goes, it must distinctly be said that he consulted his own option rather than Harriet’s.”

¹Reference cannot be made to this momentous subject without acknowledging the great service rendered to society by the Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Corresponding Secretary of the United States National Divorce Reform League, whose laborious investigations have brought the facts before us.
pher asserts that Harriet, after the separation, connected herself with some other protector, a charge which, it is to be presumed, he would not make without knowing it to be true, and the truth of which would not in any way mend the case. Legislation on these lines would suit some men better than any woman. It did not suit poor Harriet.

It appears that in the series of legislative reforms which in the course of a century has been bringing Europe finally out of the feudal system, with its quasi-military relations, and with the vestiges of tribalism which lingered in it, into the system of modern society, the interests of both sexes have been embraced, and that of the female sex has had its full share. This, as the legislatures were male, seems to prove not only that men in legislating are unlikely to forget their wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters, but that women without votes can exercise great influence on legislation. The press is open to them, it is powerful, and not a few of them make use of it. The platform is open to as many of them as do not shrink from its publicity. They have access under the most favourable conditions to those by whom the law is made. That they have confidence in the justice and affection of men their present appeal, as has been said before, shows; for it is from man’s free will that they must expect the concession of the suffrage. Some of them, it is true, threaten us with a terrible vengeance if their petition is not heard, but they are powerless to give effect to their threats. They will renounce their present influence in grasping the vote. Let them appear as a separate interest in the political arena, and they will, like every other separate interest, waken an antagonism which does not now exist.

That women are treated as citizens only for the purpose of taxation is the summary of their wrongs blazoned in manifestos by the leaders of the movement. The answer is that the State treats them in all respects as citizens, giving them protection for person, property, and character, with every benefit

\[1\] See Mr. William Michael Rossetti's *Memoir* prefixed to his edition of Shelley's Poetical Works. London: Moxon, 1870. Different versions have been given, but there can be no dispute about the main facts.
which civil government can bestow, and therefore full value for their taxes.

The plain question then presents itself in the joint interest of the two sexes, whether the exercise of political power by women would be generally conducive to good government. If it would not, the concession, it must be repeated, would be a wrong done to the whole community. We know very well that in some gifts and qualities woman is superior to man. Suppose she is superior to him on the whole. Suppose, to adopt the somewhat amatory language of Mr. Blair's Committee, she is the angelic portion of humanity. It does not follow that she is political any more than man is maternal or adapted for housekeeping. Nor is the absence of political qualities a disgrace to her any more than the absence of maternal or housekeeping qualities is to him. Difference of spheres, we must repeat, the spheres being equal in importance, implies no disparagement. As a rule, it is in the affections and graces that woman is strong; and these, the affections at least, though they may be worth more than the practical qualities needed in politics, are not the practical qualities. But the training also is wanting. The political wisdom of men in general, to whatever it may amount, is formed by daily contact and collision with the world in which they have to gain their bread, and which impresses upon them in its rough school caution, prudence, the necessity of compromise, the limitations of their will. Some of them are flighty enough after all, and the world just now is in no small peril from their flightiness. But their general tendency as a sex is to be commonplace and practical. Their life usually is more or less public, while that of woman is in the home. Moreover, they feel as a sex the full measure of responsibility in public action. This is not felt so strongly by their partners. If rash measures get the community into trouble, it is by the men that it must be got out again. To them it will fall to pull the waggon through the slough. The exception taken to female legislators, or Ministers of State, or judges, on account of the interruptions of the nursery might be met by appointing
only spinsters or widows. But it would be impossible, without change of sentiment, to hold the female legislator, administrator, or judge to the full measure of male responsibility. If they were called to account they would plead their sex. We are told that ladies in New York objected to the appointment of education commissioners of their own sex on the ground that they were exempted from criticism by the gallantry of the men.

It is supposed that women would allay the angry strife of faction and refine its coarseness by imparting their gentleness, tenderness, and delicacy to public life. But is it not because they have been kept out of politics and generally out of the contentious arena that they have remained gentle, tender, and delicate? Weakness thrown into an exciting struggle usually shows itself, not by superior gentleness, but by loss of self-control. Of this, the crusade against the Contagious Diseases Act in England has given some proof. By the use which both the political parties in England have of late been making of women for electioneering purposes, the fury of the fray does not seem to have been allayed.

"Corruption of male suffrage," says Mr. Blair's Report, "is already a well-nigh fatal disease." Would it be cured by throwing in the other sex? That women would be likely, by taking part in public life, to make it pure, that they are less prone than men to favouritism, jobbery, and corruption, is contrary to experience, which shows that they are prone to these minor vices while they are comparatively seldom guilty of the greater crimes.

In a paper prepared at the request of an association of women, which is cited in the Minority Report of the Senate Committee, Mr. Francis Parkman says of the female politician as she is and is likely to be in the United States:

"It is not woman's virtues that would be prominent or influential in the political arena, they would shun it by an invincible repulsion; and the opposite qualities would be drawn into it. The Washington lobby has given us some means of judging what we may expect from the woman 'inside politics.' If politics are to be purified by artfulness, effrontery, insensibility, a pushing self-assertion, and a glib tongue, then we may
look for regeneration; for the typical female politician will be richly endowed with all these gifts.

"Thus accoutred for the conflict, she may fairly hope to have the better of her masculine antagonist. A woman has the inalienable right of attacking without being attacked in return. She may strike, but must not be struck either literally or figuratively. Most women refrain from abusing their privilege of non-combatants; but there are those in whom the sense of impunity breeds the cowardly courage of the virago.

"In reckoning the resources of the female politicians, there is one which can by no means be left out. None know better than woman the potency of feminine charms aided by feminine arts. The woman 'inside politics' will not fail to make use of an influence so subtle and so strong and of which the management is peculiarly suited to her talents. If—and the contingency is in the highest degree probable—she is not gifted with charms of her own, she will have no difficulty in finding and using others of her sex who are. If report is to be trusted, Delilah has already spread her snares for the Congressional Samson; and the power before which the wise fail and the mighty fall has been invoked against the sages and heroes of the Capitol. When 'woman' is fairly 'inside politics' the sensation press will reap a harvest of scandals more lucrative to itself than profitable to public morals. And as the zeal of one class of female reformers has been and no doubt will be largely directed to their grievances in matters of sex, we shall have shrill-tongued discussions of subjects which had far better be let alone.

"It may be said that the advocates of female suffrage do not look to political women for the purifying of politics, but to the votes of the sex at large. The two, however, cannot be separated. It should be remembered that the question is not of a limited and select female suffrage, but of a universal one. To limit would be impossible. It would seek the broadest areas and the lowest depths, and spread itself through the marshes and malarious pools of society." 1

That some women are political and many men are not, is as true as it is that some men are unmilitary and a few women are Amazons. But this does not alter the general fact; and it is upon general facts that political institutions must be founded.

Mill, appealing to history, bids us mark that so excellent a judge of practical ability as Charles V. set women to govern the Netherlands. Charles V. appointed women because he had no males in his family to appoint. It was in fact this

failure of males in dynasties, combined with the superstition of hereditary right, that led to the introduction in Europe of what John Knox called "the monstrous regiment of women." Charles's experiment was not happy, since the result was the revolt of the Netherlands. Blanche of Castile, is also cited by Mill. She appears to have been a woman of masculine qualities, not to say a virago, to have held her excellent but rather weak-minded son in complete subjection, and to have governed with vigour and judgment as his vicegerent; but there were evidently two sides to her character; which of them prevailed on the whole, we have hardly evidence enough to decide.

If we are to go to history, to history let us go; only remembering that the examples are those of queens regnant, or women placed by their circumstances in positions of power, and that they afford no certain indication of what women would be when they had climbed to power as demagogues after passing through the party mill.

In England, the women who have wielded power legally or practically have been Matilda, the claimant of the crown against Stephen, about whom we know little, but who seems to have injured her party by her arrogance; Eleanor, the jealous and intriguing Queen of Henry II., who laboured to secure the succession for John, and whose own record is not fair; Isabella, the paramour of Mortimer, and with him guilty of the murder of Edward II.; Margaret, the Queen of Henry VI., whose violence and favouritism helped to bring on the War of the Roses; Mary, of whom it need only be said that she was probably not a bad woman, but misled by influences to which her sex is specially exposed; Elizabeth; Henrietta Maria, who by her feminine violence had, like Margaret of Anjou, no small share in plunging the country into civil war; and Queen Anne, who, under personal influences and at the instigation of a favourite waiting-woman, upset a great ministry and deprived the country of the fruits of victory, while, had she lived longer, her fondness for her family would have probably led to an attempt to restore the Stuarts. The star is Elizabeth. But Elizabeth's reputation for anything except the arts of popu-
larity, in which she was supreme, has suffered terribly by the researches of Motley and other recent writers. Her deceitfulness, perfidy, and ingratitude to those who had served her and the country best, were pretty well known, as were her vanity and her coquetry. But her reputation for statesmanship is now greatly reduced, and it is clear that the country was saved not by her, but by itself; from the Armada it was saved in her despite. Mr. Froude, who set out as her fervent admirer, has in the end to say that her conduct in the transaction which preceded the sailing of the Armada "would alone suffice to disqualify Elizabeth from being cited as an example of the capacity of female sovereigns." And when the country was saved, whom did the Queen select for the honour? Whom did she prefer on this and all other occasions above the great servants of the State? The good-looking but worthless Leicester, "infamed," as Burleigh said he was, "by the death of his wife." Her ungrateful persecution of the Puritans in the latter part of her reign sowed the wind from which her unhappy successors reaped the whirlwind. She had the good fortune to be the crowning figure of an heroic age, and her sex threw about her a romantic halo, the brightness of which was enhanced by the calamities, partly her bequest, which ensued.

In France the more recent list is Catherine de Medici, whose name suffices; Anne of Austria, who was in the able hands of Mazarin; Madame de Maintenon, to whose female piety France owed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, while to her tenderness for the Catholic Stuarts it owed a great war; Madame de Pompadour, whose name again suffices; Marie Antoinette, who, besides helping to dismiss Turgot and to complete the ruin of French finances by plunging France into the war of the American Revolution, did so much to bring on the crash of the French Revolution that her misdeeds were scarcely washed out by her tears. The story is closed by the influence, partly religious, partly dynastic and domestic, which, Frenchmen say, made the Franco-German war and finished the work by interfering with its conduct in the interest of the dynasty and deterring the Emperor and his army from falling back on Paris.
Isabella of Castile graced her crown and formed a noble queen of chivalry in the war against the Moors. As a ruler, she had Ferdinand at her side. That it was to her feminine instinct that the genius of Columbus was revealed, recent researches have made less certain than it is that her piety established the Inquisition in Castile, and that great numbers of persons were burned by it in her reign.

Monuments of a female influence over government more certainly beneficent were the crosses which Edward I. erected in memory of the Queen who seems to have softened his sternness with her love, while she displayed the beauty of affection on the throne. England also owes a debt of gratitude to Caroline of Brunswick, by whose unambitious support Walpole, the best statesman of an unheroic time, was kept in power.

Nothing need be said about queens nominally regnant who have reigned but not governed, and whose influence has been happily exerted in the social sphere which all admit to be the realm of woman.

Queen Victoria, however, is often cited as a proof that a woman can rule an Empire without male help. What says Queen Victoria herself? “Lord Melbourne was very useful to me, but I can never be sufficiently thankful that I passed safely through those two years to my marriage. Then I was in a safe haven, and there I remained for twenty years. Now that is over, and I am again at sea, always wishing to consult one who is not here, groping by myself, with a constant sense of desolation.” ¹

Suppose now that a crisis should come in this political struggle, as conceivably it may, laying a strain on the personal force and resolution of the wearer of the British crown. Suppose a Radical majority should demand the destruction of the House of Lords by a swamping creation of Peers. Could a lady be advised or expected to do anything which would expose her to danger or annoyance even in the utmost necessity of the State?

Mill has told us that Begums have shone as rulers in India. He was in the India House and his authority is good, though he does not give the names. It is hardly credible that a woman brought up in a Zenana should be a great ruler, but she might be better than a hog or a tiger. Not all Begums have escaped the common influence of the Durbar. We have one, styled a heroine, making away successively with her father-in-law, her husband, and her son, because they stood in her way, enrolling cut-throats, and practising corruption as freely as any male. The superiority can hardly be such as to give much assurance of safety in revolutionising the relations between the sexes.

On the whole, experience apparently so far fails to show that the introduction of women into politics would be likely to lead to any improvement of government or legislation sufficient to countervail the danger of misdirecting the aspirations of woman and withdrawing her from her proper and transcendently important work as a wife and mother.

The writer of this paper signed, in company with John Bright, John Stuart Mill’s first petition in favour of suffrage for unmarried women. Mr. Bright, as well as the writer, was a good deal influenced by his respect and regard for Mill. Both of them afterwards changed their minds, and Bright spoke strongly against the measure. The writer found that the women of his acquaintance for whom he had most respect, and who seemed to him the best representatives of their sex, were opposed to the change, fearing that the position and privileges of women in general would be sacrificed to the ambition of a few.

Since that time Mill’s Autobiography has appeared, and has revealed the history of his extraordinary and almost portentous education, the singular circumstances of his marriage, his hallucination (for it surely can be called nothing else) as to the surpassing genius of his wife, and peculiarities of character and temperament such as could not fail to prevent him from fully appreciating the power of influences which, whatever

1 See C. Forjelt’s Our Real Danger in India, p. 39.
our philosophy may say, reign and will continue to reign supreme over questions of this kind. To him marriage was a union of two philosophers in the pursuit of truth, and wedded life was intellectual intercourse. In his work on "The Subjection of Women" not only does he almost leave maternity out of sight, but sex and its influences seem hardly to be present to his mind. Of the distinctive excellence and beauty of the female character, or of the conditions essential to its preservation, it does not appear that he had formed any idea, though he dilates on the special qualities of the female understanding.

Mill has allowed us to see that his opinions as to the political position of women were formed early in his life, probably before he had studied history rationally, perhaps before the rational study of history had come into existence. The consequence, with all deference to his great name be it said, is that his historical presentment of the case is fundamentally unsound. He and his disciples represent the lot of the woman as having always been determined by the will of the man, who, according to them, has willed that she should be the slave, and that he should be her master and tyrant. "Society, both in this [the case of marriage] and other cases, has preferred to attain its object by foul rather than by fair means; but this is the only case in which it has substantially persisted in them even to the present day." This is Mill's fundamental assumption; and from it, as every rational student of history is now aware, conclusions utterly erroneous as well as injurious to humanity must flow. The lot of the woman has not been determined by the will of the man, at least in any considerable degree. The lot both of the man and of the woman has been determined from age to age by circumstances over which the will of neither of them had much control, and which neither could be blamed for accepting or failing to reverse. Mill and his disciples assume that the man has always willed that he should himself enjoy political rights, and that the woman should be his slave; forgetting that it is only in a few countries that man does enjoy political rights,
and that, even in those few countries, freedom is the birth almost of yesterday. It may probably be said that the number of men who have really and freely exercised the suffrage up to the present time is not very much greater than the number of those who have in different ages and in various ways laid down their lives or made personal sacrifices of other kinds in bringing elective government into existence.

In the early stages of civilisation the family was socially and legally, as well as politically, a unit. Its head represented the whole household before the tribe, the State, and all persons and bodies without; while within he exercised absolute power over all the members, male as well as female, over his sons as well as over his wife and daughters. On the death of the head of a family his eldest son stepped into his place, and became the representative and protector of the whole household, including the widow of the deceased chief. This system, long retained in conservative Rome, was there the source of the national respect for authority, and, by an expansion of feeling from the family to the community, of the patriotism which produced and sustained Roman greatness. Its traces lingered far down in history. It was not male tyranny that authorised a Tudor queen to send members of the royal household to the Tower by her personal authority as the mistress of the family, without regard to the common law against arbitrary imprisonment. Such a constitution was essential to the existence of the family in primitive times; without it the germs of nations and of humanity would have perished. To suppose that it was devised by the male sex for the gratification of their own tyrannical propensities, would be most absurd. It was at least as much a necessity to the primitive woman as it was to the primitive man. It is still a necessity to woman in the countries where the primitive type of society remains. What would be the fate of a female Bedouin if she were suddenly invested with Woman's Rights, and emancipated from the protection of her husband?

That the present relation of women to their husbands literally has its origin in slavery, and is a hideous relic of that
system, is a theory which Mill sets forth in language such as, if it could sink into the hearts of those to whom it is addressed, might turn affection to bitterness, and divide every household against itself. Yet this theory is without historical foundation. It seems indeed like a figure of invective heedlessly converted into history. Even in the most primitive times, and those in which the subjection of the woman was most complete, the wife was clearly distinguished from the slave. The lot of Sarah is different from that of Hagar; the authority of Hector over Andromache is absolute, yet no one can confound her position with that of her handmaidens. The Roman matron who sent her slave to be crucified, the Southern matron who was the fierce supporter of slavery, were not themselves slaves. Whatever may now be obsolete in the relations of husband and wife is not a relic of slavery, but of primitive marriage, and may be regarded as at worst an arrangement once indispensable which has survived its hour. Where real slavery has existed, it has extended to both sexes, and it has ceased for both at the same time. Even the Oriental seclusion of women, perhaps the worst condition in which the sex has ever been, has its root not in the slave-owning propensity so much as in jealousy, a passion which, though extravagant and detestable in its excessive manifestation, is not without an element of affection. The most beautiful building in the East is that which Shah Jehan raised as the monument of a beloved wife. Is it possible that an American lady living in Paris on the fruits of her husband’s toil at New York, or looking on while a porter at Saratoga toils beneath her colossal trunk, should deem herself a slave?

If the calm and philosophic nature of Mill is ever betrayed into violence, it is in his denunciations of the present institution of marriage. He depicts it as a despotism full of mutual degradation, and fruitful of no virtues or affections except the debased virtues and the miserable affections of the master and the slave. The grossest and most degrading terms of Oriental servitude are used to designate the relations of husband and wife throughout the book. A husband who desires his wife’s
love is only seeking “to have in the woman most nearly con-
nected with him, not a forced slave, but a willing one; not a
slave merely, but a favourite.” Husbands have, therefore,
“put everything in practice to enslave the minds of their
wives.” If a wife is intensely attached to her husband,
“exactly as much may be said of domestic slavery.” “It is a
part of the irony of life that the strongest feelings of devoted
gratitude of which human nature seems to be susceptible are
called forth in human beings towards those who, having the
power entirely to crush their earthly existence, voluntarily
refrain from using their power.” Even children are only links
in the chain of bondage. By the affections of women “are
meant the only ones they are allowed to have, those to the men
to whom they are connected, or to the children who constitute
an additional and indefeasible tie between them and a man.”
Such a description of British matrimony seems to be scarcely
sane. The Jesuit is an object of sympathy because he is the
enemy of the domestic tyrant, and it is assumed that the hus-
band can have no motive but the love of undivided tyranny for
objecting to being superseded by an intriguing interloper in
his wife’s affections. As though a wife would regard with
complacency, say a female spiritualist installed beside her
hearth! Mill’s book, written with his usual clearness and
impressiveness, having been the manifesto, has remained the
manual of the movement. It is therefore still necessary to
deal with it, nor can there be anything invidious, as some of
his admirers seem to have fancied, in reviewing it by the light
of the Autobiography. For what purpose is the life of a
philosopher published if it is not to enable us better to under-
stand his works? The book might poison marriage if it were
not read with a knowledge of the influence under which it was
written. Mill himself seems at last to start from the picture
which he has drawn and to be inclined to qualify it. But he
does this faintly and too late.

If, in this most imperfect world, woman, through the
changeful ages, has, like her partner, had much to undergo,
and too often at her partner’s hands, she has also had advan-
tages which she would have been sorry to forfeit, and which she would be sorry to forfeit now. She has sat safe in her home while her partner was toiling, hunting, battling with the sea, fighting for her abroad. By her partner's labour and with peril of his life the earth has been subdued for her and made fit for her habitation. When she complains that she has been treated as a toy, does she mean that she has been wronged because man has taken most of the rough and hard work to himself? War has comparatively spared her; public justice has been lenient to her; in a shipwreck she has been put first into the boat, while the slave to whom she now likens herself has been thrown overboard to save the provisions. In civilised countries she is on all occasions served and considered first; special provisions are made for her comfort and convenience. Is this the lot of a slave, or of one even more miserable than a slave?

Sometimes woman has had man's hard work to do. But this has been mostly in times of special need or of general barbarism, and the revulsion which any such employment of her causes, denotes her general immunity. The Red Indian used his mate as a beast of burden. But the Red Indian was a savage. Even he, however, might have pleaded special need. The hunter, by the product of whose chase the wigwam was fed, would have been spoiled, his powers of endurance would have been reduced, and the keenness of his sense would have been impaired, by heavy domestic labour.

Marriage has risen in character with the general progress of civilisation from the primeval contract of force or purchase to a free contract, of a contract generally of love. Primeval practice was not regulated by the will of those generations, but by primeval circumstance, and the improvement of the marriage tie has come, as all other great improvements of human relations have come, in the course of secular evolution. It was something when the passions of the male were subjected to a regular and lasting bond of any kind. If women are now to be made independent of marriage, which appears to be the aim of some of their champions, they will be made indepen-
dent of that in which the happiness of a creature formed for affection usually consists. Perhaps if they take advantage of their independence many of them will owe their champions but scanty thanks in their old age.

The anomalies in the property law affecting married women, to which remedial legislation has recently been directed, are, like whatever is obsolete in the relations between the sexes generally, not deliberate iniquities, but survivals. They are relics of feudalism or of still more primitive institutions incorporated by feudalism; and while the system to which they belonged existed they were indispensable parts of it, and must have been so regarded by both sexes alike. Any one who is tolerably well informed ought to be ashamed to represent them as the contrivances of male injustice. It is not on one sex only that the relics of feudalism have borne hard.

The exclusion of women from professions is cited as another proof of constant and immemorial injustice. But what woman asked or wished to be admitted to a profession a hundred or even fifty years ago? What woman till quite recently would have been ready to renounce marriage and maternity in order that she might devote herself to law, medicine, or commercial pursuits? The demand is probably in some measure connected with an abnormal and possibly transient state of things. The expensiveness of living in a country where the fashion is set by millionaires, combined with the overcrowded condition of the very callings to which women are demanding admission, has put extraordinary difficulties in the way of marriage. Many women are thus left without an object in life, and they naturally try to open for themselves some new career. The utmost sympathy is due to them, and every facility ought in justice to be afforded them; though unhappily the addition of fresh competitors for subsistence to a crowd in which some are already starving will be as far as possible from removing the real root of the evil, to say nothing of the risk which a woman runs in committing herself irrevocably to an undomestic calling, and closing against herself the gate of married life. But the demand, as has already been said, is of yester-
day, and probably in its serious form is as yet confined to the countries in which impediments to early marriage exist. It is not always easy to distinguish the serious demand from a passion for emulating the male sex which is hardly more respectable in women than the affectation of feminine tastes and habits would be in a man. With regard to the profession of law, indeed, so far as it is concerned with the administration of justice, there is, as was said before, and while human emotions retain their force always will be, a reason, independent of the question of demand, for excluding women, at least for excluding one of the two sexes from jury trials. The influence of a pretty advocate appealing to a jury, perhaps in behalf of a client of her own sex, would not have seemed to Mill at all dangerous to the integrity of public justice; but most people, and especially those who have seen anything of sentimental causes in the United States, or even in more phlegmatic England, will probably be of a different opinion.

What has been said as to the professions is equally true of the universities, which were schools for the professions. A few years ago, what girl would have consented to leave her home and mingle with male students? What girl would have thought it possible that she could go through the whole of the medical course with male companions of her studies? Even now what is the amount of settled belief in "co-education"? What would be said to a young man who applied for admission in the name of that principle at the door of any female college? Without arraigning what has been done, those whose duty it is may reconsider with due deliberation the two distinct questions — whether it is desirable that the education of both sexes shall be the same, and whether it is desirable that the young men and the young women of the wealthier classes shall be educated together in the universities. Beneath the first question lies the still deeper question whether it is good for humanity that woman, who has hitherto been the helpmate and the complement, should become, as the leaders of the Woman's Rights movement evidently desire, the rival and competitor of man. Both she cannot be; and it is by no
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means clear that in deciding which she shall be the aspirations of the leaders of this movement coincide with the interests of the sex. Marriage, if that is to be considered, is surely more enriched by diversity than by uniformity of acquirements on the sides of the two partners, universal accomplishment being possible to neither.

If the education of women has hitherto been defective, so has that of men. We are now going to do our best to improve both. Surely no accomplishment in the acquisition of which woman has been condemned to spend her time could well be less useful than that of writing Greek or Latin verses has been to the generality of male students. That the education of woman has hitherto been lighter than that of men is no proof that for the purposes of woman’s destination it has been worse. Among other things, it is to be considered whether the children would be healthy if the brain of the mother, as well as that of the father, were severely tasked. One medical authority at least holds that the principal cause of the increasing avoidance and prevention of child-bearing in the United States is the physical and nervous deterioration of the women, which, in his opinion, is largely due to the severe strain of modern life and education.¹ That the comparative absence of works of creative genius among women is due entirely to the social tyranny which has excluded, or is supposed to have excluded, them from literary or scientific careers, cannot be said to be self-evident. The case of musical composition, often cited, seems to suggest that there is another cause, and that the career of intellectual ambition is in most cases not likely to be happier than that of domestic affection, though this is no reason why the experiment should not be fairly tried. Perhaps the intellectual disabilities under which women have laboured, even in the past, have been somewhat overstated. If Shelley was a child to Mrs. Mill, as Mr. Mill says, no “social disabilities” hindered Mrs. Mill from publishing poems which would have eclipsed Shelley. The writer once heard an

¹ Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July, 1894, p. 56.
American lecturer of eminence confidently ascribe the licentiousness of English fiction in the early part of the last century to the exclusion of women from literary life. The lecturer forgot that the most popular novelist of that period, and certainly not the least licentious, was Mrs. Aphra Behn. This lady's name suggests the remark that as the relations of the sexes have been the most intimate conceivable, the action of character has been reciprocal, and the level of moral ideas and sentiments for both pretty much the same.

Mill, seeing that the man is the stronger, seems to assume that the relations between man and woman must always have been regulated by the law of the strongest. But strength is not tyranny. The protector must always be stronger than the person under his protection. A mother is overwhelmingly superior in strength to her infant child, and the child is completely at her mercy. The very highest conception that humanity has ever formed, whether it be founded in reality or not, is that of power losing itself in affection. St. Paul (who, on any hypothesis as to his inspiration, is an authoritative expositor of the morality which became that of Christendom) affirms with perfect clearness the essential equality of the sexes and their necessary relations to each other as the two halves of humanity. Yet he no less distinctly ratifies the unity of the family, the authority of its head, and the female need of that headship; a need which, supposing it to be natural, has nothing in it more degrading than the need of protection.¹

Subjection is a word of sinister import, and Mill, in adopting it, prejudices the question. Subordination, or obedience, where it is necessary, implies no disparagement. Nothing grates on ordinary feelings when Beatrice, in "Much Ado about Nothing," says that she "will tame her wild heart to the hand" of the man whom she is to wed. Not the soldier only, but most of us have some one whom we are bound to obey, and whom, it being necessary, we obey without humiliation. A head of the family there must be if there is not to

¹ 1 Cor. xi., 7-12; Eph. v., 22-33; Col. iii., 18.
be domestic anarchy. Children must know to whom their obedience is due. Mill proposes that the authority shall be divided between the husband and wife in the marriage contract, and that the subjects in which each is to be supreme shall be set out in a schedule; but he has not given us a draft of such a contract. He had himself no children. In the whole of this movement of sexual revolution the family, though it may not, with anyone but a Nihilist, be the object of intentional or conscious attack, is practically threatened with dissolution. One Utopian reformer, as we have seen, proposes not only that the wife shall be made independent of the husband, but that the children shall be made independent of the parents.

"Enfranchise women," says Mr. Blair's Report, "or this Republic will steadily advance to the same destruction, the same ignoble and tragic catastrophe, which has engulfed the male republics of history." This seems to imply a new reading of history, according to which republics have owed their fall to their masculine character. The Greek republics were overwhelmed by the Macedonian monarchy, their surrender to which was assuredly not due to excess of masculine force. The Roman republic was converted by the vast extension of Roman conquest into a military empire. The city republicanism of the Middle Ages was crushed by the great monarchies. The short-lived Commonwealth of England owed its overthrow to causes which certainly had nothing to do with sex. The Swiss republic, the American republic, the French republic still live, so do several constitutional monarchies, including Great Britain and her colonies, which are republics in all but name. It is true that these commonwealths, though, we may hope, less directly threatened with the wrath of heaven than the report assumes them to be, are yet not free from peril; but their peril apparently lies in the passions, the giddiness, the anarchical tendencies of the multitude, and would hardly be averted by opening another floodgate and letting in all at once the full tide of feminine emotion.

Woman, if she becomes a man, will be a weaker man. Yet she must be prepared to resign her privileges as a woman.
Privilege and equality at once she cannot hope to have. To don the other sex she must doff her own, a process in which she will run some risk of ceasing to be, or at least to be deemed, the "angelic portion of humanity." For the time, perhaps, the ancient sentiment might linger; but the total change of relations would in the end bring a change of feeling. Chivalry depends on the acknowledged need of protection, and what is accorded to a gentle helpmate would not be accorded to a rival. Man would not be bound nor inclined to treat with tenderness and forbearing the being who was jostling with him in all the walks of life, wrangling with him in the law courts, wrestling with him on the stump, manoeuvring against him in elections, haggling with him on 'Change or in Wall Street. Take mere sex apart from character, and there will be nothing in the female of the human species more than in the female of any other species to command our respect or devotion. Aphrodite, in her heart, perhaps flatters herself that her Cestus will preserve her privilege, while she gains the advantage of equality. So much poetry has been addressed to her that she may well be excused for not forming a prosaic estimate of the probable results. But the outspoken Schopenhauer has told her that beauty is rarer in her sex than in the other. It takes more to make a beautiful woman than a handsome man. Of this we may be sure, that the attractions of women generally depend upon their being women. Mrs. Mill, be it observed, remained a woman. If she had put on her wig and gown to go into court and cross-examine witnesses, or had stood against her husband for Westminster, we should have seen the great experiment really tried. That she has had social advantages while she has lain under political disabilities, woman, especially in America, can hardly deny; her sex has been an object of respect, sometimes of a worship almost fatuous, irrespective of her personal qualities. This is partly traceable to historical accident. Jonathan Oldbuck is a cynic, but he is not far wrong in saying that it was by the fantastic imagination of chivalry that Dulcineas were exalted into despotic goddesses. He might have added that Mariolatry had played its part.
It is averred that women, unless they share political power, cannot take an interest in public affairs. It has even been said that they cannot read history. That they can not only read but write history experience shows. It shows also that many of them do take interest in public affairs. Apart from politics the whole field of charity, benevolence, and social reform invites their action. In it they have produced a train of worthies such as Miss Nightingale, and the same field is preferred by many of the best men, who shrink from the political arena in its present state. Politics, after all, are not the greatest part of life. It was under the despotism of a foreign conqueror that Christianity came into the world.

The far western State of Wyoming, the mining State of Colorado, and New Zealand have made the experiment of Woman’s Suffrage. Let them fairly try it, and if the result is good, let the rest of the world follow. In every field of action, except that of politics, use is made of experiment. A new engine is tested before it is put on all the railways or into all the steamships. A new medicine, however promising, is tried in one or two cases before it is applied universally. If an airship were invented, aeronauts would be called upon to prove its safety before all the world ascended. But in politics sweeping changes are irrevocably made upon the strength of what even an advocate of the change, if he had any fairness of mind, would allow to be a mere balance of argument in its favour. Had extensions of the suffrage, or changes in the form of local government been tried in one or two districts or cities first, a pause of salutary reflection might have ensued. But political changes, for the most part, are the result of conflict, not of reasoning; of the desire of a class or party for power, not of broad conviction as to the public good. Woman’s Suffrage is a change fraught with the most momentous results, not only to the commonwealth, but to the household. Let Wyoming, Colorado, and New Zealand give it a full trial. The success of the Wyoming experiment is publicly proclaimed, and the universe is exhorted to go and do likewise by Wyoming, whose voice is that of the female voters.
Other accounts are not so favourable,¹ nor have neighbouring States, which must have the clearest view of the results, been induced to follow the example. In Nebraska, in spite of a laborious canvass headed by Miss Susan B. Anthony, Woman Suffrage was defeated by two to one.² To Wyoming and Colorado, Woman’s Suffrage in the United States remains confined. The New Zealand experiment will be more satisfactory, though New Zealand, having no warlike neighbours, does not run the same risk in emasculating her government which is run by a European State. If after effectual trial it appears from the experiments that legislation and government have become wiser, more far-sighted, and more just, without any detriment to the peace and order of the home, let the world follow the example, and be grateful to those by whom the first experiment was made.

At the present juncture in Europe sexual revolution would be especially perilous. Among other things tendency to the personal ascendancy of great demagogues, which has shown itself as a result of the enfranchisement of masses ignorant of political principles and questions, could not fail to be aggravated by the enfranchisement of all the women, the inclination of the sex being to personal rather than constitutional government. In France, with Woman Suffrage, the Republic could hardly live.

Mr. Blair’s Report ends by saying that men can have no motive for refusing the suffrage to women but the selfish one of unwillingness to part with half of the sovereign power. Selfishness in this matter would undoubtedly be not only wickedness but folly. What is good for woman is good in the same measure for man, and ought not to be withheld. One lady in her evidence warns Congress, if it will not give way, that the wild enthusiasm of woman can be used for evil as well as good, and threatens in America a repetition of the scenes of the French Commune. More terrible even than this menace is the fear of doing an injury to man’s partner, and thereby a

¹ See the paper by Governor Crounse of Nebraska, North American Review, June, 1894.
² Ibid.
deeper injury to man himself. But the change ought to be proved good. Before man hands over the government to woman, he ought to be satisfied that he cannot do what is right himself. In an age of "flabby" sentiment and servile worship of change, we have had enough of weak and precipitate surrenders. It was to weak and precipitate surrender that the world owed the French Revolution and the deluge of calamity which followed. To man, as he alone could enforce the law, the sovereign power came naturally and righteously. Let him see whether he cannot make a just use of it, in the interest of his wife and children as well as in his own, before he sends in his resignation.

But in the rage of the universal faction fight the voice of prudence is drowned, and the world is hurried from change to change, not by conviction, but by the exigencies and accidents of the party strife. A New Zealander, writing in the Fortnightly Review,\(^1\) gives us his account of the way in which female suffrage was carried. Only a few "wild women," he says, so far as he by careful inquiry could ascertain, really desired it, though thousands were induced to sign the petition. But some Conservative politicians thought it would strengthen their party. The Prohibitionists—never caring what may happen to the commonwealth so long as they carry their own measure—were most strenuous in favour of the change. Thus the measure slipped through the House of Representatives. It would, according to the writer, have been thrown out by the Legislative Council had not one or two of the members of that Council wished to embarrass the Ministry. So a measure "which no one but a few fanatics and a few Conservative politicians really desired, and which at the least ninety-five per cent. of the population neither desired nor approved of was passed into law." So it will be elsewhere, and a political change, far more momentous than any extension of the male franchise, will be forced on one community after another by the fanaticism of Prohibitionists, aided by the shifty politicians, and the desire or fear of votes. The reception of Wyoming as

\(^{1}\) February, 1894.
a State with a female constitution was strongly resisted in Congress and was carried, it is believed, through the need felt by a political party of two more Senatorial votes. Every demand for an extension of the suffrage is pretty sure in like manner to prevail. When to all the existing masses of the electorate, with its medley of sections, interests, and agitations, has been added the whole female sex with emotions, passions, objects, and issues of its own, and with the new order of demagogism to which it is sure to give birth, the system of demagogic and party government will have reached its climax, and the world may be led to consider whether to escape confusion it will not be necessary to set up in one form or another a strong, stable, and impartial government.
To the Editor of the New York Times:

The woman suffragists of New York State are claiming that suffrage should be forced upon unwilling women, because it is the voice of the people, and consequently, the voice of God. They claim to have signed to the voluminous papers that are annually presented to the Legislature 300,000 signatures. They admit that a proportion of those names are represented by the signature of one man. For instance, a labor organization of many hundred men is credited as having signed the petition through the secretary. This has been done in several instances. How were the other names obtained? A fee was paid for the enrollment of each name; 1 cent, 2 cents, and in some instances, we are told, 3 cents per name was given. In a village in the interior part of the State several women have openly said that, although opposed to the extension of suffrage to women, they have signed their names to the suffrage petition through their desire to help the woman who was trying to earn a little money in this way. Merchants were not only cajoled, but threatened; and so were women, if they refused to sign the petition. Many boys and girls of tender years affixed their signatures, as many older people did, "for the fun of it." Ridicule and satire were used, where it could be used, against the women who were opposed to suffrage, and logic and sense were tried to be swept away by an avalanche of sophistry and fanaticism.

"Women who pay taxes should vote," was the war cry; and when it was proved that the very large majority of women who pay taxes were opposed to the extension of unlimited suffrage to their sex, then the old cry of "ignorance" and "slavery" rang on the
ear. It was so ridiculously absurd to dub American women of the present age as either "ignorant," or "slaves," that the cry sank into silence through its own weakness.

Now, regarding this "voice of the people" argument. Despite the fact that long petitions said to contain these many names have been presented to the Legislature of the State of New York, the fact that there are only 1,600 enrolled suffragists in a State where there are nearly 7,000,000 people, shows at once the weakness of that argument. It is currently reported that the women leaders in the suffrage movement have forgotten that women are to purify the political cesspools, and so have descended to threaten our legislators with the bugbear of a defeat, in case they try for re-election, if they prove to be opposed to allowing the question of women suffrage to go to the people to be voted upon. Now, as there are more than as many thousand enrolled anti-suffragists, as there are hundreds of suffragists in New York State, and as names are being added daily to the lists of anti-suffragists, the legislators—if they are governed by their fears of women—have more need of acting with the antis than against them, for, while the anti-suffragists would deplore the necessity for lowering themselves to the level of corrupt political methods, they would, nevertheless, feel themselves bound to defend their cause against the methods employed by the suffragists, even if they were forced to use the same weapons.

The suffragists say that the antis are afraid of allowing the question to go to the people to decide. That is not so. If it were decided by men at the polls, the defeat would be more overwhelming than it was in Massachusetts. But the antis believe the question of women's voting should be decided by women themselves, and, as the burden of proof lies with the suffragists, that until it can be shown by them that a large majority of women of voting age desire the franchise, no notice of the matter should be taken by our legislators. No possible good would be derived by submitting the question to the people. If it would, then Massachusetts is no criterion for New York, for, despite the overwhelming defeat that the suffragists met at the polls last fall in Massachusetts, they are to-day urging their claims as fiercely as ever and demanding that the people be allowed to again vote upon the question. They are boasting that, although the Massachusetts Legislature this year refused to give them a chance of a hearing before a special committee, they have forced a hearing through three committees. They already have had a hearing before
the Committee on Election Laws and the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, besides flooding the legislative halls with petitions and leaflets. They acknowledge that they are working on the principal that the Cuban insurgents have followed, viz., to tire out their opponents. But, while the anti-suffragists receive no pay for their services, they are in the fight through honest conviction, and will stay in it to the end. They can not be worried or fretted or ridiculed for their "ignorance" out of the way. They object to the publicity and added burden, but they submit, knowing that they are working for the good of the State as well as all womankind.

Albany, March 14, 1896. 

A. P. P.
WOMAN SUFFRAGE DEFEATS.

To the Editor of The Argus:

A syndicate letter is going the rounds of the press giving what is termed the gains made by the women suffragists during the last fifty years. It has been clearly proven in "Woman and the Republic" that neither Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Stanton or Miss Anthony knew the names of the proposers and defenders of the bill that opened the way in New York for all the liberal legislation that has followed. During the constitutional convention of 1894, Mr. Church, of Alleghany, presented an appeal from his county asking for the suffrage. He said in part: "Beginning in 1848, the male citizens of the State of New York, not at the clamor of the women, as I understand it, but actuated by a sense of justice, began to remove the disabilities under which women labored at that time. Gradually, from that time on, the barriers had been stricken away until, in 1891, I believe, the last impediments were removed."

A careful study of the laws of our State shows that the change in the laws did not originate in the suffrage movement; that change of law has not been so much sought for by the suffrage leaders, as a voice upon change of laws; that not so much demand has been made for better laws, as for woman suffrage; that being held up to be the panacea for all woman’s wrongs.

Women to-day in nearly every State of the Union stand on a par legally with men, or are raised upon a legal plane above men. Suffrage to be granted to women should only be considered from the standpoint first: Will the right to vote confer upon women any benefit from which she is now deprived? And second, will the State be benefitted by allowing all of its women to vote?

That these questions have been decided in the negative by the States below, is proof that the suffrage cry of "gain" is an empty nothing. These statistics are given from the time of the late presidential election.

In Arizona, a woman suffrage bill was defeated by the Assembly. In California a constitutional amendment conferring the full rights
of suffrage upon women was defeated by the people at the election in November, 1896; and both branches of the Legislature of 1897 rejected a resolution to submit the question again to the people.

In Connecticut the Legislature rejected all woman suffrage measures, including a bill to permit women to vote on the license question, and one allowing tax-paying women to vote upon questions involving the levying of taxes.

In Delaware the constitutional convention refused to strike the word "male" from the election clause of the new Constitution. Similar action was taken with a motion to make the clause read "every citizen."

In Illinois it failed to be the one constitutional amendment possible to be adopted.

In Indiana, the Supreme Court handed down a decision denying the claim that women have the right of suffrage under the existing Constitution. The courts held that the Constitution proceeds on the assumption that the suffrage is not an inherent or natural right; and that this is the assumption of the framers of all the constitutions in the land.

In Iowa, a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated.

In Kansas, a bill to give women the right to vote for Presidential electors was reported adversely by the committee on elections, and the House refused to give it a place on the calendar for discussion.

In Kentucky, a bill permitting women to vote for school officers and to be eligible to the office of school trustee was rejected.

In Missouri, a resolution for a constitutional amendment conferring the suffrage upon women was defeated.

In Massachusetts, a resolution providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment striking the word "male" from the Constitution was defeated; also a bill to permit women to vote on the license question; and propositions to confer municipal suffrage and presidential suffrage upon women were defeated.

In Maine, the judiciary committee of the Legislature gave the petitioners for a municipal suffrage bill "leave to withdraw."

In Montana, the Legislature defeated a proposed constitutional amendment to confer the suffrage upon women.

In Nebraska, the House defeated a resolution to submit a woman's suffrage amendment to the Constitution; and the Senate refused to consider a municipal suffrage bill.

In Nevada, the Assembly defeated a woman suffrage bill.
In New York, a resolution for a suffrage constitutional amendment was introduced into the Legislature, but defeated in the judiciary committee. A proposed woman’s suffrage provision in the Greater New York charter failed in the Legislature.

In New Jersey, a proposed amendment to grant school suffrage to women was defeated.

In Oklahoma, the House on January 25th, 1897, defeated by a decisive vote a bill to permit women to vote in the territory; and on February 18th, reaffirmed the action.

In Rhode Island, a resolution for a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated.

In Vermont, a bill to confer municipal suffrage upon women taxpayers was defeated.

Woman suffrage bills were defeated also in Nova Scotia, in the British House of Commons, later in the House of Lords and still later in Australia.

To this statement may be added the fact that the Assembly judiciary committee of New York voted against woman suffrage on February 2d, 1898.

Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell.

Albany, Feb., 1898.
WOMAN SUFFRAGE DEFEATS.

A syndicate letter is going the rounds of the press giving what is termed the gains made by the women suffragists during the last fifty years. It has been clearly proven in "Woman and the Republic" that neither Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Stanton or Miss Anthony knew the names of the proposers and defenders of the bill that opened the way in New York for all the liberal legislation that has followed. During the constitutional convention of 1894, Mr. Church, of Allegany, presented an appeal from his county asking for the suffrage. He said in part: "Beginning in 1848, the male citizens of the State of New York, not at the clamor of the women, as I understand it, but actuated by a sense of justice began to remove the disabilities under which women labored at that time. Gradually from that time on, the barriers had been stricken away until, in 1891, I believe, the last impediments were removed."

A careful study of the laws of our State shows that the change in the laws did not originate in the suffrage movement; that change of law has not been so much sought for by the suffrage leaders, as a voice upon change of laws: that not so much demand has been made for better laws as for woman suffrage; that being held up to be the panacea for all woman's wrongs.

To-day, in nearly every State of the Union, women stand on a par legally with men, or are raised upon a legal plane above men. Suffrage to be granted to women should be considered only from the standpoint, first: Will the right to vote confer upon woman any benefit from which she is now deprived? And second, will the State be benefited by allowing all of its women to vote?

That these questions have been decided in the negative by the States below, is proof that the suffrage cry of "gain" is "whistling in the dark." These statistics are given from, and including 1894,—the year that the constitutional convention met in Albany and refused to submit to the people an amendment striking the word "male" from the Constitution.

1894.

In Iowa, the Senate defeated a proposition to submit a suffrage constitutional amendment to the people.

In Kansas, a constitutional amendment giving to women full rights of suffrage was defeated.
In Massachusetts, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate.

In New York, the constitutional convention refused to submit to the people an amendment striking the word "male" from the Constitution.

In Vermont, the House, after first acting favorably on a municipal suffrage bill, rejected it, and subsequently refused to reconsider this action.

1895.

In California, bills for municipal suffrage and for full suffrage for women failed; but a joint resolution was passed submitting to the people in 1896 a suffrage constitutional amendment.

In Connecticut, a municipal suffrage bill was rejected by the Senate. A Presidential suffrage bill did not reach a vote.

In Illinois, a bill conferring upon women the right of township suffrage was twice defeated by the Senate.

In Indiana, a constitutional amendment, striking the word "male" from the Constitution of the State, was introduced, but secured no support, and was not reported by the committee to which it was referred.

In Kansas, a bill was passed by the Senate giving full suffrage to nine women who had petitioned for it, and who were named in the bill. The Senate also passed a bill conferring upon women the right to vote for Presidential electors. Neither bill reached a vote in the House.

In Maine, the Senate defeated a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women.

In Massachusetts, the House refused a third reading to a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women. An act was passed permitting all persons qualified to vote for school committee to express their opinion at the State election by voting Yes or No to the question "Is it expedient that municipal suffrage be granted to women?" The question was decided in the negative at the polls, by a large vote.

In Michigan, a proposition to submit a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated.

In Missouri, a resolution providing for submitting a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated in the House.

In Montana, a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment was defeated in the Senate.

In North Dakota, a bill conferring full suffrage upon women, subject to a referendum to the people was defeated by the House.

In Rhode Island, a resolution for a constitutional amendment was referred to the next Legislature.
In South Dakota, the House tabled a resolution providing for submitting a constitutional amendment to the people.

In Washington, a resolution for a constitutional amendment was defeated by the house.

In Wisconsin, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Assembly.

1896.

In California, a constitutional amendment conferring the full rights of suffrage upon women was defeated by the people.

In Iowa, a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated.

In Massachusetts, the House of Representatives defeated a proposed woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution without calling for the Yeas and Nays. The House also defeated a bill to confer upon women the right to vote upon the License question; and immediately after rejected by an overwhelming vote a bill to confer municipal suffrage upon women.

In Rhode Island, a resolution for a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated.

In Vermont, a bill to confer municipal suffrage upon women taxpayers was defeated.

1897.

In Arizona, a women suffrage bill was defeated by the Assembly.

In California, both branches of the Legislature rejected a resolution to again submit to the people a constitutional amendment conferring the full rights of suffrage upon women.

In Connecticut, the Legislature rejected all women suffrage measures, including a bill to permit women to vote on the license question, and one allowing tax-paying women to vote upon questions involving the levying of taxes.

In Delaware, the constitutional convention refused to strike the word “male” from the election clause of the new Constitution. Similar action was taken with a motion to make the clause read “every citizen.”

In Illinois, a proposed constitutional amendment conferring suffrage upon women, failed to be adopted by the Legislature.

In Indiana, the Supreme Court handed down a decision denying the claim that women have the right of suffrage under the existing Constitution. The Court held that the Constitution proceeds on the assumption that the suffrage is not an inherent or natural right; and that this is the assumption of the framers of all the constitutions in the land.

In Kansas, a bill to give women the right to vote for Presidential electors was reported adversely by the committee on elections, and
the House refused to give it a place on the calendar for discussion.

In Kentucky, a bill permitting women to vote for school officers and to be eligible to the office of school trustee was rejected.

In Missouri, a resolution for a constitutional amendment conferring the suffrage upon women was defeated.

In Massachusetts, a resolution providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment striking the word "male from the Constitution was defeated; also a bill to permit women to vote on the license question; and propositions to confer municipal suffrage and presidential suffrage upon women were also defeated.

In Maine, the judiciary committee of the Legislature gave the petitioners for a municipal suffrage bill "leave to withdraw."

In Montana, the Legislature defeated a proposed constitutional amendment to confer the suffrage upon women.

In Nebraska, the House defeated a resolution to submit a woman's suffrage amendment to the Constitution; and the Senate refused to consider a municipal suffrage bill.

In Nevada, the Assembly defeated a woman suffrage bill.

In New York, a resolution for a suffrage constitutional amendment was introduced into the Legislature, but was defeated in the judiciary committee. A proposed woman suffrage provision in the Greater New York charter failed in the Legislature.

In New Jersey, a proposed amendment to grant school suffrage to women was defeated.

In Oklahoma, the House defeated by a decisive vote a bill to permit women to vote in the territory, and later reaffirmed its action.

Woman suffrage bills were defeated in Nova Scotia, in the British House of Commons, later in the House of Lords, and still later in Australia.

1898.

The Assembly Judiciary Committee of New York, on February 2, 1898, killed in committee, the concurrent resolution to amend the Constitution by providing for woman suffrage. On March 3d, the suffragists forced a hearing before the Judiciary Committee, who again voted to not report favorably.

In Massachusetts, three suffrage bills were defeated. On February 14, 1898, a bill to amend the State Constitution by striking out the word "male" was overwhelmingly defeated. The committee on constitutional amendments reported "leave to withdraw" on that petition. The election laws committee reported "leave to withdraw" on the petition for municipal and license suffrage, but the House decided to debate the license suffrage petition. The result was that the House of Representatives refused to substitute a license suffrage bill for the adverse report made by the committee.
In Iowa, on Feb. 15, 1898, a bill to submit a suffrage amendment to the people was defeated in the Assembly.

In Ohio, the Legislature defeated, on Feb. 28, 1898, a proposed submission to the people of an amendment to the Constitution giving full suffrage to women.

In South Dakota, Nov. 1898, a proposed amendment to the Constitution conferring the elective franchise on women, was submitted to the people and defeated.

In Vermont, Nov. 4, 1898, the House refused a third reading to the bill extending municipal suffrage to tax paying women.

In Washington, Nov., 1898, a proposed amendment to the constitution conferring the elective franchise on women, was submitted to the people and defeated.

In the Colony of Victoria, Australia, the woman suffrage bill sent by the Assembly to the Legislative Council was defeated.

1899.

In Arizona, a bill conferring full suffrage upon women was defeated in the Senate.

In Arkansas, a bill conferring school suffrage upon women was defeated.

In California, a bill granting school suffrage to women was defeated by the Governor who refused to sign the bill.

In Connecticut, a bill granting municipal suffrage to women was defeated in both houses.

In Georgia, efforts were made to introduce bills in the Legislature to exempt the property of women from taxation until they could vote and to provide for a convention to revise the Constitution so as to give equal suffrage rights with men, both of which failed.

In Illinois, three bills were introduced in the Legislature granting to women township suffrage, the right to vote by tax paying women on appropriations of public funds, and the right to vote for presidential electors and other offices, all of which failed.

In Maine, a petition to the Legislature to exempt women from taxation was disposed of by the committee on taxation who voted that the petitioners have leave to withdraw.

In Massachusetts, a concurrent resolution to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution, and a bill providing for municipal suffrage for women were both defeated.

In Michigan, a joint resolution introduced into the Legislature asking for equal suffrage was defeated.

In Montana, a bill to give the right of suffrage to tax paying women was defeated in the house.

In Nevada, the Legislature rejected a resolution for a woman suffrage amendment.
In New Mexico, a bill introduced into the Legislature to grant school suffrage to women, was defeated.

In New York, a bill conferring upon women the right to vote in towns and villages upon questions involving taxation was defeated in the Senate Judiciary Committee. A bill to provide for the compulsory representation of women on Boards of Education was defeated.

In North Carolina, no action was taken upon a bill giving the right to vote to tax paying women on questions involving taxation.

In Oklahoma, a constitutional amendment giving full suffrage to women was defeated in the Senate.

In Tennessee, a bill making women eligible to the office of notary public was defeated in the Senate.

In Washington, a bill asking for an amendment to the Constitution permitting women to vote on the proposition “Shall women be Enfranchised?” was defeated in committee.

In West Virginia, a bill introduced in the Legislature asking for full suffrage for women was defeated.

In Great Britain, Houses of Parliament rejected bill permitting election of women as councillors.

At Melbourne, the Legislative Council of Victoria rejected the Woman’s Suffrage Bill.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL,
ALBANY, N. Y., September, 1899. Chairman Ex. Com. S. O. S. W.
ALBANY, N. Y.
WOMAN SUFFRAGE DEFEATS.

SUPPLEMENTAL.

1900.

In Iowa. — Proposed woman suffrage amendments to the State constitution were rejected by the legislature.

In Massachusetts. — A municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the legislature.

In New York. — Resolution adopted by the senate of New York: "Resolved, That it is the sense of the senate that it is not expedient or advisable to attempt at this session any change in the constitution or statutes relating to woman suffrage."

In Ohio. — Proposed woman suffrage amendments to the State constitution were rejected by the legislature.

In Oregon. — A proposed woman suffrage amendment to the State constitution was defeated at the polls.

In South Dakota. — A proposed woman suffrage amendment to the State constitution was defeated by the people.

In Vermont. — A woman suffrage taxpayers' bill was defeated in the legislature.

In Washington. — A proposed woman suffrage amendment to the State constitution was defeated by the people.

1901.

In Alabama. — The constitutional convention rejected a proposition to admit women to the franchise in municipal elections called for the purpose of issuing bonds or incurring debt.

In California. — Proposed constitutional amendments conferring suffrage upon women were defeated in the legislature.

In Connecticut. — Municipal suffrage bills were defeated.

In Indiana. — Proposed constitutional amendments conferring suffrage upon women were defeated in the legislature.

In Kansas. — A presidential suffrage bill was defeated.

In Massachusetts. — Municipal suffrage bills were defeated.

In New Mexico. — A school suffrage bill was defeated.

In Oregon. — Proposed constitutional amendments conferring suffrage upon women were defeated.
In South Dakota. — Proposed constitutional amendments conferring suffrage upon women were defeated.

In Wisconsin. — Proposed constitutional amendments conferring suffrage upon women were defeated.

1902.

In Connecticut. — The constitutional convention rejected a resolution giving women the full right of suffrage.

In Iowa. — A joint resolution for the submission of an amendment to the people providing for woman suffrage was defeated in the house.

In Kentucky. — The legislature repealed the law which had allowed women to vote for school officers in second-class cities.

In Massachusetts. — Tax-paying and license suffrage bills and a resolve for a suffrage constitutional amendment were defeated.

In New York. — A bill to give women in third-class cities the right to vote upon tax propositions failed, and the legislature passed a bill repealing the law of 1892, which gave women in towns the right to vote for school commissioners, on the ground that it was unconstitutional.

In Vermont. — The legislature rejected presidential suffrage and municipal suffrage bills, and refused to permit women to vote on the local option referendum.

1903.

In Arizona. — A bill conferring full suffrage upon women passed both branches of the legislature, but was vetoed by the governor on constitutional grounds. The bill was quite generally regarded as a Mormon measure, and if it had been adopted would unquestionably have heavily increased the Mormon vote.

In Connecticut. — A tax-paying suffrage bill was defeated in the house, May 6, 105 to 60.

In Illinois. — Bills were introduced to give women tax-payers the right to vote for tax officials and on tax matters and to give all women the right to vote for all officers over whose election the legislature has full control, including presidential electors; and a joint resolution for a suffrage constitutional amendment. None of these measures was favorably acted on.

In Kansas. — A presidential suffrage bill was defeated.

In Maine. — A bill was introduced to confer municipal suffrage upon tax-paying women. The committee on legal affairs declined to report it in that form, and eliminated the tax-paying feature.
In a new draft, conferring municipal suffrage upon all women, it was discussed in the house February 13, and defeated by a large majority. The senate, a week later, defeated the bill by a tie vote, the president of the senate breaking the tie by voting in the negative.

In Massachusetts. — A tax-paying suffrage bill and a proposed constitutional amendment were defeated in the legislature.

In Minnesota. — A presidential suffrage bill was introduced and failed.

In Montana. — A resolution for the submission to the people of the suffrage question was killed in the senate by the casting vote of the lieutenant-governor.

In Nebraska. — The movement for a constitutional amendment was abandoned, and the suffragists concentrated their efforts upon a bill to improve the property rights of women, which was defeated by hostile amendments, which forced its withdrawal.

In New Hampshire. — At the polls, March 10, a constitutional amendment giving women full suffrage was defeated. To carry the amendment should have received two-thirds of the vote cast. It fell far short of getting even a majority. The vote in favor was 14,162 against 21,788.

In New York. — The bill to give all tax-paying women in third-class cities the right to vote on propositions submitted at special tax elections, which was defeated in 1902, again failed. It was passed by the house, but failed in the senate committee.

In Rhode Island. — A presidential suffrage bill was introduced, but failed to receive even a committee report.

In West Virginia. — A presidential suffrage bill was defeated.

In Wisconsin. — A tax-paying suffrage bill was defeated.

1904.

In Iowa. — A proposed constitutional amendment failed to receive the required constitutional majority in the house, the vote being 43 to 40; and in the senate was indefinitely postponed.

In Massachusetts. — The committee on election laws reported, 10 to 1, “leave to withdraw” on a municipal suffrage bill and unanimously on a municipal and license suffrage bill. The adverse report on the latter bill was accepted without debate in both houses; that on the former was debated in the house, but was accepted without a roll-call, the supporters of the bill being unable to secure the 30 votes needed to demand it.
In New York. — Bills to allow women to vote for school officers and to vote on questions of raising and spending money in third-class cities failed.

In Ohio. — A bill to allow women to vote at local option elections failed.

In Rhode Island. — The house, March 24, voted to indefinitely postpone a presidential suffrage bill.

In Vermont. — A tax-paying municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the house.

1905.

During the year 1905 woman suffrage bills were defeated in California, Connecticut, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, Vermont and West Virginia.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNEll.

ALBANY, N. Y., June 1, 1905.
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WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND WAGES.

WILL THE BALLOT HELP WOMEN MORE THAN IT DOES MEN?

To the Editor of the Tribune:

Sir:—The women who are agitating the question of giving suffrage to women use as an argument to bring the working women into sympathy with them the assertion that when women vote all women will be employed at increased wages. The fallacy of this argument is seen in the fact that so many men who are voters are idle, and also in the frequency of strikes; for if wages and suffrage bore any relative value, there would be no men out of employment and no need of any united demand for an increase of wages or protest against their decrease.

The question to be considered carefully is whether the condition of the working woman will be bettered by allowing her the franchise. Very few women reason; very few are logical; sophistry takes the place of argument; and ridicule or invective are the weapons used in debate; but facts continue to be facts. Political economists assure us that the wages of labor, in the sharp competition among laborers, will naturally ever gravitate toward the lowest point that will support life. It is an acknowledged fact that wages can be kept up only by keeping the demand a little beyond the supply; that is, by narrowing competition. Everywhere the wage is regulated by demand and supply; and as women enter the field as competitors with men, the result is always that instead of wages being increased for women, they are lowered for men. The reason of this is obvious, competition is closer among women than among men, and they can support themselves on lower wages. Many girls on leaving
school enter employment as a means of obtaining money for extra clothing or trinkets, and not as a means of livelihood. This is furnished them by the fathers and brothers whose places they are usurping and whose wages they are lowering. They are housed and fed; they do not have to pay for rent, fire, light, food or ordinary clothing; and so they accept prices for labor that no man who has to provide for a family could accept. When a merchant or a manufacturer can fill all the vacant places with girls who are not only willing but anxious to work for a low wage, will they stop to ask if they had not better employ a man at an advanced price of labor because he can vote?

The question is asked seriously by a suffragist: "Do you suppose that girls will accept the pittance they now receive in factories when they can vote?" I fail to see how the condition of things will be changed by the simple fact that so often in a year women will cast their ballots. The price of labor can not be made a legislative matter; and if it could it could not be enforced. I am told that there is not a factory in existence in New York State to-day that has not a long roll of names of girls who are begging to be employed. How are these girls to regulate their pay if they can vote? Are not the unemployed men thronging our streets to-day? They can vote; and they are only too willing to be employed at any wages that may be offered.

We will, for the sake of the argument, allow an impossibility, namely, that when women vote they will, by that simple reason, have accorded them increased wages. What then? Will our manufacturers be willing to open their mills and factories, closed on account of their inability to pay the price of labor to-day, and sell their goods at a loss? Will they in Don Quixote spirit, fling open their doors for the "woman with a ballot in her hand?" Would it be wise, when so many men are unemployed and seeking labor, when communism, anarchy and sedition are rife in our midst, to throw into this seething mass the unknown quantity dubbed "woman suffrage," with all its power for evil as well as for good?

All professions, as well as other fields of labor, are open to women without the ballot. Why did they not avail themselves of these openings? Women physicians in the State hospitals receive from $1,000 to $1,500 a year; and yet the examination advertised in January by the New York State Civil Service Commission for women candidates failed for lack of applicants.
In literature women are as well paid as men for the same quality of work. It is stated authoritatively that the largest price ever paid in this country for a manuscript was received by a woman. The magazines make no discrimination; and the same rule obtains in art. On the stage and in music there is absolute wage equality of sex. If there is any distinction it is in favor of the woman. A fashionable dressmaker or milliner usually receives more extravagant profits than the tailor or hatter.

The first woman admitted to the bar in New York State was a teacher in the State Normal College at Albany, and she is there still and has been there many years since receiving her diploma. She has never been heard of in court, and has evidently never tried to avail herself of the privileges of her legal profession. There have been several women physicians who have put out their shingle in Albany, and then, after a few years of unrewarded desire to be of service to women physically, have, like the Arab, folded their tents and quietly stolen away.

Wages will never be a question of the ballot. Low wages will obtain as long as there is illegitimate competition; and as long as young women enter the shop or factory as a bridge to span the interval between school and marriage, so long there will be unfair competition. The workers in large proportion see this. When the protest against striking the word "male" from the Constitution was being signed in Albany, hundreds of young women employed in shops and factories came to the headquarters to sign the protest. One of them said that a suffrage petition had been handed to her with the statement that if she could vote she would have higher wages; to which she replied: "I am now receiving more than my father does, and he votes."

It is a wise policy that dictates the holding of a known good rather than to lose it by trying to grasp an unknown and untried system that may prove to be an illusive phantom, or worse.

Albany, March 7, 1896.                                       E. S. C.
Woman Suffragists' Weakness.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

When the Massachusetts referendum relative to the expediency of granting suffrage to women was decided in the negative by an overwhelming majority, it was supposed that this voice of the people would settle the matter, for a time at least. The hopes of the home-loving women were defeated, however, for no sooner had the Massachusetts Legislature convened last winter than it was besieged by petitions, leaflets, and personal applications for the granting of presidential and municipal suffrage to women. It had been customary to appoint a legislative Suffrage Committee, but this the legislators wisely concluded was not necessary this year, as the people had decided the question. The suffragists, not to be beaten, then appeared before the Committee on Elections, the Municipal Elections Committee and the License Committee. The claims urged by them were the old theories that have been over and over proved to be fallacies, but there was a glimmering hope for the suffragists when the question of allowing women to vote for license was brought up.

The pedestal upon which the women of this country and century have been placed through the chivalry of men seemed to hold a being so perfect that the liquor question would be settled by prohibitionary laws if women could have the suffrage; but it was shown that out of 1,100 applications for license in Boston 491 names of women were copartners. The result was that all three bills were defeated.

The kernel in the nut of the above statements is the fact that the suffragists of New York State propose presenting a bill allowing the present voting population of the State to vote upon the question of woman suffrage.

They hope to influence those legislators who are opposed to woman suffrage with the fallacious hope that the people's voice will settle the question. There is no question in the mind of any thoughtful person as to the result of the people's vote. The men in
New York State would be governed by the wishes of the women to whom they owe allegiance, and the women who are opposed to suffrage outrank the suffragists 4,000 to 1. That this statement is not overdrawn is proved by the following quotation from Mr. Catt, husband of Mrs. C. Catt, the organizer of the National Suffrage Association: “New York, with a white population of 6,000,000, has only 1,600 organized suffragists, or only 27 organized suffragists to each 100,000 of her white population.”

Until the suffragists can show at least 1,000,000 women who desire suffrage, our legislators should obey the will of the great majority of the women, who are opposed to suffrage, and they should not sanction the action of the few clamoring women by even giving them a hearing. These women claim equal rights with men. They claim that they do not ask for chivalry or any courtesy denied to men. Would so slight a percentage of men who wished to revolutionize the suffrage policy be given a hearing year in and year out? Would in not be said to them: “You presented your arguments to the Constitutional Convention; they had there a full and even generous hearing, and the convention decided by a large majority that it would not be wise or for the good of the State to grant your request; we believe the convention to have acted in accordance with the views of the people in general, and we refuse to act in opposition to what they thought best”?

This should be the position of our legislators regarding woman suffrage.

New York, April 11, 1896. 

A. P. P.
WOMAN SUFFRAGE

ONE OF THE GRIEVANCES OF THE LEADING ADVOCATES THEREOF.

From the Popular Science Monthly.

One of the grievances of the suffrage leaders lay in the fact that the literary women of the country would express no sympathy with their efforts. Poets and authors in general were denounced. Gail Hamilton, who had the good of woman in her heart, who was better informed on public affairs than perhaps any other woman in the United States, and whose trenchant pen cut deep and spared not, always reprobated the cause. Mrs. Stowe stood aloof, and so did Catherine Beecher, though urged to the contrary course by Henry Ward Beecher, and Isabella Beecher Hooker. In a letter to Mrs. Cutler, Catherine Beecher said:—"I am not opposed to women’s speaking in public to any who are willing to hear, nor am I opposed to women’s preaching, sanctioned as it is by a prophetic apostle—as one of the millennial results. Nor am I opposed to a woman’s earning her own independence in any lawful calling, and wish many more were open to her which are now closed. Nor am I opposed to the organization and agitation of women, as women, to set forth the wrongs suffered by great multitudes of our sex, which are multiform and most humiliating. Nor am I opposed to women’s undertaking to govern boys and men—they always have, and they always will. Nor am I opposed to the claim that women have equal rights with men. I rather claim that they have the sacred superior rights that God and good men accord to the weak and defenseless, by which they have the easiest work, the most safe and comfortable places, and the largest share of all the most agreeable and desirable enjoyments of this life. My main objection to the woman-suffrage organization is this, that a wrong mode is employed to gain a right object.

Enquirer, Buffalo, N. Y., June 4th, 1897.
WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

It has been claimed by those who advocate Woman Suffrage that the right to vote is a natural right, and therefore women are as much entitled to it as man. Perhaps we can best answer this by giving the views of Herbert Spencer who, having made a life-study of Sociology, is entitled to be considered good authority. He says: "If a man has general freedom to pursue the object of life, subject only to the rights of other men, if the integrity of his body is no way interfered with, if there is no impediment to his locomotion, if his ownership of all that he has earned or acquired is fully respected, if he may give or bequeath as he pleases, occupy himself in what way he likes, make a contract or exchange with whomsoever he will, hold any opinions and express them in speech or print, nothing remains for him to demand under the name of rights as properly understood. The giving of a vote in no way furthers the voter's life as does the exercise of these various liberties we properly call rights."

The value and influence of a vote has, we think, been very much overrated. In our own country we have seen how the will of the majority has been frustrated; how voting does not prevent the corruption of municipal government, does not prevent the growth of general and local organizations by which each individual is compelled to surrender his power to bosses and wirepullers; does not prevent an enormous majority of consumers being taxed for the benefit of a small minority of manufacturers and artisans, does not even protect men from violent deaths. But small comparatively as the influence of a vote is in our opinion, we believe that while the world is subject to wars, men, who are physically better able to defend their country in its armies, have from that fact a greater right to vote than women. To give women the right to vote for a war which they are physically incapable of carrying on, seems to us a greater wrong than taxation without representation of which there is so much complaint.

When we look at this question as a matter of desirability and expediency, it seems to us there can be but one decision.
As civilization advances there is more and more a tendency towards a division of labor, to the giving to each person the work he is best fitted to do, and it seems a monstrous absurdity to suppose that women are best fitted to make laws and men to train children. It has been said, "Let me make the songs of a people and I care not who makes its laws." In a much truer sense it may be said, "Let me train the children of the world and I care not who makes its laws." We believe our country needs good wise mothers more than women voters, for we believe habits are more powerful than laws.

Another plea for giving Woman suffrage is that without it they cannot obtain legal recognition of their just rights. But the facts do not sustain this claim. During the last thirty years various disabilities of women have been removed with very little resistance from men. *Comparing the behavior of men to men with the behavior of men to women, it is manifest that in modern times the sentiment of Justice has been more operative in determining the last than the first. Ill treated classes of men have had to struggle far longer before they obtained from the classes which ill treated them, the concessions they demanded than women as a class has had to struggle before obtaining from man as a class the various freedoms they asked for. They have obtained these without political power and there is no reason to doubt that such further injustice as they complain of may be similarly remedied without making the great constitutional change some of them seek. In the present condition of affairs, women are the friends and co-workers with men; should they become voters we fear they would become opponents and work against each other. While women are respected and treated with so much consideration in our own country that all foreigners remark it, they cannot with truth be said to be degraded simply because they do not vote. *To surrender this position and enter into political strife seems to me the most stupendous folly the world has seen since Esau sold his birthright for a mess of potage. It is claimed that the voting of

*In the State of New York it is to be particularly noted that all these rights and privileges have been granted women, not at the request or solicitation of women, but as a voluntary concession, made by men to womanly women in recognition of natural right and justice.
women will purify the morals of the world, but it must be remembered that while women use influence only, a good woman is much more powerful, but should they vote a corrupt woman's vote counts for just as much as that of the best and purest of women. It is a notorious fact that it is very difficult to get the best men of our country interested in public affairs, and it will be much more difficult to induce our best women to enter the political field. We fear herefore that Woman Suffrage would only add another element of corruption to politics. It is sometimes stated as an injustice that the ignorant and corrupt men are allowed to vote. The remedy for this seems to us to be to limit the right of suffrage among men, not to add to it the vote of ignorant women also.

Should it become necessary for a woman to earn her own living in the world of business, she will find no law in America to prevent her doing whatever she is capable of and we believe a women will have a larger measure of success in business under the present state of affairs than if she had equal political rights. But the crowding of women into the world of business has, we think, already produced a disastrous effect in taking work from the men and in lowering wages, making it more and more difficult for men to marry, who desire to support their families themselves as all honorable Americans do.

Let us now look for a moment at the women of other countries and times. In England the women take an active part in political affairs. They canvass the country for votes from cottage to cottage. In the towns they invade bachelors' apartments, visit the alleys of White Chapel, and the savages of Lambeth, being often insulted and personally abused. Some of the best class of women have been struck with eggs, stones and dead fish, and in a late election the wife of one of the candidates had her eye put out and her sister lost all of her front teeth. What seems strangest of all these same English girls would not give a man they knew a cup of tea in their own drawing-room, unless their mother was present to protect them.

Perhaps there is no country in the civilized world where women have done so much work outside of their homes as in France. What has been the result? Says a writer: "The First French Revolution presented one of the most striking
illustrations of the social mischiefs resulting from a neglect of the purifying influence of women. Morals, religion, virtue, were swamped in sensualism. The character of the woman became depraved, conjugal fidelity was disregarded, maternity was held in reproach, family and home were alike corrupted, France was motherless, and the Revolution burst forth amid the yells and fierce violence of women."

Gibbons tells us that after the Punic triumphs the matrons of Rome aspired to the common benefits of a free and opulent Republic. "Their wishes were gratified by the indulgence of their fathers and lovers, and their ambition was unsuccessfully resisted by Cato the Censor. When the Roman matrons became the equal and voluntary companions of their lords, a new Jurisprudence was introduced,—that marriage, like any other partnership might be dissolved by the abdication of one of the associates. In three centuries of prosperity and corruption this principle was enlarged to frequent practice and pernicious abuse. We believe that the agitation and partial success of the movement for female suffrage in our own country is having the same result, and as we believe that pure well ordered homes are the foundation of all good and stable movement, we feel it our duty to resist the advance of this government as wives, mothers and lovers of our country. We believe the proper work of woman is educational, benevolent and in the home. This work has been assigned to her, not by men but by God, who has endowed her with the qualifications necessary for her position. It is a position that will call forth all of her ability, and is an exalted, ennobling one. As Thomas Carlyle has so beautifully expressed it, "I have never doubted but the true and noble function of a woman in this world was, is, and forever will be that of being a wife and help-mate to a worthy man, and discharging well the duties that devolve upon her in consequence as a mother of children, and a mistress of household,—duties high, noble and silently important as any that fall to a human being, duties which if well discharged constitute woman in a soft, beautiful, almost sacred way—The Queen of the World.

JANE C. HARVEY,
Tacoma,
November 29th, 1895.

Washington.
WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

NOTABLE REVERSALS OF OPINION.

Horace Bushnell, when assured that the principles of progress which he had adopted required him to support woman suffrage, reopened the question. After protracted thought, he was forced to the conclusion it would be "a reform against nature."

John Bright, the patriot, the tried and valued friend of every movement for the general benefit of woman, accustomed to equality of meeting in Friends' meetings, spoke against the enfranchisement of women in 1876. When charged with having changed his opinions, he wrote: "I cannot give you all the reasons for the view I take, but I act from the belief that to introduce women into the strife of political life would be a great evil to them, and that to our own sex no possible good could arise. When women are not safe under the charge or care of fathers, husbands, brothers and sons, it is the fault of our non-civilization and not of our laws. As civilization founded on Christian principles advances, women will gain all that is right for them to have, though they are not seen contending in the strife of political parties. In my experience I have observed evil results to many women who have entered heartily into political conflict and discussion. I would save them from it. I am,

Respectfully yours,

JOHN BRIGHT.

Upon Bishop John H. Vincent, the founder of Chautauqua, the consideration of this subject has naturally been forced. And to it he has given years of reflection, carefully following the influence of modern general and higher education in society and particular upon
the home. In former years he was an advocate of woman suffrage, but though enthusiastically devoted to the spread of knowledge, and having distributed diplomas to thousands of women who have pursued the extended course of reading of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, he has been compelled to reverse his attitude. In response to a request for a concise statement of the grounds which led to the change of his views, he wrote the following letter:

"When about thirty years of age I accepted for a time the doctrine of woman suffrage and publicly advocated it. Years of wide and careful observation have convinced me that the demand for woman suffrage in America is without foundation in equity, and if successful, must prove harmful to American society. I find some worthy women defending it, but the majority of our best women, especially our most intelligent ones, neither ask for nor desire it. The curse of America to-day is a dominated partisan vote, the vote of ignorance and superstition. Shall we help matters by doubling this dangerous mass? Free from the weak complications and passions of the political arena, the best women may exert a conservative and moral influence over men as voters. Woman can through the votes of men have every right to which she is entitled. All she has man has gladly given her. It is his glory to represent her. To rob him of this right is to weaken both. He and she are just now in danger from his mistaken courtesy."

JOHN H. VINCENT.
WYOMING.

PUBLISHED

BY THE

ALBANY ANTI-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

1895.
As so much has been said by the suffragists regarding Wyoming, and its exceptional condition as the star state in the union, I had the curiosity to look up Wyoming, and this is what I find from reliable sources. Suffrage was granted to women in Wyoming in 1869, and in 1870 the United States took a census. In that year, one year after the suffrage had been granted to women, the total population of the State of Wyoming was 9,118, and the number of females of all ages from childhood to old age was less than 2,000, and they were scattered over a territory of about 100,000 square miles, or one female, whether in infancy or old age, to every fifty square miles of territory! What is the condition to-day? It must be remembered that the State of Wyoming is more than twice as large as the State of New York, and that the last census report gives the total population, inclusive of Indians and cowboys, as 60,000.

Think of the population of the city of Troy scattered over more than twice the territory of New York State, and you have Wyoming as it stands to-day. It seems then, somewhat superfluous to state "that not one country of Wyoming has a poor-house." Four years ago Wyoming was admitted as a State. Thirty years ago it was a howling wilderness, with no population save the wandering Indians. The settlers were what all settlers of a new country are, some from the east and others from Europe, many of whom could not speak the English language, and the adventurers and tramps that usually flock into a new country. Aged and decrepit people are not taken to a new country, so that it is fair to presume that the people who settled Wyoming were strong and well as pioneers usually are, and to whom the question of existence means to work or starve.

One would be surprised if in the "twenty-five years of woman-suffrage," or any other condition, there should be need of a poor-house, with the vast territory and the small population. The city of Albany has 100,000 inhabitants. There is only one poor-house for the city and county of Albany with a population three times as large as that of the whole State of Wyoming, and that is not filled except in very exceptional times. Then it is stated that the "jails are almost empty." Until a few years ago prisoners were sent to Joliet, Ill., when lynch-law did not get the start of justice.

Isn't it nonsense to seriously cite Wyoming with its four years existence as a State, and its 60,000 inhabitants, as a precedent for New York with its nearly three centuries behind its back, and its more than 6,000,000 inhabitants?

The Colorado Spring Gazette of March 12, 1893, says: "To any one who knows anything of recent Wyoming politics, the statement about 'peaceful and orderly elections, good government and a remarkable degree of initiative on the public school in the State of Wyoming. According..."
statements of all parties, politics in Wyoming are as corrupt as in any State in the union. It certainly cannot be held up as a model for other States in any respect, and the women who want to vote injure rather than help their cause by citing it as an example of what woman's suffrage will do to purify elections and secure good government.”

A writer in the New York Press, says: “People who have lived in Wyoming tell me that gambling is allowed by law, morality is at its lowest ebb, and if there have been fewer hangings—legal hangings—it has been because lynching is more popular.”

Mr. Blackwell, editor of the Woman's Journal, and husband of Lucy Stone, made an appeal to the republicans implying that women would vote for the party who secured them equal rights of suffrage. Let us look at Wyoming as an example, as Mr. Blackwell speaks of it as “Republican Wyoming, saved to Harrison by the heroic efforts of her women.” What are the facts? Not the newspaper partisan statements, but the facts as they are recorded.

In 1890 Wyoming elected a republican governor by a majority of 1,726 in a total vote of 16,032, and chose a legislature which contained thirty-seven republicans and ten democrats. The result of the election November, 1892, was the choice of a legislature democratic by twenty-five to twenty-four, a democratic governor by a majority of 1,871, and a democratic congressman by a majority of 461, while there was a plurality of 953 for the Harrison electors. These changes were actually brought about by the votes of the women; and Gen. Thompson, who managed the democratic campaign in Wyoming, reported afterward that “the women's vote is the easiest thing in the world to get, and the easiest thing to keep, and the easiest thing to manipulate, of any element in politics.”

Governor Waite of Colorado, who favors woman suffrage for political reasons, says: “In Wyoming and Washington, to my knowledge, no extraordinary progress has been made in the line of political reform that can be traced to female suffrage, and in Colorado sufficient time has not elapsed to speak understandingly of the result. Certainly there is little hope of the future, unless women, admitted to suffrage, acquaint themselves more thoroughly than men with political affairs.”

Governor Crounse of Nebraska says: “By way of comparison it may be remarked that the Nebraska laws relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors are far more thorough and far reaching, and are better observed than they are in the sister and adjoining State, Wyoming, where woman suffrage has obtained for a quarter of a century.” He then quotes from the Chicago Record regarding Wyoming: “At the capital city of the State, gambling houses are abundant, and open saloons are as frequent as any other kind of stores; and the charge is made that not a single act of legislation aimed at the betterment of the human race has been passed through woman's influence.” Governor Crounse adds, “Nebraska's sons are largely what their mothers have made them; and what their husbands have achieved has been with the advice and support of the wives, whose influence is felt in a thousand ways other than in the caucus, the convention
It would be easy to fill pages with such statements as are given above. We give these merely to show that there are two sides to the question of whether equal suffrage is a success in Wyoming or not. But the statement as to territory and population will be enough in itself to show the utter nonsense of citing Wyoming as a precedent for New York.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL.

ALBANY, N. Y., May, 1894.
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A Word of Appreciation to Mrs. Pruyn.

The Woman's Association opposed to the extension of suffrage to women, of the Third Judicial District of the State of New York, sincerely appreciating the invaluable services of one who for years has been the foremost leader in the cause of anti-suffrage, whose enthusiastic energy and rare ability have been chiefly responsible for the uniform success and repeated achievements of the association in the interest of womanhood and the home, desires to express its great indebtedness to its honorary president, Mrs. John V. L. Pruyn, of Albany.

Mrs. Pruyn was the president and active leader of the association from 1894 to 1900. During that time she was the moving spirit in the work, ingeniously planning many aggressive measures that were carried out effectively under her personal supervision. The results thus achieved had great influence not only in this State, but also in nearly every other State in the Union where the woman suffrage question was pending.

When in 1894 it became necessary for the home-loving women of this State to demonstrate to the Constitutional Convention that they resented the efforts of female agitators to thrust women into the political arena, it was under Mrs. Pruyn's guidance that our association enrolled over 8,000 members in a single month.

Again, when it became apparent that the woman suffragists would besiege the Republican National Convention at St. Louis in June, 1896, to obtain a declaration favorable to female suffrage in the party platform, it was Mrs. Pruyn's
idea to discount the suffragists by sending to the convention a representative of the anti-suffrage association to protest.

The protest was heeded. It was as one of the leading suffragists present at the convention said: "A protest more forceful than the protest of a thousand men;" and continued, "it will require years to regain the lost ground."

The plan of the suffragists being frustrated at St. Louis, where the Republican party refused to give the desired recognition, the suffragists, a few weeks later, went to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago to urge the adoption of a woman suffrage plank for the Democratic platform. But it was again due to Mrs. Pruyn's forethought that a representative of the anti-suffragists was present to protest.

The result of this opposition was electric. Immediately the attention of the press was attracted, and the fact was heralded throughout the land that an effective organization had been perfected among women opposed to the extension of suffrage. Thus women in many States were roused to join the movement, and the cause of anti-woman suffrage became a matter of national concern.

It was Mrs. Pruyn's thought and her determination that sent a representative to the far western States of South Dakota and Washington to assist the women there in defeating woman suffrage amendments.

It has been due to Mrs. Pruyn's never-failing watchfulness that woman suffrage bills in State legislatures throughout the Union have been discovered and obstructed year after year. She has turned the searchlight of publicity upon them, and by distributing thousands of leaflets and sending hundreds of personal letters has awakened both men and women to a full knowledge of the many objections to such legislation. During this campaign of education there were nearly 100 suffrage defeats in about two-thirds of the States of the Union. No doubt the literature sent out by Mrs. Pruyn had much to do with the results.

No one save those who have been in actual touch with the work will ever know how great and how wide-spread has been
her influence. She has been the most potent and vigorous apostle the anti-suffrage cause has ever had, and her enforced withdrawal from active work by order of her physician is a great loss to the anti-suffrage movement. Being devoted to the cause from a high sense of her duty to womanhood, she has not only contributed her time and her best thought to the work, but also has given the principal financial support to the association, using her own private means in a hundred different ways for the advancement of the work.

The members of the association, who have had the honor and pleasure of working under Mrs. Pruyn as leader, desire to give this testimony in recognition of her invaluable services to the cause; and to add an expression of keen regret that ill-health makes it necessary for her to sever her active connection with the association.
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