

Document title

VII, 1a No 13 POLITICAL SCIENCE STUDY SERIES Vol. III. December, 1897, No. 3

THE BALLOT AND THE BULLET COMPILED BY CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT. PUBLISHED FOR The National America Woman Suffrage Association 107 WORLD BUILDING, NEW YORK Entered at Post-office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mall matter. Issued quarterly, \$1.45 per annum.

EX LIBRIS Carrie Chapman Catt

I have six honest serving men, They taught me an I knew, Their names are Why & What & When And how & Where & Who. Kipling.

Section VII—Pamphlets— No. No. 1-a (13

THE BALLOT AND THE BULLET COMPILED BY CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT. PUBLISHED BY The National American Woman Suffrage Association 107 WORLD BUILDING, NEW YORK Philadelphia: PRESS OF ALFRED J. FERRIS. 1897.

CONTENTS.

Female Warriors *D. P. Livermore* 11

The Right of Woman to the Ballot *Charles H. Chapman* 36 Republished with consent of the "Arena."

The Military Argument *Alice Stone Blackwell* 54

Address Before the United States Senate Committee *Hon. John Davis* 64

PREFACE.

The struggle for individual political liberty has extended over a period of seven hundred years, and even in the most highly civilized nations it is not yet closed. It dates its inception from the period when nations bowed in helpless and unquestioning obedience to royal edicts, and when all political power was concentrated in the hands of one man. The first victory won for individual freedom was when Magna Charta struck its fatal blow at the Divine right of kings. Since that time, class after

has either forced a recognition of its claims to a share in governmental authority, or it has been gratuitously extended through the liberality and justice of the ruling power.

It is curious fact, that throughout this long period each movement to extend political privilege (which in the latter part of this period has been synonymous with the ballot), whether in this or foreign countries, has been resisted along the same lines and with precisely the same arguments. Each class, in turn, which it has been proposed to empower with political authority, has been forced to prove its patriotism, its loyalty, its intelligence and its virtue. Each class has met the charges that the voting privilege would prove demoralizing to its members, a serious injury to those already enjoying the use of the ballot, and a menace to the safety of the state. Each class has even counted among its members advocates of its own liberty and remonstrants against it. History has constantly repeated itself, and the evolution of each movement to extend the suffrage has been out the rehearsal of the last.

It is a long distance between the conditions of 1215, when King John was forced to share his power with the Barons, and present institutions. In the United States, Democracy is established with the exception of one remaining disenfranchised class—women. Even this class has received full suffrage privileges in four states and fractional suffrage in twenty-three states and two territories, additional, and the last scenes in the struggle for individual political liberty are evidently near at hand. Yet in this modern movement, arguments and objections of ancient times are repeated with the freshness and vigor of originality and without a suspicion that they have been repeated, answered, and abandoned again and again in the last seven hundred years. If, for instance, one unacquainted with the questioned should desire to learn the arguments for and against woman suffrage, he could find them all in the written history of the enfranchisement of the non-taxpayers in the United States, the small rate-payers in England, or the workingmen of Belgium.

One argument only has the merit of genuine originality. It is the claim that the ballot is a privilege which must be paid for by military service; and since, as they say, women cannot and will not fight, they must renounce all claim to the ballot. No opponent of woman suffrage has yet appeared who has not made much of this argument. At the close of a century of democracy, in no period of which has the willingness or ability to bear arms even been made a qualification for the ballot, an effort is being made to discover in remote customs an origin wherein to establish a military basis for modern American citizenship. Utterly oblivious to inconsistencies, the new philosophy of bullets for ballots is promulgated with vigor and seriousness by ministers and editors, whose occupation exempts them from military duty; and by book worms, lawyers and clerks, whose physical incompetence would dismiss them from the muster. Indifferent, likewise, are they to the fact, that women of physical strength and courage, under the influence of ardent devotion to their respective causes, have braved

both the dangers of war and discovery, and served with honor in the ranks of soldiers, North and South, while it was no uncommon incident for men to hide or even maim themselves in order to protect themselves from the draft.

The disgust experienced by persons of refinement at thought of the settlement of grave questions of human liberty and justice, or even mere technicalities of opinion, by the arbitrament of a brutal physical contest, has never penetrated the conception of the advocates of the military philosophy. The rapid evolution of sentiment in all civilized countries toward peaceful settlements of difficulties, and the appeal of disputes instead, to trained and steady brains, has passed unnoticed. Forgetting that ideal conditions of society demand votes which stand for brains, not muscles for consciences not bullets, the argument gains ground only with those who sympathize with past conditions and who are blinded to present possibilities.

This little pamphlet is compiled in reply to this argument. The paper "Woman Warriors" appeared several years ago and was prepared by D. R. Livermore, whose wife's name, Mary A. Livermore, is better known than that of any other woman in connection with the service of women to the loyal armies of the United States in the 9 Civil War. The address before a Senate hearing by Hon. John Davis, an ex-Congressman of Kansas, is given entire. A paper by Alice Stone Blackwell, the worthy daughter of the illustrious Lucy Stone, and one by Charles H. Chapman, a rising young writer, completes the compilation. Together, they form an unassailable rebuttal of the claim that each ballot must be defended by a bullet. Carrie Chapman Catt.

FEMALE WARRIORS.

One prominent objection to woman suffrage is that women cannot fight, and therefore cannot enforce their will, nor execute such laws as they might enact. This objection is based on the supposition that women are to be a distinct and separate force in government, when they are clothed with the elective franchise, a political condition which is merely suppositious, and can never exist.

When woman has the ballot, it is only adding so much political power to the men, or to the leading parties of the nation. It is claimed that women will vote generally as men desire. If so, the vote will be simply augmented, and each party will be composed of men and women, of the same relative strength as now, and the fighting force of the men will remain the same—and if women cannot fight, as is asserted, the fighting ability of men is not affected by woman's enfranchisement. Men will have the same strength to enforce their will that they ever had. But such an objection is frivolous, because men do not execute their will by the sword and cannon and War Department, but through

recognized governmental agencies,—the law and its penalties, and officers and courts, and various forms of administrative government.

12

Men do not now fight to carry on the government and execute their will, and there are thousands of men who vote, who have no fighting ability, and no physical strength to enforce their will or any law. And if women cannot have the ballot because they cannot fight, why should not men be disenfranchised for the same reason?

In the "Christian Register" of August 7th, 1884, Mr. Francis Parkman repeats this silly objection to woman suffrage in the following language:

"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."

To this the editor, Rev. Samuel J. Barrows, makes a lengthy reply. We have space only for the following extract:

"Mr. Parkman's argument is not original with him, and therefore cannot claim the inspiration of his gifted pen. It is an argument long familiar to advocates of women suffrage, and one which grows weaker and weaker every year as brains take the place of brute force both in the science of war and in the science of government.

"As a matter of fact, the suffrage line is not definitely drawn between the combatant and non-combatant classes. There are countries with immense standing armies, the soldiers of which have little or no power to vote. There are, on the other hand, sixty-five thousand non-combatant Quakers in Great Britain and 13 America. It is not enough to say that they belong to a class that can and will fight; the fact is that they do not and will not fight. If there is any validity in Mr. Parkman's argument, these sixty-five thousand Quakers have no business at the polls. England utterly ignores this supposed law that only combatants shall legislate by having a woman for a ruler, whose long and successful reign is a familiar proof that women may efficiently administer the highest offices that any government can bestow. In our own country military competency is not declared by law

among the qualifications of the male voter. When the question of woman's voting arises, however, it suddenly becomes necessary to insist on it!

"Mr. Parkman practically abandons the non-combatant line with its confessed absurdity, and falls back upon the sex line. His argument, here reduced to its lowest terms, is simply this: Men should vote because they are men; women should not vote because they are women. The logic of the sentence is much improved by dropping the irrational negative.

"Mr. parkman implies, with a seriousness that amazes us, the possibility of war between the sexes, if the suffrage is extended to women. The chances of such a conflict may be measured by the chances that the universe will fall into chaos when woman suffrage is adopted.

"The absurdity of making military competency a test of suffrage in individual cases has been graciously conceded by Mr. Parkman. This concession robs the rest of the argument of its validity. A still greater absurdity lurks in the implication, inseparable from this argument, that women are not as essential to the existence of the Republic as men! If the ballot is given to woman, it must not be by virtue of her ability to perform the duties which belong to men, but by virtue of her ability to perform the duties which belong to women; by virtue of those personal rights and privileges which she may enjoy, and those obligations which she may accept without unsexing herself.

"Even Homer, writing in a remote age, was not willing to leave the impression that martial force was to be the controlling element in society. It was the bright-eyed Athene, the daughter of Zeus, who gave the brazen Ares, the god of war, such a terrible 14 thrashing that he bellowed loud as nine thousand warriors. And Father Zeus, whose sympathy he craved, thought that it served him right. It is decreed that intelligence, which Homer deified in a feminine form, should ultimately conquer brute force. When Athene asks for the ballot. Ares would better step out of the way."

While Mr. Barrows, in his rejoinder to Mr. Parkman, shows conclusively that, in times of war, women perform hospital services quite as well as men, and in this regard are just as important to the service as men, and that they quicken and stimulate the patriotic spirit of the soldiers and the country, and engage in manual labor in providing the necessary food and clothing for soldiers and so relieve a large number of men for active military duty; yet, he does not touch the real objection of Mr. Parkman, that women have no "capacity to fight." Probably Mr. Parkman will admit that women may be helpers in various directions, but as long as it is made to appear that women have "no capacity to fight," and that they belong to the "non-combatant" class, the objection is not fully answered, and of course, will be continually urged as too formidable for refutation.

We propose therefore another line of argument which will completely answer the objection and we are willing to meet the question squarely, and to defend the position that women can fight, when necessary, as effectively as men; and history shows that when armies have been composed of both sexes, that women have exhibited quite as much fighting ability as the men, and even greater powers of endurance. And when women have commanded armies, they have shown such 15 extraordinary sagacity and military skill, that they have been as succesful on the field of battle as male generals.

If women could receive the same military education as men, there is no doubt but that they would show quite as much military genius as men have shown. In our review of Mrs. Leonard, to which we refer our readers, in refutation of her objection that "women are incapable of taking part in battles," we gave many instances of female heroism, and of woman's military capacity to fight in the ranks, as well as to command armies.

But the testimony on this point is so abundant, and this objection is so common and even formidable with many, that we propose to extend our investigations, and present more proof of woman's military capacity and ability to fight in defence of her rights and in the interests of her country.

But before proceeding with our investigations, let us fully understand what constitutes the fighting capacity of an individual, and what are the constituent elements and requirements of a good soldier. Our judgment must be based on the capacity of the female sex as a whole, and not on any imperfect fragment, or class of women in society, that would not fairly represent the physical and mental status of womanhood. We are not to form our opinion on this important subject by the physical condition of woman in the fashionable circles of American society, where she has been falsely educated to think that the weakest physical and mental femininity is the highest type of ladyhood, and 16 where a stout, healthy body is regarded almost as much of a misfortune as to have an intelligent face and a strong mind!

This great question is not to be relegated for decision to a class of dawdling, weak, foolish know-nothings and do-nothings, who cry over a sentimental story, and scream with fright at the sight of a spider or a mouse. This small fraction of fashionable women, who repose under gilded canopies and ride in costly equipages, whose hands are not soiled with the world's work, and who are nothing for humane and benevolent movements, constitute too limited a circle upon which to base an argument concerning woman's inferiority and "incapacity to take part in battles." The women who constitute one-half of the population of the world are of another type, and who, in physical force and mental vigor, are quite equal to men. The fighting capacity of an individual does not depend so

much on great physical strength, as on power of endurance. The essential physical qualifications of a soldier are good health, ordinary strength, keen eyesight, quickness of movement and capacity for endurance and suffering privations, with the mental qualities of courage, conscience, integrity, fidelity to principle, and a patriotic spirit; and women possess these qualities in quite as eminent a degree as men!

The objection to woman suffrage, based on man's superior strength, has no force, because, there is no demand in a soldier's life for extraordinary strength; and a male warrior with moderate strength is just as good a soldier, if indeed not better, than a man of gigantic proportions and strength. A soldier who can lift one hundred pounds is quite as effective in battle as one who can toss five hundred pounds.

Whatever may be our theory upon this subject, there is abundant evidence that women are capable of taking part in battles, and they make as effective soldiers as men.

All history shows that women are as patriotic and self-sacrificing as men, and while they abhor fighting as a business, or a profession, they yet can fight, when their lives, their honor and their country demand it, with the same daring and patriotic fervor that men have shown. Our own country does not furnish as many instances of woman's military capacity as foreign lands where the customs of society permit women to engage in the coarser activities and more laborious pursuits of life, and where their physical powers are more fully developed; but we are by no means lacking in evidence upon this point. Few women, comparatively, have joined our armies, as the orders of our government and the customs of society have prevented them from so doing, and consequently they have not had a fair chance. But we have sufficient data to support the argument that women make most excellent soldiers. They have been obliged to enter the army stealthily, so as not to have their sex recognized, and whenever it has been discovered, even when a wife has fought for months beside her husband, and shown great courage and endurance and fighting capacity, she has been obliged to leave the army immediately; and it is hardly fair to say that women cannot fight.

It is not true, as Mrs. Leonard asserts, that women are "incapable of taking part in battles," as any one can see who has read the three volumes of "The Women of the Revolution," by Mrs. Ellet, or two large volumes entitled "Female Warriors."

The women of the American Revolution were animated with such a lofty spirit of patriotism, that, during the darkest periods of its history, when the hearts of men almost sank within them, these brave and self-sacrificing women encouraged the faltering men with their own heroic spirit and did everything in their power to make the Revolution a success. Indeed, it is not too much to say, that,

had it not been for the patriotic women of revolutionary times, American Independence, probably, would not have been achieved.

Such women as Mrs. Abigail Smith Adams, and Mrs. Mercy Otis Warren, were not merely the braces of revolutionary society, they were among the pillars and corner stones which supported the political, national edifice then being erected.

Mrs. Mercy Warren, wife of the distinguished patriot, James Warren, was the sister of James Otis, and was animated with all the fiery ardor and patriotic zeal of her illustrious brother, with perhaps, less vehement impulses, but with more political wisdom and sagacity. Mrs. Ellet, the historian, says that "in point of influence, Mercy Warren was the most remarkable woman who lived in the days of the American Revolution."

19

A writer in the "New American Cyclopædia" says, "She was in intimate correspondence with the two Adamses, Jefferson and other distinguished patriots, who were accustomed to consult her on momentous occasions." She was the first one to suggest the doctrine of "inherent rights," which was at once accepted by the men, as belonging to all mankind, and she was the first person to advise separation from the mother country as the only solution of the political problem, and she did this when the hearts of many strong men quaked with fear! Mrs. Warren impressed her convictions upon Samuel and John Adams, who were foremost in their advocacy of "Independence," and who incurred the displeasure of many by suggesting its necessity. John Adams was treated with marked discourtesy in Philadelphia for presenting such views, but Mrs. Warren continually braced him up with her strong words and patriotic spirit, and encouraged him to stand firmly for "Independence." Her convincing arguments did much to inspire the noble men of the Revolution, who constantly sought her counsel. So powerful was her influence that generals in the army conferred with her, and Gen. Knox wrote:—"I should be happy to receive your counsels from time to time."

Rochefoucauld, in his "Tour in the United States," says: "Seldom has a woman in any age acquired such ascendancy by the mere force of a powerful intellect, and her influence continued through life."

Such women did much to assist men to organize and carry forward the Revolution. It is said that a woman sent Paul Revere on his famous ride to Concord and Lexington, to warn the people of approaching danger; also, that two women of Concord, disguised in men's apparel, captured a spy bearing important papers, which proved a great value to the cause of the patriots. It is a well-known fact that women everywhere formed "Anti-Tea Leagues," and many women organized themselves into an association called "Daughters of Liberty," to aid to "Sons of Liberty" in their revolutionary enterprise.

It is also claimed that the country is indebted to a woman,—Mrs. Elizabeth Ross of Philadelphia—for the beauty of the American flag, honored at home and respected abroad. She was consulted by the committee appointed to prepare a flag of the Union, and she so changed and improved the original design, that we now have the national ensign substantially as it came from her hands.

Woman's patriotic influence was felt all through the seven years' war of the Revolution. Her heart and hand did much to strengthen and steady the American cause.

All speak in the highest terms of the patriotism of Putnam, who left his plow in the field on hearing of the shedding of blood at Concord and Lexington, and started for Cambridge without even a change of clothing; and of Stark, who left his saw-mill in his shirt-sleeves, and hastened to join the army which was fighting in defence of Colonial Rights.

But the patriotic services of Mrs. Mary Draper of 21 Dedham as told by Mrs. Ellet, were no less important to the army. Feeling deeply for her "distressed country," as one of the self-sacrificing women of the Revolution, on the first call to arms she urged her husband and only son, a lad of sixteen, to go at once to the front and render all assistance in their power, and though her heart was heavy at parting with her husband and boy, yet her country called for help, and she talked bravely, and bound knapsack and blanket on the shoulders of her son, and kissing him lovingly, she bade him "go and do his duty." And though her daughter besought her mother to allow her brother to remain as their protector, her patriotic reply was, "He is wanted and must go; you and I, Kate, have also services to do. Food must be prepared for the hungry,—for, before to-morrow night hundreds, I hope thousands, will be on their way to join the Continental forces, and we must feed as many as we can."

With resolute heart they went to work, spending the whole day and night in baking brown bread in two immense ovens that belonged to the house. As the soldiers came along, large pans of bread and cheese were placed by the wayside, to refresh the weary patriots. Has not such a woman fighting capacity?

Mrs. Rachel Martin, another of the patriotic women of the Revolution, was the mother of seven sons, all of whom she gave to the cause of her country, saying to them at the first call for volunteers: "Go, my boys, fight for your country! Fight, till death—if you must, but never let your country be dishonored. Were I a 22 man I would go with you." A mother who could give such Spartan advice to her sons, would lay down her own life for her country.

The story of Deborah Samson, as told by Mrs. Ellet, is of thrilling interest, and illustrates the fighting capacity of women. Deborah was born in Plymouth County in this state. She had been accustomed

to hard work, and when the news reached her that the battle of “Bunker Hill” had gone against the patriots, and that Warren had fallen, and many a brave man had shed his blood in defending his rights, Deborah, Samson's heart went out sympathetically to the patriotic soldiers, and she had a burning desire to help the army and her suffering country.

She secretly resolved to join the Colonial forces, and, if need be, fight for liberty, and having earned twelve dollars by teaching school, she purchased a quantity of cloth and secretly made her garments of male attire, which she assumed, and in this disguise as a man, presented herself to the army, only anxious to serve her country, enlisting for the whole term of the war. She was enrolled under the name of Robert Shirtliffe. For three years this brave young woman was in the army before her sex was discovered, and her historian says that her “exemplary” conduct and the fidelity with which her duties were performed, gained the approbation and confidence of the officers.” She was in several hazardous enterprises, was twice wounded, once by a sword cut on her head, and once she was shot through her shoulder; but her wounds did not cause her as much suffering, says her biographer, as the thought that her sex would be discovered, and she dismissed from the service perhaps in disgrace. She was finally stricken down with brain fever, and while almost at death's door, Dr. Binney, of Philadelphia,—in loosening a bandage about her chest—accidentally discovered the sex of his poor, sick patient, and, “with prudence, delicacy and generosity” becoming a gentleman, kept the secret to himself, and after she recovered from her illness, he sent her with a letter to General Washington, who received her very courteously. After perusing the letter, he retired for a short time, and, returning, he politely handed her a formal discharge from military service, without uttering a word of reproach,—putting into her hands a note containing some words of advice, and a small sum of money to pay her expenses home.

After the war closed she married Benjamin Gannett of Sharon, and her biographer says that “when Washington was President, she received a letter inviting Robert Shirtliffe, or rather, Mrs. Gannett, to visit the seat of government. Congress was then in session, and during her stay in the Capitol a bill passed granting her a pension in addition to certain lands which she was to receive as an acknowledgment for her services to the country in a military capacity.” Can any one doubt the fighting ability of this brave, patriotic woman? Could she not enforce her will and defend her vote, if necessary, as well as any man?

This same historian gives the following resolution of 24 Congress in which honorable mention is made of the services of Mrs. Margaret Corbin, thus:

“Resolved:—That Margaret Corbin, wounded and disabled at the attack on Fort Washington, while she heroically filled the post of her husband, who was killed by her side, serving a piece of artillery, do receive, during her natural life, of continuance of said disability, one-half the monthly pay drawn

by a soldier in service of these states; and that she now receive, out of public stores, one suit of clothes, or value thereof in money."

[July, 1779.]

Mrs. Ellet also refers to the story which has often been told, of the "gunner's wife who took her husband's place when he was killed at the battle of Monmouth, and did such execution that after the engagement she was rewarded by a commission."

A woman from Pennsylvania, by the name of Molly Macauley, served for more than two years in the revolutionary army, and was engaged in several battles and showed quite as much heroism as the men. She shrank from no duty, and discharged every obligation with such fidelity that she was promoted to the rank of sergeant. Commanding in personal presence, her whole bearing and carriage indicated such qualities that all supposed that this brave soldier was a patriotic young man. She was often in the thickest of the fight, and in excited moments she would gesticulate with her cavalry sword and shout for "Mad Anthony," as General Anthony Wayne, one of the most brilliant officers of the revolutionary army, was often called. Receiving a severe wound at the battle of Brandywine, the surgeon discovered that this brave soldier was a woman, 25 and she was dismissed from the service and sent home. But she fought as well as any man.

According to this record women are as patriotic as men, and show quite as good fighting qualities as men, and hence the objection to woman suffrage, based on her inability to fight, vanishes.

But the evidence is cumulative upon this point. During our late civil war, it is estimated that more than four hundred women enlisted in the Union army, and that a large number of women fought in the Confederate service. It was stated that, at one time there were about one hundred and fifty women soldiers in the army of the Potomac alone. It was never exactly known how so many women could join the army, but this was in 1864, when there was a great demand for recruits, after the army had been depleted by sickness and hundreds of hard fought battles, and probably the officials were not quite as careful about whom they received as at first. Still it is believed that many women had been in collusion with men who had been examined by the surgeons, and after the examination, the women appeared as substitutes for the men and entered the army.

We have an account of a Pennsylvania girl who served in one of the Western regiments for te months, before it was known that she was a woman. She stated that there were many female soldiers known to her and one female lieutenant. She had assisted in burying three female soldiers whose sex was unknown to any one but herself. We have also an account of Mrs. 26 Francis L. Clayton, who enlisted in 1861 with her husband at St. Paul, Minn. The two fought together side by

side in eighteen battles, till the husband was killed in the battle at Stone River. After that sad event, Mrs. Clayton concluded to retire from active service, and on informing the commander that she was a woman, she received an honorable discharge. She was wounded three times while fighting bravely for her country, and was once taken prisoner. Could not such a woman defend her vote?

The Brooklyn, N. Y. "Times" of October, 1863, soon after the battle of Chattanooga, gave an account of a young woman who joined the army of the Cumberland, and endured many hardships and showed great courage and heroism. During one of the severest engagements she was terribly wounded in the left side by a minie ball, and was borne from the bloody field to the surgeon's tent, where her sex was discovered. The brave girl was told that her wound was mortal, and she was urged and finally consented to reveal her true name and the home of her parents who had mourned for her as one dead.

In 1863, the Cincinnati "Times" reported a skirmish between the Union forces and General Bragg's army, at Ringgold, near Chattanooga, and among other things said,—“Several of the fair sex were in the Confederate ranks, and certainly conducted themselves with a great deal of courage.”

Mrs. Florence Bodwin of Philadelphia, Pa., enlisted in the Union army, and being dressed in male attire, as 27 a soldier, her sex was not discovered till her death, which occurred at Timonsville, S. C., where her grave may now be seen.

On one occasion, at Lookout Mountain, when it was deemed absolutely essential to the success of the campaign, that Gen. Bragg's forces should be beaten, and to ascertain the strength of his position, a scout of eighteen soldiers, one of whom was a woman, was sent on the perilous errand. Another female soldier fell in the bloody battle of Lookout Mountain.

For more than a year, Elizabeth Compton served in the 25th Michigan Cavalry, and in a severe engagement at Greenbriar Bridge, Tennessee, she was wounded, and on her removal to the hospital, her sex was discovered, and on recovery she received an honorable discharge from the service, but her endurance and bravery on the field of battle, vindicated her ability to fight. In Vol. II. of the "History of Woman Suffrage" I find the following:

“Ellen Goodridge, although not an enlisted soldier, was in every great battle fought in Virginia, receiving a painful wound in the arm from a minie ball. Sophia Thompson served three years in the 59th O. V. I. Another woman soldier, under the name of Joseph Davidson, also served three years in the same company. Her father was killed fighting by her side at Chickamauga. A soldier belonging to the 14th Iowa regiment, was discovered, by the Provost-Marshal of Cairo, to be a woman. An

investigation being ordered, "Charlie" placed the muzzle of her revolver to her head, fired, and fell dead on open parade ground. No clue was obtained to her name, home, or family."

"Frances Hook, of Illinois, enlisted with her brother, in the 65th Home Guards, assuming the name of 'Frank Miller.' She served three months, and was mustered out without her sex being discovered. She then enlisted in the 90th Illinois, and was taken prisoner in a battle near Chattanooga. After her release from a rebel prison, she again enlisted in the 2d East Tennessee Calvary. She was in the thickest of the fight at Murfreesboro and was severely wounded in the shoulder, but fought gallantly, and waded the Stone River into Murfreesboro, on that memorable Sunday, when the Union forces were driven back. Her sex was again disclosed upon the dressing of her wound, and General Rosecrans was informed, who caused her to be mustered out of the service, notwithstanding her earnest entreaty to be allowed to serve the cause she loved so well."

The Louisville "Journal" gave the following account of her, under the head of, "Mustered Out":

"Frank Miller, the young lady soldier, now at Barracks No. One, will be mustered out of the service in accordance with the army regulations which prohibit the enlistment of females in the army, and sent to her parents in Pennsylvania. This will be sad news to Frances, who has cherished the fond hope that she would be permitted to serve the Union cause during the war. She has been of great service as a scout to the army of the Cumberland, and her place will not easily be filled. She is a true patriot and a gallant soldier."

The St. Louis "Times," after the close of the war, gave the following account of a witness in court, in that city:

"This lady is a historical character, having served over two years in the Federal army during the war; fifteen months as a private in the Illinois cavalry, and over nine months as a teamster in the noted Lead mine regiment raised from the counties of Jo. Daviess and Carrol. She was at the siege of Corinth, and was on duty during most of the campaign against Vicksburg. At Lookout Mountain, she formed one of the party of eighteen, selected to make a scout and report the position of General Bragg's forces. She went through her army life under the cognomen of 'Soldier Tom.'"

29

While the number of women who listed in the Union army is not large, still, they are sufficiently numerous to answer the objection which may make against the fighting ability of woman. All history shows that she can fight in defence of her rights and for the honor of her country. Women are patriotic and self-sacrificing and are abundantly able to enforce their wills and defend their votes.

And therefore, this objection of woman's inability to fight and to defend her right to the franchise falls to the ground, as does every objection to woman suffrage when carefully examined.

We by no means plead for the battlefield. We do not say that fighting is a good thing for men or women. The army is not a good place for women; neither is it an excellent place for men. War is sometimes a terrible necessity. All we have attempted to show, is, that women are as patriotic as men, have quite as much power of endurance, and can fight as well as men, and from this point of view, are quite as much entitled to the ballot as men.

And while we have fully met the objection to woman suffrage, "that women are incapable of taking part in battles," we have by no means exhausted the testimony upon this point. There are volumes of evidence upon this subject, showing conclusively that in all ages, and among all nations, women have fought, with the same heroism and patriotic fervor as men!

In the volumes, entitled "Female Warriors," by Mrs. Needham, hundreds of instances are given, where women have not only led armies to victory, but have so composed the rank and file of the fighting ability of armies, the same as men. They have stood side by side of male soldiers and have shown strength and bravery quite equal to men. In Vol. II., p. 100, we find the following item concerning the census of St. Petersburg, published in 1829. "Soldiers and subalterns, 46,076 men; 9,975 women."

Of the numerous instances of the fighting ability of women, as given by this author, we select a few cases, in further proof of our position, fearing that the most of our readers will not be able to find these volumes, which are published in London.

We have not space to refer at length to any of the Oriental female warriors who led armies and fought bravely on hundreds of battlefields. Herodotus mentions two Lybian tribes, who trained their girls to the use of arms, the sword, and lance and arrow and other warlike implements used in that ancient period. Harpalyce, daughter of King Lycurgus, was trained in all manly and warlike exercises and proved herself a brave soldier and skillful commander. On one occasion, the King was defeated and taken prisoner. As soon as the daughter learned of this disaster to the King's forces, she gathered an army, placed herself at the head of the troops, and attacked the enemy, put them to fight, and rescued her father.

Atalanta, of Greece, was a courageous and daring warrior and secured the approbation and praise of her comrades by her heroism and military skill. Cyrus, one of the world's greatest conquerors, it is said, met his last defeat at the hands of a woman warrior, Queen Tomyris. By much cunning and strategy, Cyrus left a large amount of wine, so that the forces commanded by the nephew of the

Queen became intoxicated, and, overcome by drunkenness, were easily slain or made prisoners. The brave Queen collected the rest of her army and gave battle to the Persians, after decoying them into a narrow pass, and gained such an overwhelming victory, that Justin says: "There was not one man left to carry the news home."

The historian says that,

"The British and Caledonian women were, as a rule, brave and warlike, and invariably followed their husbands to battle. More than five thousand women enlisted under the banners of Boadicea, and fought, many of them as bravely as the men. The women of Caledonia were equally warlike, and the Gallic and German women joined frequently in the battles between rival tribes. The women of Tortone, Spain, distinguished themselves so highly in some skirmishes with the Moors, that a military order of Knighthood was conferred upon them."

The first crusading armies, commanded by Peter the Hermit, in 1096, contained nearly as many women as men, as they fought with the same bravery and success as men. When the second crusade was organized, many ladies in France and Germany formed themselves into squadrons and regiments, and one writer, referring to these warriors, says that "by their valor they rendered credible all that has been said of the prowess of the Amazons."

During the sixteenth century, when the wars raged furiously between the Christians and the Turks, women took a prominent share in the fearful scenes of blood shed. When a place needed to be defended, women at once took up arms, and assisted the men to defeat the enemy. And so it has been, all along through the ages, till we come down to later times.

Coming to England, we find on a tombstone in Brighton churchyard, the following record of a female warrior:

"Sacred to the memory of Phœbe Hassell, born Sept. 1, 1713. She served for many years as a private soldier in the 5th regiment, in different parts of Europe, and in 1745 fought under the Duke of Cumberland in the battle of Fontenoy, where she received a bayonet wound in the arm; her long life, which commenced in the reign of Queen Anne, induced his present Majesty, George IV, to grant her a pension. She died at Brighton, where she had long resided, Dec. 12, 1821, aged 108 years."

Mrs. Needham gives the following account of one of the most remarkable female warriors of the world, Mary Schelienck, a native of Ghent. In March, 1792, she entered the Second Belgium Battalion as a male volunteer. At the battle of Jamappes, she distinguished herself for her bravery and received six wounds. After her recovery, she made the campaigns of Germany with a Bavarian

Brigade. She was removed to the 8th Light Infantry, and displayed great heroism at the battle of Austerlitz. Here she received a severe wound, and was left for dead on the field, but finally recovered and followed the regiment, and at last presented a petition to Napoleon, who received her with "marked distinction," and he invested her with the Cross of the Legion of Honor, and placed her tenth 33 on the list of lieutenants. She received an annual pension of twenty pounds. She died in January, 1841, at Menin, where she was buried with military honors, her funeral being attended by an immense concourse of people.

We have a thrilling account of a woman warrior of Spain, Agostina, the Maid of Saragossa, whose bravery made her famous throughout the world. The French Marshal Lefebvre had attacked the town, when women of all ranks assisted in its defence, and were organized into companies of several hundred each. The French Marshal was surprised at the determination of the enemy to resist his efforts, and bribed the keepers to blow up a powder-magazine, which caused great confusion, and enabled the French forces to enter the town.

"At this dreadful moment," says Mrs. Hale, "an unknown maiden issued from the church of Nostra Donna del Pillas, habited in a white raiment, a cross suspended from her neck, her dark hair dishevelled and her eyes sparkling with supernatural lustre! She traversed the city with a bold and firm step; she passed to the ramparts, to the very spot where the enemy was pouring in to the assault; she mounted to the breach, seized a lighted match from the hand of a dying engineer, and fired the piece of artillery he had failed to manage; then kissing her cross, she cried with the accent of inspiration, 'Death or victory,' and reloaded her canon. Such a cry, such a vision could not fail to call up enthusiasm; it seemed that heaven had brought aid to the just cause; her cry was answered, 'Long Agostina.' The French were driven back with much slaughter; though with superior numbers they finally gained possession of the town. Agostina lived to the age of sixty-nine, and died at Cuesta, July, 1857; where her remains were interred with all the honors due her public position as a Spanish soldier."

34

An Austrian officer, in giving an account of his army, says:

"We had wives and daughters of frontier soldiers with us on the march through Hungary, who equaled the men in the endurance of fatigue, and displayed undaunted courage in battle."

A French paper gives the following account of Mlle. Lix who was the daughter of a French officer, and she is now forty-five years old. When about eighteen she went to Poland as governess to a daughter of a Polish countess. In 1863, when the rebellion broke out in Poland, she put on male attire and

joined the rebels; and she showed such good fighting qualities that she was made a lieutenant. She returned to France in 1866.

“When the Franco-German war broke out, Mlle. Lix again put on her soldier clothes, enlisted in a free corps, and soon afterward again became a lieutenant and took part in the fight at Bourgonce-Nompatelise. She was called Lieutenant Tony, the name given to her by the Polish patriots. She proved herself a brave fighter as well as kind-hearted woman, and her labors for the relief of the wounded were indefatigable.

“Her soldierly conduct won for her many honors. In '72 the government conferred upon her a gold medal of the first class, as well as the bronze cross of the ambulances. General Charrette in '73 sent her the medal of the Pontifical Zouaves, while the ladies of Alsace presented her with a splendid sword of honor.”

The following is from the “Chronic der Zeit”:

“In 1862, when the English surrendered the Ionian Islands to Greece, Dr. Barry, the military physician who had served with distinction for twenty years at the Cape of Good Hope, gave up his situation and settled in Corfu. When he died, in 1865, it was found that the doctor was a woman. What induced her to conceal her sex is not known, but there is no doubt that she served in the British army for forty years as an officer, took part in several battles, and was renowned not only as a physician, but as a skillful surgeon.”

We might present almost any amount of evidence upon this point, but we have brought forward sufficient testimony to fully substantiate our position that women possess quite as good military qualities as men, that they have as much power of endurance and are as patriotic as men. We commend these facts to the attention of Mrs. Leonard, who objects to woman's enfranchisement, because women are “incapable of taking part in battles!” We have shown the mistake of this position, whether Mrs. L. is candid enough to acknowledge it or not!

Mr. Parkman falls into the same error, and says that women cannot fight, and so ought not to vote, when the history of the world refutes his statement!

We have shown that women possess sufficient fighting capacity to defend their rights and can enforce their “will,” quite as well as men, and this prominent objection to women suffrage is therefore without force. No one can honestly ignore or deny these historic facts, and this objection therefore can have no weight with candid, intelligent, thinking people. And if Mr. Parkman continues

to urge it, he must presume on the ignorance of his readers, or on the prejudices of the public, to condemn a just cause, to satisfy a heartless, fashionable circle!

36

THE RIGHT OF WOMAN TO THE BALLOT. BY CHARLES H. CHAPMAN.

I have read Mr. Rossiter Johnson's pamphlet entitled "The Blank-Cartridge Ballot," and am very much pleased with it. It is a very clever piece of work. It is well written, logically constructed, and of excellent diction. It is, in fact, the best presentation of the argument that I have ever read. It lacks but two things to make it irrefutable,—a basis of truth and a confirmation by facts.

The gist of Mr. Johnson's argument, boiled down and stripped of all superfluous emendations, is "Woman cannot vote because she cannot fight." In other words the elective franchise is dependent on the capacity for bearing arms, and woman cannot bear arms. Accept this as an axiom and Mr. Johnson's deductions follow without further discussion. But the age of blind acceptance of beliefs has passed. We no longer blindly accept the authority of powers an maintain without question that the sun moves round the earth, or any other so-called axiom equally reasonable which they feel called upon to advance.

"Woman cannot fight." I seldom open a newspaper without finding some instance of a woman making a 37 pretty good fight against a burglar, highwayman, or other ruffian. Without commenting on Jeanne d'Arc, the Countess de Montford, and other memories of the dark ages, we can refer Mr. Johnson to the annals of our border wars, where he will find many an instance where woman has fought,—fought like the savage she-wolf in her lair, for the safety of her children, husband, and home.

What is the most essential qualification for a fighter, a combatant who stands out in the face of the enemy and throws down his gage of battle with the resolution to win the cause or die?

Is it strength? Is it physical endurance? Is it steadiness of nerve? All these are well enough in their way and valuable under circumstances, but the one indispensable element is courage. Without that, all other advantages are worse than useless.

You see the illustration of this on the college football field to-day. Watch the practice of the team against the scrub. Who is that little, undersized runt of a boy running with the ball in the heart of every wedge and scrimmage, tackling and throwing those big fellows as the bulldog throws the bull? What is he doing on the team? Why is not one of those men on the scrub, or one of these dozen big

men among the bystanders, big, straight-standing, strong-looking, finely developed men, playing in the place of that little caricature of humanity? You put the question to the captain or coach and he replies, "Yes, so and so is small, but he has the grit and can play, while that big, handsome man is as powerful 38 as he looks and a wonder in the gymnasium, but he hasn't got the 'sand' to play football."

"Where the spirit is lacking, the flesh is weak." Woman possesses courage in the same ratio as man, no more and no less. Daughters inherit the gift from their fathers, and sons from their mothers. It is as free to both sexes as honesty, intelligence, memory, or any other virtue of mankind. Many women are skilled in the use of firearms and other weapons and use them well enough to defeat the average man in any contest of expertness.

The statement that women cannot fight or bear arms is proven false by the experience of centuries. She can and will fight most desperately if forced to do so, as the female of any animal species will do in defence of her offspring. The lioness, tigress, and she-wolf are less aggressive than their consorts, but the hunter knows them for much more dangerous foes when they turn to bay in defence of their litters. The male deer flees at the mere scent of the prowling wolf, but the doe braves the combat in defence of her fawn; and even the timid hare will attack the marauding weasel to protect her progeny.

The statement that woman cannot fight or bear arms is a perversion of the truth; but when we say, "Woman, as a rule, does not fight; she leaves to man, more aggressive by nature and better qualified physically, the bearing of the brunt of actual conflict," we state fairly the facts of the case.

"But," we hear our opponent argue, "war is a serious 39 matter. Nations in warfare call upon every resource they can command. Why is it that woman, if she can fight as well as you claim to show, has never been called on to bear the brunt of battle?"

The answer is clear. The fighting force of a people is always in small proportion to the population. Every person in the field requires five or six at home to keep him there in fighting trim. The soldier does not live on air. He requires to be fed to be clothed, to be nursed in sickness. His children and family and private affairs need attention while he is absent on the tented field. "An army travels on its stomach," is an axiom most thoroughly proven to every soldier who has ever had to do arduous duty on short rations.

Now this is the part of war that has devolved on woman from time to immemorial, to feed and clothe the armies, to nurse the sick and wounded, and in addition to take the burden of the absent and perform the task of caring for and feeding the children and the aged and infirm, a task of double

labor in the absence of her helpmate; and of the two stay-at-homes have at times the harder, if the less dangerous part.

When Mr. Johnson argues that the franchise is dependent on the power and the will to handle the musket, to pay what Mr. Johnson calls the service tax, which tax he claims is levied on men alone, and which, if I am rightly informed, the Government pays for in monthly wages and prospective pensions, the money for which is collected by taxes levied on men and women alike, it seems to me, considering that women have been 40 doing their share at home and bearing the burdens of men in addition to their own, besides working extensively in the hospitals and commissary departments, that the service tax is pretty equally distributed between the sexes after all. "Men must work and women must weep," writes Kingsley; but when men must fight, women must both work and weep. Yet "women cannot vote because they cannot fight."

The lame, halt, and blind and also the aged men vote, but that is "because they are so few that it has not been thought worth while to bar them out," to quote Mr. Johnson. I fail to recall any passage in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the various state constitutions, or the writings or speeches of our most prominent statesmen, that would lead to the above inference. I have always had the impression that the ballot was the birthright of every male citizen of legal age, not wrung from the Government by force, but freely given by his fellow-citizens to be used for his and their benefit; and I have always held it to be the glory of the nation that this right was inalienable to the citizen be he weak or strong, great or small, and forfeitable only by crime.

We fought a tyrannical power, not for the right itself, but for the power to give the right. We gained that power, and we, the sovereign people gave freely the right of franchise to every male citizen of the United States. Equally so can we give that right to every female citizen.

But let us see what proportion of these non-combatants 41 Mr. Johnson thinks so small as to be not worth while barring out. The men actually under arms on both sides in the "late unpleasantness" numbered about three millions. The total vote cast for President in 1860 was 4,680,193.

Deduct from the muster of the troops the members of the regular army and navy who, although fighters, had no vote, and the prospective citizens not yet naturalized, many of whom shamed native citizens by the eagerness with which they took up arms for their adopted country, and add to the voting total the voters who shunned the polls (a large class as we know from experience), and we can safely say that forty per cent. of those qualified by law to vote were incapacitated or wilfully refused to bear arms to enforce the ballot that they cast. This is the proportion that Mr. Johnson considers not worth while barring out. "But," I think I hear the objection, "these men who held back

from supporting their ballots with a 'pinch of powder and a pellet of lead' were not needed at the front. If they had been they would have done their duty in the ranks." I will not refer to the draft riots and other disturbances which followed the levies of 1863, showing in what a willing spirit the stay-at-home voters answered their country's call, but will pass on to more pertinent matters.

There is no doubt that the Confederate cause needed every available man at the front. There is no doubt that it used every expedient to get them there. Men were forced into the ranks under penalty of death on refusal, driven in like cattle at the point of the bayonet, 42 hunted down and dragged out of their hiding-places in holes and caves, and given the choice of instant death or enlistment. The country was drained of every man that could carry a musket. Boys not yet through school and grandfathers stiff with age marched side by side, and in days of travel no able bodied white man could be found who was not a soldier.

The enlisted strength of the Confederate troops was about 600,000. The vote for President in 1860 in ten of the secession states was 857,704. South Carolina's vote was cast by her legislature and does not figure in the total, but her voting strength, calculated on the basis of her white population, was about 45,000, making the total Southern vote about 900,000 in round numbers. Here are 300,000 blank-cartridge ballots, about one-third of the whole, which Mr. Johnson considers not worth while barring out. "But," to quote again, "such a man [i.e., non-combatant] might still be very powerful in creating a riot or suppressing one, in overthrowing a government or in sustaining one in an emergency, and this fact has to be recognized."

Women have had a chance of creating riots and of overthrowing governments in the French Revolution and elsewhere, and also in suppressing sedition and sustaining governments at various times and in various capacities, and have proved not wanting in power and wisdom, and these facts have to be recognized. And while we are supposing imaginary states of affairs let us suppose that woman put into use some of that power for organization that she possesses in common with man, 43 and organized a strike against one of these wars in whose making and conduct she had no voice.

Suppose the women of the country said: "We will have none of this war. We will not feed and clothe the soldiers. We will not nurse the wounded. We will not care for our husband's, father's, brother's family and manage his business affairs while he is in the field trying to shoot some one else's husband, father, or brother." That war would come to a stop so suddenly that not even a blank-cartridge ballot would be needed to give it its final quietus.

Gen. Lee would not have surrendered in another four years if Grant's troops had amused themselves firing blank cartridges at him, but he would have yielded in less than six months if he had lacked the toil, support, and sympathy of the women of the South.

"When gunpowder came into use," says Mr. Johnson, "suffrage began to be popularized, and it has been widening ever since, but it only follows the development of the rifle." This sentence is a little obscure. It is, of course, a well-known fact that suffrage has been popularized and widened in common with improvements in firearms ordnance, and other military and naval appliances, as it has with the increased knowledge and use of printing, machinery, chemistry, medicine, and other modern sciences and arts. We take it, however, that Mr. Johnson means to infer that the spread of the ballot has been due to the possession of arms and the knowledge of using them; that it is a thing wrested from authority by individual force; that it is not a gift dictated by justice and right, but a concessions actuated by fear and intimidation. Let us see how far this idea is borne out by facts.

Women, Mr. Johnson claims, cannot bear arms or fight, and women, we are glad to admit, do not usually enforce their demands by means of warfare and violence. In Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Russia, Finland, Austria-Hungary, Croatia, Dalmatia, Italy, the Madras and Bombay Presidencies of India, Cape Colony, New Zealand, Iceland, Dominion of Canada, and Northwest territories, and twenty-eight states and territories of the United States, women enjoy partial or entire suffrage. In every case was it given them in recognition of their right to have some voice in making the laws and in choosing the officers to enforce the laws by which they are governed, in no instance being granted through fear or force.

Take for example the State of Wyoming, a government located in what writers delight to call the "wild and wooly West," where men are shot for breakfast, and "bad men" keep private graveyards for their victims; where every man's life is supposed to depend on his skill in using the loaded revolver he carries at his side; an ideal community, evidently, for Mr. Johnson's fighting voter, the man who enforces his ballot with his musket. Wyoming territory gave woman equal suffrage in 1870. After twenty years of trial, Wyoming thought so well of woman's "blank-cartridge" ballot that in 1889 the convention by a unanimous vote inserted an equal-suffrage provision in the state constitution, which 45 constitutions was ratified by the voters by a three-fourths majority.

Mr. Johnson claims that in Great Britain every enlargement of the franchise was wrung from the governing class by fear and intimidation. Surely this is an ungenerous criticism of the great Liberal party and its leaders, W. E. Gladstone, John Bright, and others, who have spent years to relieve, elevate, and enlighten the weak and downtrodden, and have time and time again come to the rescue of those so ignorant and defenceless that their only appeal was, "We suffer; help us;" who have

striven for years to give to Ireland the self-government she desires but cannot obtain, and whose work would ere this have been crowned with success but for the bigotry and opposition of certain factions of the Irish themselves.

But is it not time to do away with this worn-out fallacy, this barbarous conception of universal suffrage and representative government as being dependent only on the physical force that lies behind the ballot box, and not in the intelligence, justice, and respect for the self-made law of an enlightened people?

The ballot is the gift of the strong to the weak, the generous recognition by the strong that the weak have rights which he is bound by justice and honor to respect whether he is able to ignore them by his superior strength or not. The powerful says to humbleness, "I know that you possess equal interest in life with me although your strength does not permit you to manifest it; I give you the right to an equal voice in this matter 46 with myself, and, if necessary, I will add my strength to yours to maintain it." Thus, to use Mr. Johnson's own simile, if Mr. Johnson was in danger of being dispossessed of his franchise, Mr. Astor, the plutocrat, and the humble servitor would both fly to Mr. Johnson's aid, and if Mr. Astor were in like danger, Mr. Johnson and his sweeper would be on hand, even if Mr. Astor were too old, sick, or crippled to lift a finger in his own behalf. So also would they if Mr. Astor's property were assailed, and why should they not do so if Mrs. Astor's franchise were assailed?

Free and popular government is the best form of government for an intelligent and enlightened people, and it is only safe for such. Any attempt to introduce it into barbarous and uncivilized nations has resulted and always will result in failure. The ballot must be guided by intelligence to be beneficial. In the hands of ignorance it becomes something worse than Mr. Johnson's dreaded blank cartridges. It becomes the instrument of the noisy demagogue, of the wily and unscrupulous politician, to be used for furtherment of his own selfish gain and the detriment of the public good; the weapon of the political machine and the bane of good government. The greatest danger to the government is not in the admission as voters of intelligent and educated women who could use the ballot wisely and well, but the failure to bar the franchise from ignorant and unprincipled foreigners who use their votes at the bidding of an unscrupulous "boss" to support open fraud and corruption in public office.

47

Mr. Johnson cites the case of the negro voter as an example of the uselessness of the blank-cartridge ballot. He claims their failure as voters is "not from lack of intelligence, for many of them are well educated and are quite as intelligent as some of the whites." (Query: How many, what per cent. of the whole? Also how many are as intelligent as the average of the whites?) Yet in the same

paragraph he prophesies, "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." Now I will prophesy that when the colored race has acquired sufficient intelligence as a whole to organize, and incidentally to make a wise and proper use of the franchise already granted, then the colored vote will be cast and counted without reference to the Winchester rifle either as a present fact or possible contingency.

Mr. Johnson inquires with anxiety what would happen if eight hundred thousand men were to undertake to stand against six hundred thousand men and a million women. As George Stephenson replied to an eminent personage inquiring as to the result of a collision between his newly constructed engine and a female of the bovine species, that "it would be varra bad for the coo," so I am inclined to think that in the above very extraordinary contingency the eight hundred thousand would find themselves in a very uncomfortable position without delay. "You are to bid any man stand," quotes Mr. Johnson. "How if he will not stand?" 48 In these times we usually arrest such a man and imprison or fine him for breach of the peace. If we cannot do so, I agree that we decline into a state of anarchy, not because we have asked intelligent women to share with us the difficulties and responsibilities of self-government, but because we have so degenerated from enlightenment toward savagery as to refuse to recognize and enforce the laws and obligations imposed by our own will and actions.

Mr. Johnson seems greatly concerned at the danger to the Government at every closely contested election. "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 led to in one noticeable instance" (meaning, we presume, the great Rebellion). We can assure Mr. Johnson that the situation he dreads has already occurred in our history in an even more aggravated form without the condition that he predicts arising. For example, in 1824 Andrew Jackson had a clear plurality of the popular vote over John Quincy Adams, but the House of Representatives elected Mr. Adams and the people acquiesced in their choice without an attempted appeal to arms. In 1876 the country was almost evenly divided over the rivals, Mr. Hayes and Mr. Tilden, so evenly divided that the question was settled by Congress by the smallest possible majority. Yet no talk of armed resistance stirred the country, and either candidate, placing his good sense and good citizenship before his personal ambition, 49 would have refused with scorn and horror any attempt on the part of his supporters to gain him the office by force.

In 1888 Mr. Cleveland had a clear popular majority in his favor, but the election of Mr. Harrison was accepted as an accomplished fact, without a thought of protest. Other examples could be given, but these suffice to show the non-existence of idea that even the majority would attempt to

break by force the laws that they themselves have made. As for the great Rebellion, Mr. Johnson is too well informed to claim that the divided vote of the election of 1860 was the cause of that civil struggle. The war was the inevitable arrival of that crisis long foreseen and foretold by Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and other statesmen, the inexorable result of the axiom that freedom and slavery cannot be co-existent in the same nation. The slaveholders, driven from their last stronghold, and condemned by the voice of the people, appealed to the foundation of their system, brute force, and once again civilization triumphed over barbarism.

History teaches us that governments based on military strength are not stable, for they are constantly at the mercy of any stronger force and they contain in themselves elements of discord that weaken the nation more than the trained warriors strengthen it. The very arms that it most on for protection may at any moment turn against it. Such governments are neither popular, representative, nor democratic. Their foundation precludes it. Government by force can only exist by concentration of force. Concentration of force means the surrender of all authority into the smallest possible number of hands, in other words a despotism, hereditary or elective, king or dictator.

The Romans maintained a representative government in a wise and stable form as long as they retained the principle of uniform representation, but when they endeavored to govern conquered territory by force, without listening to the voice of the governed, the government, one standing alone without rival in the world, rapidly degenerated through various forms of oligarchy and dictatorship to the empire, which was riven apart by its own internal dissensions and the utter apathy of the people toward a government in which they had no representation.

The power to bear arms is not the qualification to wield the ballot even among savage tribes. In the lodges of the Indians, it is not the mighty hunter, the bold and dashing young warrior, to whom it is given to decide the policy and destiny of the tribe. It is the ancient chieftain, hoary with years and wisdom, whose tottering steps will never more follow on the trail, whose dim eyes can no more sight the rifle, whose withered arm is too weak for the mighty war-club,—he it is who enters the council lodge, and gives his voice and his vote to the welfare of the people, and the young men hearken to his counsels and obey his behests with the reverence that strength ever pays to wisdom and experience.

We need to vote of women in our public responsibilities we need her voice and assistance in our homes and 51 daily tasks. Government needs many hands and many voices directed by intelligence. Too many such we cannot have, and we are foolish to neglect to avail ourselves of the intelligence and wisdom that knock for admittance.

The right of women to vote is contained in the principles of republican government, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." It is as self-evident as her right to exist, her right to a half interest in the control of her children, her right to a share of her husband's property, or her right to a share of her parents' estate.

Not one but many politicians and statesmen have admitted that when women unanimously, or in a large majority, demanded the ballot, it would be given them; no power, they say, can withhold it. It is because so many are indifferent to their right and privilege, and a few, imitating the dog in the manger, with the statement, "We don't want to vote, so you shan't," bitterly oppose it, that universal suffrage has not yet been attained.

Where then is the dominating idea of the man and the musket behind the ballot? Evidently it has no place in the experience of men whose business is politics and government. Given universal suffrage, in the event of war woman would occupy the same place that she has in the past, except that she would be more fitted by practice and experience to take the place of the soldier called to the field.

The ancient Germans possessed sufficient confidence in 52 their women to place in their hands the decision of their legal troubles, and the female courts were the admiration of their contemporaries for their unbiassed justice and wisdom.

Can we not manifest enough confidence in our women to give them a share in our public affairs? Must we wait until the concession is wrung from us by the unanimous demand of womankind, whose voice we, as civilized men, must recognize in the household or in public, although unbacked by the armed force that pessimists deem necessary?

Cannot we refuse to lend an ear to the clique that endeavors to debar others from the right that they are too prejudiced, timorous, or unpatriotic to desire to use, and say to woman: "We give to you the ballot, as you undisputed right as an American citizen. We give it not through fear or coercion, but in recognition of your right; and we will defend you in this, your right, as we have defended you in others in the past; and we shall expect you to use this privilege for our good as well as your own and the common welfare of the country"?

If, then, in some future time, the contingency dreaded by the timorous should arise, and a number of relics of barbarism should attempt to thwart by force the will of the people, I trust there will be enough right-thinking men and right-thinking women of all parties and opinions to compel observance of the law. When there are not such, the government had better fall at once as being too civilized for a race degenerated into barbarism.

53

We gave life, work, intellect, and money in untold profusion to free the slaves. Are we not generous enough to do the same for the rights of our mothers, wives, and sisters?

54

THE MILITARY ARGUMENT. BY ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

A favorite argument against equal suffrage is that women ought not to vote because they cannot fight. Miss Mary A. J. M'Intyre says:

"We have founded our government on manhood suffrage, not because our male citizens own more or less property, or any property at all, but because they are men; because behind the law must be the power of enforcing it. Without sufficient force to compel respect and observance, laws would be dead letters. To make laws that cannot be enforced is to bring a government into ridicule and contempt, and to invite anarchy. The insuperable objection to woman suffrage is fundamental and functional, and Nature alone is responsible for it, since she has created man combatant and woman non-combatant."

If this theory were correct, all men who can fight would be admitted to the ballot box, and all men who cannot fight would be excluded. But the theory has not a vestige of foundation, either in history, or in the practice of other nations, or in our own. In Massachusetts to-day, thousands of able-bodied men are excluded from suffrage because they cannot read and write. Tens of thousands who are not able-bodied vote at every election. In most European nations, the majority of the men who can fight are not admitted to vote. In our own country, suffrage has at different times been conditioned upon property, intelligence, moral character, in some cases even upon religious opinions and church membership; but never upon the ability to bear arms.

By a kind of comic fatality, this argument that women must not vote because they cannot fight is especially apt to be used by men who could not fight themselves. Some peaceable, venerable old clergyman comes up and makes this objection before the legislative committee; or some corpulent elderly physician, who would expire under a forced march of five miles. I have even had this objection made to me by a man who had been stone blind ever since he was three years old. He voted at every election, but he was fully convinced that a woman ought not to be permitted to vote, because she could not shoulder a musket in time of war.

If no one were allowed to help choose the law-makers except those who can help to enforce the laws, women could not complain of being ruled out along with other non-combatants. But so long as

the old, the infirm, the halt, the lame and the blind are freely admitted to vote, some better reason must be found for excluding women than the fact that they do not fight.

It is sometimes objected that even men exempt from military service may be called upon to help in putting down a riot. Some men exempt from military service may be called upon, but not all. There is no such liability for a blind man, or a cripple, or a man over a certain age; yet all these can vote. Moreover, such calls are altogether exceptional. Not one voter in a 56 thousand is ever called upon to help in putting down a riot. In all ordinary cases the enforcement of the civil law is done by the police, and women contribute to it in exactly the same way that men do, i.e., they help to pay for it. No man is compelled to serve in the police, but out of those who volunteer a sufficient number are hired, and they are paid with tax-money that is levied equally upon the property of men and women.

It may be said that we have to legislate for classes, not for individual exceptions; and that men as a class can fight, while women as a class cannot. But there are large classes of men who are regarded as unable to fight, and are legally exempt from military service, and who are nevertheless allowed to vote. All men over forty-five years of age are exempt from military service. So are all who are not physically robust. The U. S. Military Statistics taken at the time of our last war show that a large majority of the lawyers, ministers and editors examined for military service were found to be physically disqualified. Of unskilled laborers, on the other hand, only a very small fraction were found disqualified. Since professional men as a class cannot fight, while un-skilled laborers can, does it follow that suffrage should be taken away from professional men and be limited to unskilled laborers?

Besides it is not true that we do not legislate for exceptions. Men as a class are of sound mind; men as a class are unconvicted of crime; men as a class are able to read and write. But when a man is an exception, in 57 anything that is required as essential to suffrage, he is treated as an exception, and is forbidden to vote.

Either the ability to fight is a necessary qualification for suffrage, or it is not. If it is, the men who lack it ought to be excluded. If it is not, the lack of it is no reason for excluding women. There is no escape from this conclusion.

In considering the military argument against equal suffrage, it must be rendered that if women do not render military service, they do render equivalent service to their country in another way, since it is the women who bring all the soldiers into the world. This ought in all fairness to be taken as an offset for the military service which is not required for them. As Lady Henry Somerset says, "She who bears soldiers does not need to bear arms."

It may be said that, while this is perhaps true as a matter of abstract justice, there would be no certainty that laws could be enforced unless the majority of ballots always represented a majority of bayonets. But we already admit non-combatants to vote, by tens of thousands, and there is no certainty at any election that the majority of legal votes represents the majority of fighting men.

Suffragists are often accused of having a bad opinion of men, but some of the objections urged by our opponents imply a much worse opinion of men than we hold, especially this argument that the majority of American men would be likely to defy the law unless backed by an overwhelming force of bayonets. Women cannot get the suffrage until men are ready to give it to them; and whenever they do give it to us, and say that we shall vote, I have not the slightest fear of their refusing to abide by the result of the election. Every decent man in the defeated party could be counted upon to resist any such attempt of a lawless minority.

But, it may be said, what is to be feared is not so much an open defiance of the law as an evasion of it, and especially of the liquor laws. But there is always more or less dodging of the liquor laws, whether prohibitive or restrictive. There is no evidence that there is any more dodging where women vote than where all the voters are men. For instance, in 1880, Arkansas adopted a law that the opening of a saloon within three miles of a church or schoolhouse might be prevented by a petition from a majority of the adult inhabitants, men and women. The liquor dealers contested the constitutionality of the law. Their lawyer in his argument before the Supreme Court, said (I quote from his printed brief):

“None but male persons of sound mind can vote; but their rights are destroyed, and the idiot, alien and females step in and usurp their rights in popular government. Since females, idiots and aliens cannot vote, they should not be permitted to accomplish the same purpose by signing a petition; for the signature of an adult to a petition is the substance of a ballot in taking the popular sense of the community. It merely changes the form, and is identical in effect.”

He was right in claiming that to let women petition in this way, with authority, was equivalent to letting them vote. The Supreme Court, however, upheld the constitutionality of the law. Under it, a large part of Arkansas “goes dry.” There is some dodging of the law, but no more than there is in other states where women do not vote. In fact, we do not hear half so many complaints about Arkansas as about Maine, where all the voters are men. Neither has there been in Arkansas any attempt at insurrection by the liquor dealers and their friends. If this is found true in communities not particularly law-abiding, and in regard to the liquor question, which is perhaps of all others the most irritating to the lawless element, we need not have much fear of what will happen in other places from general women suffrage.

This is a matter in which we have some experience to guide us. Women have been voting for many years, in many different places, and upon a great variety of questions. There is no case on record where all the men have voted one way and all the women another; but it has occasionally happened that the majority of men have voted one way and the majority of women the other. There has never been any refusal to abide by the result of the election. For the last six years the 10,000 or more women voters of Boston have turned the scale at every school election. Have the defeated candidates and their friends ever tried to overturn the election by an armed insurrection? Is there the slightest practical danger of their ever doing so? In Kansas, women have had municipal suffrage since 1887. They have often defeated corrupt candidates at exciting city elections. There has never been any attempt at insurrection. 60 In Elk Falls, the municipal election was once decided by a single vote, that of a woman eighty-six years old, Mrs. Prudence Crandall Philleo. There was no rebellion. And if there had been, what practical difference would it have made, for fighting purposes, whether the casting vote had been given by a woman eighty-six years old, or by a man of the same age? In Wyoming, where women have had full suffrage since 1869, they have often defeated bad candidates, but no disorder has ever resulted. There is no reason to believe that the men of Eastern States are less civilized than those of the West.

It may be of interest to consider the views of some well-known men and women in regard to this argument that women should not vote because they do not fight. Mr. Wm. I. Bowditch points out that young men between eighteen and twenty-one, who are among our best fighters, are not allowed to vote, while our wisest voters, the men over forty-five, are not required to fight.

Dr. James Freeman Clarke said:

“An able and highly respected writer against suffrage seems to regard voting as a mere test of physical strength. Because women cannot take part in battle or in putting down riot, therefore, it is argued, they must not vote. But this is wholly to misunderstand the nature of our institutions. In this country public opinion, and not physical force, is the supreme power. It is public opinion which is expressed by the ballot. The great majority of men never belong to the army or the police, and do not lose their votes on that account. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes has given views on this subject in the following lines:

“To cut men's throat to help them count their votes Is asinine—nay, worse—ascidian folly; 61
Blindness like that would scare the mole and bat, And make the liveliest monkey melancholy. I say
once more, as I have said before, If voting for our Tildens and our Hayeses Means only fight, then,
Liberty, good night! Pack up your ballot-box and go to blazes!”

Ex-Governor Long says:

"Think of arguing with a sober face against a man whose brains are reduced to such a minimum that he solemnly asserts a woman should not vote because she cannot fight! In the first place, she can fight; in the second, men are largely exempt from military service; and in the third, there is not the remotest relation between firing a musket and casting a ballot."

Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace of Indiana, from who Gen. Lew Wallace says that he drew the portrait of the mother in "Ben Hur," deals with this argument as follows:

"It is objected that women cannot fight. This is a mistake; women can fight. They have led armies; but history is full of instances of women who have fought a braver than that fought by any army. But it is in no degree necessary that women should fight. It is good to have some element in government which does not fight. Such an element will help on the supremacy of spiritual power over brute force, and help usher in the realization of the beatific vision of Isaiah, when a little child shall lead the forces which will find better work to do than cutting each other's throats and blowing each other's brains out. Woman's ballot will increase the tendency towards arbitration between nations, and thus hasten the time when they shall learn war no more.

"A gentleman once asked me almost sneeringly, 'What have you women ever done for the state that it should give you the ballot?' We were in a parlor with a company, and I did not care to be drawn into a discussion; but he persisted, till at last I said: 'Napoleon realized fully the value of women to the state when he said, "The great need of France is mothers." If 62 women do not fight, they give to the state all its soldiers. A woman who goes down into the valley of the shadow of death every few years, who gives up her health, her beauty, her means of improvement, her social pleasures, that she may furnish soldiers for the state, certainly does as much for the defence of the state as the father who buys bread and shoes for the children.'

"Ah, ahem, I never thought of it in that light,' he said.

"No,' I responded, 'I told you was all a matter of growth and enlightenment.'"

Lucy Stone says:

"Some woman risks her life whenever a soldier is born into the world. For years she does picket duty by his cradle. Later on she is his quartermaster, and gathers his rations. And when that boy grows to a man, shall he say to his mother, 'If you want to vote, you must first go and kill somebody?' It is a coward's argument!"

Col. Higginson has unearthed some interesting figures bearing on this question, from the tabulated Medical statistics of the Provost Marshal General's Bureau, showing what proportion of the men examined for military service during our last war were found to be physically disqualified. Col. Higginson says:

"Among lawyers, 544 out of 1,000 are disqualified; among journalists, 740; among clergymen, 954. Grave divines are horrified at the thought of admitting women to vote when they cannot fight; though not one in twenty of their own number is fit for military duty, if he volunteered. Of the editors who denounce woman suffrage, only about one in four could himself carry a musket; while, of the lawyers who fill Congress, the majority could not be defenders of their country, but could only be defended. And it must be remembered that even these statistics very imperfectly represent the case. They do not apply to the whole male sex, but actually to the picked portion only, to the men presumed to be of military age.

63

"But can laws be executed without brute force? Not without a certain amount of it, but that amount under civilization grows less and less. Besides, there is no possibility in nature of a political division in which all the men shall be on one side and all the women on the other. The mutual influence of the sexes forbids it. The very persons who hint at such a fear refute themselves at other times, by arguing that 'women will always be sufficiently represented by men,' or that 'every woman will vote as her husband thinks, and it will merely double the numbers.' As a matter of fact, the law will prevail in all English-speaking nations; a few men fighting for it will be stronger than many fighting against it; and if those few have the law and the women on their side, there will be no trouble. War is the last appeal, and happily in these days the rarest appeal, of statesmanship. In the multifarious other duties that make up statesmanship, we cannot spare the brains, the self-devotion and the enthusiasm of women."

Col. Higginson quotes in this connection a discussion between Boswell and Johnson as to whether women ought to inherit real estate. Boswell thought not. But Dr. Johnson said:

"When fiefs implied military service, it is easily discerned why females could not inherit them; but the reason is at an end. As manners make laws, so manners likewise repeal them."

Col. Higginson says:

"This admirable statement should be carefully pondered by those who hold that suffrage should be only co-extensive with military duty. The position that woman cannot properly vote because she cannot fight for her vote efficiently, is precisely like the position of feudalism and of Boswell, that

she could not properly hold real estate because she could not fight for it. Each position may have had some plausibility in its day, but the same current of events has made each obsolete. Dr. Johnson was right: 'When fiefs (or votes) implied military service, it is easily discerned why women should not inherit (or possess) them; but the reason is at an end. As manners make laws, so manners likewise repeal them.'

64

"Under the feudal system it would have been absurd that a woman should hold real estate, for the next armed warrior could dispossess her. By Gail Hamilton's reasoning, it is equally absurd now: 'One man is stronger than one woman; and ten men are stronger than ten women; and the nineteen millions of me in this country will subdue, capture, and execute or expel the nineteen millions of women just as soon as they set about it.' Very well: why, then, do not all the landless men in a town unite, and take away the landed property of all the women? Simply because we now live in a civilized society and under a reign of law; because those men's respect for law is greater than their appetite for property; or if you prefer, because even those landless men know that their own interest lies in the long run on the side of law. It will be precisely the same with voting. When any community is civilized up to the point of enfranchising women, it will be civilized up to the point of sustaining their vote, as it now sustains their property rights, by the whole material force of the community."

Col. Higginson might have added that the lawless men who would like to appropriate the women's real estate know perfectly well that the great majority of men would resist them in any such attempt. In America, at least, the majority of men are not lawless.

There has often strenuous resistance to the admission of women to medical, literary or scientific societies; but when it has been finally decided to admit them as members, there has never been any refusal to count their votes. It will be the same with general suffrage.

65

CONGRESSMAN DAVIS BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE. (February 21, 1894).

Suffrage is the soil out of which grows government. If the soil is narrow and meager, permitting the exercise of a single will only, we call the government a monarchy or despotism. When the suffrage soil is broader, permitting the exercise and expression of the will of a class of citizens, the government is called an aristocracy.

When suffrage is still wider and more liberal, conforming to the laws of nature and justice among all classes of citizens, we call the government a democracy.

Suffrage is founded on natural right, and all citizens have equal claims to it; but, like all natural rights, it is subject to restraints and limitations when citizens enter into a state of civilized society. Civilized governments justify the right to limit citizenship to native-born persons, and aliens can become citizens only on certain prescribed conditions which shall purge them of their alienism. Even the natural right to life and liberty may be restrained and limited when the safety and welfare of society demand it. But no natural right can justly be restrained and limited unless society can render just and sufficient reasons for doing so. It does not devolve on the individual, nor on any class of individuals, to show that they possess the right of suffrage. It is a pre-existing natural right possessed by all alike, and unless society can show that in given cases it is for the safety and welfare of society that said natural right shall be restrained and limited, it must be conceded.

The question as to what the restraints and limitations shall be and to whom they shall apply is always answered by the governing power. If the governing power is a monarch or despot, the king is little restrained and his subjects are much restrained, and perhaps oppressed, reducing them to great inconvenience and distress. If the governing power is an aristocracy then we find class laws, favoring the few and oppressing the many. In a democracy or republic, where the will of the people is supreme, restraints should be equally borne and all rights equally enjoyed as the welfare and best interests of society may demand.

Society has many ways of expressing its opinions and judgments on economic and political questions, but the tangible and ultimate plan is by the ballot. The ballot is a means of recording an individual opinion, which, when counted and computed with other individual opinions, recorded in the same authoritative way, shall indicate the aggregate public opinion on any given subject. Plainly, then, in civilized society, only those should vote who can form or entertain opinions, and whose opinions when formed are in friendly accord with the principles of the civilized society in question. Infants, lunatics, and idiots cannot form opinions, hence infants, lunatics, and idiots should be restrained from voting. Criminals do not entertain opinions friendly to the society with which they are at variance, and aliens are not supposed to form friendly opinions toward a society which is in competition with that of which they are native-born members, or with a society whose genius they have had no opportunity of understanding. Hence criminals and aliens should be restrained from voting. But if infants, idiots, lunatics, criminals, and aliens should in any just and lawful manner become purged or free from their disabilities, then they should be permitted to cast the ballot. Infants are purged of infancy at the age of 21 years. There are fixed lawful rules prescribed by which aliens are freed from their alienism. When thus freed from their disabilities infants and aliens very properly become voters. If it is practicable to relieve idiots, lunatics, and criminals of their disabilities, then they should become voters, but not otherwise.

In our judgment sex should form no bar or disability in the matter of voting. We find adult sane men and women equally capable of forming and entertaining opinions. The ballot is a means of commanding respect and of protecting personal rights and interests. Men and women are equally entitled to respect, and both have personal rights and interests requiring protection.

It is maintained by some that the ballot rests ultimately on the bullet; that majorities rule minorities, because majorities can defeat minorities in the battlefield. Then it is assumed that, therefore, woman 68 should not cast the ballot because she may or can not bear arms on the battlefield. The conclusion is wrong. The assumption is founded on the lowest ethics of savagery, and has no place in civilized society. It is assumed that, in some imaginary exigency of government, most of the non-combatants may vote in the majority; that the most of the fighting men able to bear arms may vote in the minority; and that, in such case, a rebellious minority could not be coerced into submission. On the ethics of savagery such contingencies may arise, but not in civilized society.

In the ethics of savagery women have little influence, and a dozen braves may bully and defy a thousand children and squaws. Their respect for the helpless is slight and their sense of patriotism scarcely extends into the future. Savages are little troubled with anxiety for the welfare of posterity. In the ethics of savagery it is assumed that woman is not a combatant, and hence should be excluded from the ballot.

In a thousand ways civilized society differs from savagery. There are social ties and sentiments of patriotism, and feelings of obligations to our fellows in civilized society, not found in savagery. The armies on both sides were fuller during the late war because both male and female hearts swelled with the same patriotism; because mothers, wives, and sisters said to sons, husbands, and brothers, "Go;" and noble men at Shiloh, Gettysburg, and Chattanooga fought more bravely, fell more willingly, and died more cheerfully because of the well-thumbed pages of encouragement 69 from mothers, wives, and sweethearts, carefully stowed away among the soldiers' personal treasures. Female courage, female patriotism, and female voices were a war power in that great struggle, powerfully felt and grandly acknowledged on both sides.

But this part of the subject must be built up from the lowest bed-rock. Let us appeal to physical facts plain to the comprehension of the humblest. In what consists the war power of nations? All history and philosophy since the Middle Ages, reply, "The war power of nations and peoples consists of the purse and the sword." That statement being true, what is the percentage of purse and what is the percentage of sword in the most effective war power?

Russia is a military nation. There are, say, in the entire Russian Empire 100,000,000 of people. On a war footing the Empire musters 3,000,000 of soldiers. What is the percentage? The swords amount to 3 per cent. of the people. Ninety-seven per cent. of the people are devoted to the purse and to the recuperative purposes. Let us say, then, as we safely may, that when the Empire of Russian is on an active war footing, with 3,000,000 soldiers in the field, putting forth her utmost power on a hundred battlefields, only about 3 per cent. of her population is under arms. Ninety-seven per cent. devoted to arming, clothing, feeding, encouraging, paying, recuperating, burying, and replacing the soldiers. One-half of the money earners and army supporters in Russia are females; one-half of that incomprehensible, powerful arm of the 70 Russian Empire rests on the hearts and bones and sinews of women. What is true of Russia is true of Germany, of France, of England, and of America. Behind every body of armed troops in the field there must be an adequate supporting population. This is the rule and history of the modern, half-barbarous war power. One-half of any national population may be reckoned female. Every loom and spindle run by a pale-faced girl is a "war power." Napoleon beat the armies of continental Europe, but was sent into exile by the spindles and looms of the British Islands, mainly operated by female hands.

Mr. Allison attributes England's wonderland success to the "persevering industry of the British people and the extent of the commerce which they maintained in every quarter of the globe," and to their "admirable system of finance, which seemed to rise superior to every difficulty with which it had to contend." In short England conquers with the purse more than by the sword. The purse is fed and sustained by the women and non-combatants of the Empire. The sword is scarcely 1 per cent. of her inexhaustible war power. The Duke of Wellington and the mightiest generals of the continent could only hold Napoleon in check—the women and girls of Manchester captured him, disarmed him and sent him into exile.

In the United States over twenty millions of people above the age of 10 years are engaged in gainful occupations. Fully two-thirds of them are non-combatants —unfit for military duty in the field by reason of age 71 or sex, yet every one of them is a wealth producer and swells the war power of the nation. This is indisputable. Shall all non-combatants be deprived of the ballot because, by ultimate logic or chance, in some imaginary exigency, it may be necessary to enforce the decisions of the ballot by the use of the bullet? And as non-combatants cannot carry the musket, must they therefore not vote? Where is the much-lauded gallantry of man, that he would fire bullets and charge bayonets in the face of his mother, his sister, his wife, his daughter, or his sweetheart, with not another man noble and gallant enough to object? Such brutality and lack of gallantry must be sought in a state of savagery or in the restricted suffrage countries of Europe. It will never be found in countries where the political advancement of man depends on the ballot of woman.

The ballot was given to the negro, not as a war power—it was not given until five years after the war was over—but for personal protection. Is the negro with a ballot in his hand respected more or less on that account? The question is too silly for serious consideration. Woman needs the ballot for self-protection. Will man treat woman with more or less respect and gallantry when he finds her vote necessary to the gratification of his “manly aspirations”? Does a lad treat his lass with more or less respect and gallantry when on bended knee he avers that “her consent” is necessary to his future happiness? What sort of a figure would he cut, musket in hand, marching and shooting with the rebellious 72 minority, with his mother, sister, and lady love standing unarmed on the other side to be shot? Such absurdities belong to the ethics of savagery, or to the narrow-suffrage counties of the world.

The units of civilized society are dual, yet united, consisting of the strong right arm of man and the warm beating heart of woman; with a unity of intellectual and moral forces. Show me an institution of society where a man delights to enter in company with his mother, sister, wife, or daughter, and I will show you an institution which tends to civilization. Show me an institution where man does not desire to meet his mother, sister, wife, or daughter, and I will show you an institution which tends to barbarism. Show me the voting place where women are excluded and I will show you a place repulsive to the best elements of society and frequently in need of police guardianship. Show me a place where women cast their ballots,, and I will show you carpeted rooms and tables embellished with flowers, and not requiring police protection.

The question to-day is not whether women desire to vote. But, is it better for society that men and women should vote together? It is the duty of wisdom and patriotism to consider and decide this question. Our Christian civilization depends upon its right solution. The exercise of the voting franchise is a duty, as well as a privilege.

Mr. President, we should approach new experiments in government carefully. Our system of government with a union of states under one general head is wise⁷³ and fortunate. New advancements in the upward march of progress may be tested on a small scale at first, and then adopted more widely or laid aside, without harm to the General Government or to sister states. The State of Kansas has adopted municipal suffrage for women, with great benefit to society. It is now proposed to extend the franchise for woman in that state to an equality with man. Many other states have done as much as Kansas has, and some have done all that we propose to do, with no harm reported from any. Mr. President and Senators, it is now asked of you to consider the subject of making equal suffrage for man and woman the policy of the nation, as in your judgment may be thought best for society.