

## The new womanhood, by Winnifred Harper Cooley

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS RARE BOOK COLLECTION

LIBRARY CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT SUBJECT Section VII Woman Suffrage Campaign NO 63

WINNIFRED H. COOLEY

The New Womanhood by Winnifred Harper Cooley New York, 1904 Broadway Publishing Company

Copyright, 1904, BY WINNIFRED HARPER COOLEY.

*All Rights Reserved.*

TO MY MOTHER, IDA HUSTED HARPER, *Whom I consider not only a great winter, but the most maternal of women*, AND TO MY HUSBAND, Rev. George Eliot Cooley, *Who is my great inspiration,—the sympathizer with my success, the comforter of my failures—one who believes in the highest opportunities for women being the only salvation of the race*, I DEDICATE This Child of My Mind and Heart.

### CONTENTS.

#### PAGE

Poem—A Woman to Her Poet 1

I.—The Eternal Feminine 3

II.—The Bachelor Maiden 8

III.—The Evolution of the New Woman 15

Poem—The New Paradise 33

IV.—Co-education and Democracy 34

V.—Woman's Place in the World's Work 46

VI.—The New Domesticity 61

- VII.—The First Cause of Divorce 73
- VIII.—The Problem of Human Propagation 80
- IX.—The Future of the Woman's Club 94
- X.—Women in Trades and Professions 105
- XI.—Women in Civil Office and Civic Reform 123
- XII.—Woman as Citizen 135

### THE NEW WOMANHOOD. A WOMAN TO HER POET.

Time was when I repelled the least suggestion That woman's mind to man's in awe should bow, *My*  
genius I believed in without question, Before the Muses' altar made my vow. No dull, clay *man* my  
spirit could interpret,— But no dumb plodder of the earth art thou!

'Twas long before I learned, and dared to view me, In Truth's relentless mirror clear and hard; A thrill  
of apprehensive doubt ran through me, At seeing I was not the Woman Bard! Alas, the growing-pains  
of evolution, Vain fool, my very progress did retard!

I struggled long 'twist many a vain endeavor, My egotism and my love for thee; A soul-sad task  
ambition's ties to sever, A no-one but thy loving wife to be, A worshipped, noble, constant  
inspiration, The rich soil that makes possible the tree.

2

But now, I have transferred each aspiration, 'Tis now what laurels I, but thou shalt win. (Who livest  
only on my approbation)— I bury not my talents,—that were sin; But I have seen thy poet-soul, while  
breathing,— The Paradise of life, I enter in.

Think not, I am inferior, *as woman*, Nor thou, my love, art genius, *being man*, Nay, jealously I say (for I  
am human) Such is not God's unreasonable plan; But freely, fondly bow I to my *poet*, I reverence the  
heavenly flames I fan!

3

## I. THE ETERNAL FEMININE.

What Goethe meant by his immortal phrase, *Die Ewigweibliche*, is not certain, but the eternal womanliness (literally, wifeliness) is a sufficiently plastic term to be made to fit many even contradictory ideals. The eternal, unchanging, unchangeable, universal spirit of womanhood; how different is the from the many petty characteristics called feminine! How at variance is the spirit of Goethe's ideal, the essence which he tried to embody in formal phrase, with the trivial feminine traits eulogized by many men as the embodiment of womanliness.

The *woman* has been worshipped in almost every stage of civilization, while *women* have been degraded. The Madonna has been adored, while the human mother often has been despised or neglected. Certainly no sect in Christendom more completely obscures and suppresses women in its councils than does that which glorifies *woman* in her one phase of maternity, Madonnahood!

After all has been said on the subject of purity, chastity, self-sacrifice, and sublimity in woman, does it not remain true that each of these qualities <sup>4</sup> should be striven for a the ideal also of *men*? While public opinion—than which no legal or physical force is more powerful—has encouraged women to develop along these peculiar lines, it has not required these beautiful traits in men; and while the world has united in fostering bravery, honesty, courage, loyalty, perseverance, and the *power of initiative* in men, it has almost wholly condemned these qualities in women. Thus the sexes have become differentiated by different ideals being followed (as well as varied employments) and small philosophers have prated of “different *qualities of mind* in men and women.” As far as can be learned of their methods, they have weighed the brain of a Webster, and of some common pauper woman, and finding the former more heavy, have deduced the fact of man's superiority! They have written countless books of mysticism, in which mind is termed masculine; heart, feminine; intellect, masculine; emotion, feminine; as if the functions, physical, mental, moral, spiritual, evolved through the race's tedious climb Godward were not (at least latent) in every human being!

The newest and highest thought has come to do away with the mawkish sentimentality that first separates man and women on either side of a broad road, and then forbids them to cross the artificial barrier, but bids them each keep to his own domain, and smirk and smile at a distance. Perhaps there is no topic in the world which has called forth so much wholly unfounded sentimentality as has the subject of woman. Man has placed her, in imagination, on dizzy heights <sup>5</sup> whither he scarcely dared or cared to ascend, yet strenuously fought to prevent other men from reaching. He has secluded her in cloister or harem; he has shut her in gloomy castle white he went forth to the glories and excitements of battle. The only thing he has not done is voluntarily and

frankly to say, "Thou art thine own, not another's; go or come as thou listest. Be my companion or my enemy's; or, if it please thee, choose the single pathway. Be brave and strong and noble, and if thou chooseth me, I will try to be chaste and true and gentle; let us fare forth together, working not selfishly for ourselves, but for the world!" That would have been the true chivalry of the stronger to the weaker, of him in power to her overpowered.

This, man never has said. He has been too busy with the world's business, its battles, his own scramble for food; and his leisure hours have been beguiled by idle dalliance, petting, praising, spoiling; or neglecting and oppressing women, according to his temper.

But woman, what has she been doing?

Too often, she has been a willing slave to public opinion, to love of ease, of luxury, to the *comfort of being unthinking!* Or, a hopeless slave to proverty, dependence and drudgery. She has love to hear sung her praises for docility; vanity caressed has afforded pleasure. She has grown to believe, in truth, that she is a being too find and soft and delicate to have aught but a flower's existence. Or, she has been a daughter of the soil, weary and heavy-laden, commanded by men and priests to labor and keep silent.

## 6

But even in the darkness of ignorance and apathy, the eternal feminine was groping for individual expression. Whether it were in the soul-developing spirit of mother-love that always says, "Not my life but thine is of consequence"; or the dynamic ambition which transmitted itself into, and shaped the mind of an infant Napoleon; the creative force of the universal feminine has been laboring until it has brought woman into the sunlight, it has wrested from man his pre-empted prerogatives, and taken away from him his *possession* that it may return it to him as a *free gift*. Is the present of her love less precious, O twentieth century husband, because it is the spontaneous offering of a self-owned woman? Ah, no; rather is life the richer for broker fetters, which establish democracy, and allow woman and man to progress along the blessed road of a higher civilization.

If the keynote of the present uprising of womanhood were to be sounded, it would be "No sex in brain, in mind or morals!" Most of the glaring differences between the habits and thoughts of men and women are easily traceable to the pressure of the mental and physical environment shaping each. There always will remain, however, certain distinctions of sex, certain characteristics which are inherent and natural, and which constitute the peculiar charm of one for the other. Alarm lest the sexes merge into one another, with the growth of freedom and opportunity for woman, seems as unscientific and unnecessary as the supposition that the rose and lily, if given the same opportunity

for air and sunlight, will become monotonously similar, or 7 identical. No one would from this foolish fear dwarf and starve the fair lily!

The eternal feminine will never be the less womanly for becoming more broadly and intelligently *human!* Woman asks no more gratified ambition, no more opportunity for expansion than is the possibility of man; she cries for an earthly immortality, as man aspiring ever has cried.

*"Would she have heart to endure, for the life of the worm or the fly, She desires no isles of the blest, no quiet seats of the just, Give her the pleasure of going on, And not to die!"*

The pessimist is he who is a natural tyrant. Great souls do not seek to rise upon the shoulders of their fellowmen, much less of their "sister women." He who has within his heart the eternal masculine, not qualities of the brute, the warrior or the despot, but the high and brave and humanitarian ones, will recognize in the future woman all of the old *Ewingweibliche*, with a new strength and depth and tenderness which *carries maternity into humanity*, and loves not the world less for loving her own dear ones more!

*"Love thee? She will love thee as only freedom knoweth. Love thee? She will love thee while love itself doth live. Fear not the heart of woman! no bitterness it showeth, The ages of her sorrow have but taught her to forgive!"*

8

## II. THE BACHELOR MAIDEN.

The subject of this sketch is an object of curiosity to the whole civilized world. She is the product essentially of the nineteenth century. She is regarded by some as the embodiment of American feminine independence, of coy chastity, of vast talents, and withal, the desire of all men, the possession of none; by others as the abnormal result of overwrought sensibilities and insatiable ambition, a menace to and competitor of men, and an awful example to women. Yet she is a simple and honest creature, who is the product of her environment, and of modern social conditions, just as the "hopelessly domestic" matron was the result of her age's rigid requirements. The strongest possible pressure always has been brought to bear upon women to compel them to marry, and until recent years it has been a social disgrace to remain unwed. Spinster and old maid were terms of reproach (although very unjustly so, because woman was obliged to wait to be chosen), and in France, the calamity was considered so sad, that after a certain age even spinsters were called by courtesy, Madame.

The great step from the despised spinster to the Bachelor Maid seems to have been taken 9 simply, yet we may be sure individuals endured much opposition and ostracism. The girl with a talent for art or music could not always have a mother to chaperone her for years in New York or Paris; yet she would fain heed the scriptural injunction, "Hide not thy light under a bushel," and so, daringly she ventured alone into the studios, and later, becoming self-supporting, established her own studio, which had just a charm and touch of femininity that the men's ateliers lacked; and so she became associated with cozy corners, cushions, flowers, a bright-blazing fire, and a cup of tea at twilight, until now, she is a synonym for all that is most entrancing in a moral Bohemia.

In reality, however, the Bachelor Maid often is "so" because she is obliged to be the prosaic breadwinner for herself and others, or simply because she never has found the "right man" to marry! It is an anomalous term, Bachelor Maid, used so romantically for authors and artists—which may include weary teachers, "dainty lady typewriters," women in stores, Government departments, and all of the numerous, professions, few so redolent with sentiment as the pursuits of the studio. The term should also include the conspicuous minority, the heiresses—often charming and highly cultured women—who have not found among the idle and dissipated men in the "smart set," or the suspected fortune-hunters of a lower social stratum, or the licentious scions of decayed European nobility, that ideal man who is their dreamed-of life partner.

Certainly, these women are to be pitied. Denied 10 the healthy joys of the wage-earner, who sees a material value set upon her labor, and feels that there are joyful recompenses for her work; and failing to find the inestimable delight of a sympathetic sharer in her joys of luxury and travel, bound in the very nature of things, to be suspicious of those attentions which most women accept happily as their just due, she is the envied of the poor, yet is of all women perhaps, the most lonely. Unless she be content with the life of a dilettante, she turns to philanthropy and reform, seeking something vital, and in these finds activity and unselfish happiness, as did her prototypes, in former ages, in the convents.

The world's great strides along the lines of progress have not been taken by "domestic women." Certain strenuous movements have demanded the undivided attention of the bachelor women of history. Those who did not furnish sons for Napoleon's cannon to demolish, often followed the army to the field of battle, and nursed the wounded remnants of war's brutality. Women, whose whole life was spent in the individual kitchen and nursery, could not solve the problems of the fallen, or influence legislation in behalf of the oppressed. Thus, the unwed woman (besides her inalienable right to live her own life, and develop her talents) has something in her favor, and society owes her a debt. The Joan of Arcs, the Florence Nightingales, the Grace Darlings, the Susan B. Anthonys, the Frances Willards, the Clara Bartons, the Helen Goulds, and the Jane Addamses have been unmarried

women. With the inconsistency of conservatives who cannot adjust themselves to new 11 conditions, many men have criticized women reformers, the unwed, because they did not marry; and when the married women reformers were pointed to triumphantly, have criticized these because they took an interest in the world's morals, when they *were* married!

The Bachelor Maid is not only an unconscious reflection upon the old-time marriage system, which kept a woman in narrow and restricted labor and seclusion (and thus has much to repel modern educated women), but she is a direct accusation against Man as she has found him. There are few women who cannot be won by a man of refinement and average attractions. There is no doubt that affection and romance play a larger part in women's lives than in men's. If Byron's couplet, "*Man's love is of man's life a thing apart, 'Tis woman's whole existence,*" is no longer true, owing to the multifarious interests of femininity to-day, it still contains a germ of truth. Women, as a rule, because of centuries of cultivation of their domestic instincts, and sentimental nature, enjoy marriage more subtly, and suffer its disillusionings more keenly, than do their husbands, and it is a strong commentary upon the lack of modern men to fulfill ideals, that so many women suppress their affection, and remain single. A higher type of manhood, and a greater range of occupation and activity within marriage for women, would speedily lessen the number of bachelor maids. Elizabeth Barrett 12 waited forty years for her Robert Browning, and then gave the world some of the greatest love-poems ever written. Many a Bachelor Maiden has waited a lifetime for the "hundredth man," and died unmarried, because she would have nothing lower than her cherished ideal.

Modern marriage does not require utter self-abnegation. Modern husbands frequently rejoice and are "exceeding proud" of a talented wife. Often, one hears men speak with disgust or bitterness of a wife's having abandoned music, for instance, seemingly desiring nothing but idleness in marriage. The "New Man" is as sublime a product of modern society as the new woman, and perhaps he deserves more credit, for it is rare for a dominant class voluntarily to reform its opinions or actions in favor of the subjects over which it has dominion.

The Bachelor Maiden, on the face of things, has failed to realize her ideal. Romantic she may be, but not accomplishing the highest union, she prefers constancy to a soul-conception rather than a servile dependence upon some man for bread, where love is not. There are many other human instincts, besides those of sex, which have been neglected by sentimentalists, that demand satisfaction. The whole class of mental and æsthetic and spiritual ones are vital and insistent, and do not depend upon the attraction of the sexes. They have commonly been starved in women. A wholly-developed, versatile individual desires many experiences in life besides protracted and all-absorbing domesticity from the age eighteen until death. There is a growing need for intellectual 13 experiences, for travel, for divers means of development, the gratification of which is more

satisfying even to the intensely feminine nature than men might believe. Blessed is she who finds these pleasures, and the elements of all joy, in life with a congenial and soul-satisfying husband; but *still happy can one be*, who, among the many requirements of her complex nature, *finds all except the happiness of marriage!*

The universal marrying of the past was due not only to natural affection, but to woman's financial dependence. Men were correct who insisted that grant women opportunity for wage-earning, and many would not marry—but did those men really desire to cut off the power of selection, and thus make marriage a matter of compulsion! “Give a man a right over my *subsistence*, said Alexander Hamilton, “and he has a right over my *whole moral being*.” This certainly may apply to the relations of any man and any woman.

The mistake of the past has been to glorify marriage, as *marriage*, irrespective of fitness of dignity, of congeniality, almost of decency. Some natures eminently fitted for the responsibilities of marriage never exercise these functions, but many people do marry who are totally unfit, or who would have been far happier, single; yet the old-fashioned person felicitates the world upon every marriage (and birth) as in itself a distinct acquisition to virtue! It was a long step in civilization from promiscuity to monogamy, but marriage must be reformed within itself, before it will allure many individual self-respecting men and women.

## 14

The Bachelor Maid, then, has her *raison d'être* (her reason for being, and her right to be) as well as her especial joys and duties. She should be accepted as a fact; not as a vicious phenomenon, but as a commentary upon modern moral and social conditions. Because, being self-supporting, she is not forced to marry for a “home” (as was every virtuous female of the past), when she does wed, she will be the most—the only—satisfactory wife, a willing one. The saddest stories in literature are those depicting the conflict between love and legitimate ambition. They all end the same way—in the sacrifice of genius, aspiration, everything in the woman's life, to love. If she were a rarely emotional nature, perhaps she found that love was worth the sacrifice (although one questions the appreciation of the man for whom “the world was counted well lost”); but the modern woman wishes both love and ambition, neither stultified at the expense of the other—and she expects, even in marriage, opportunity for symmetrical development.

In general, the choice of wives has not illustrated the survival of the fittest, but the selection of the meekest. The conventional women, who followed the line of least resistance, married. For the future one can but prophesy that as men grow nobler, and matrimony broader, there will be a purer domesticity and fewer Bachelor Maids.



### III. THE EVOLUTION OF THE NEW WOMAN.

There is this fundamental difference between the development of man, and that of woman: he has developed through encouragement; she in spite of discouragement. All the forces of nature and society have tended to hurry him along the road of progress—all the powers have been invoked to keep her back! No one in the world ever attempted to define for man his place in the economy of the universe; the stronger half of humanity always has assigned a sphere to woman, and held her, by force of law, public opinion and social control, in this place. Scientifically, man has seen that unless he struggled and prove his right to live, he would be weeded out as “least fit” in the survival of the fittest. Woman, on the other hand, has had to remain passive until chosen as a wife. Those who objected to the ruling order were not selected, and, therefore, left no descendants; thus, the premium being put upon passivity, and only those being wedded who evinced docility, the race perpetuated itself in negative, docile women.

This being the case, how did any woman ever create a new ideal, and dare to maintain the right to live the life of an individual, to be educated, to be economically independent, and to remain, if she desired, unwed? There was, fortunately, this saving grace: an opportunity to inherit from the father as well as from the mother, and thus, bold, untrammelled spirits and brilliant minds sometimes found themselves in the bodies of girls; and so the new women have been evolved, and have left their imprint upon history.

Girls ever have been commanded to *be*; boys to *do*. To the boy we say, “What are you going to *do*, my little man; what great thing will you accomplish!” To the maid, “*Be quiet, be good, be docile!* Some one has said that woman has been expected to keep pace with man, *with her children clinging to her garments!* This is one of those partial truths which allure us by their poesy. She has not been expected or permitted to keep pace with man, although in some instances she has inspired to. In the days when she did the spinning and weaving, the cooking, the washing and ironing; when she bore and reared fifteen and eighteen children, she could not and did not keep pace with man, in civil and intellectual pursuits. But throughout the ages individual women have aspired to be something besides wives and mothers, as men universally are something besides husbands and fathers. These Beacon Lights of woman's history have faintly illumined the sea of darkness and defied the harem, unjust laws and every form of domestic tyranny.

The term “new woman” is luminous with meaning; yet it is a paradox; for the advanced woman, the woman who does things, who strives not only to be, but to act, is not *new*, but more numerous

17 than ever before. She has appeared at intervals throughout all time, in the guise of an inspired warrior, a brilliant orator, or organizer, a Greek poetess, a scholar, or a queen.

*The new woman is only the old woman with new opportunities!* Women of the past were so limited by physical burdens and suppressed by public opinion that the wonder is there are so many beacon lights.

Some men have with delightful inconsistency, at one and the same time, assigned woman to her sphere of domestic drudgery and pointed in derision to the sad scarcity of women in the ranks of genius. "Where are your world-poets, artist, architects, musicians?" they demand. To a man who once asked the Rev. Anna Shaw what work of value women ever had produced, she retorted: "Women have spent all their time for ages in *making men*; you may judge of the value of the production!"

Opportunity has much to do with the producing of geniuses. The few noted women recorded by history are not prodigies, or accidents, but those peculiarly situated so that they *could* act. We are not to suppose Joan of Arc the only maiden in whose breast the fire of patriotism slumbered. Charlotte Corday probably was one of many peasants who longed to free France by killing the insolent tyrant. We feel sure that many an incipient poet, too obedient and docile, or too overwhelmed with work to let her light shine, was a mute, inglorious Milton in petticoats, and went to her grave unwept, unhonored and unsung. Time was when the most fitting epitaph for the average 18 wife was that of the bereaved farmer: "She was such a good woman to work!" Chance songster, modest and timid, who sometimes had their verses collected by some old gentleman after their death, were but types of many housewives who saw Italian glory in the sunsets from their kitchen window, and felt a thrill at the yellow primrose by the river's brim, as they rinsed the clothes of the family washing; but whose songs perished on their lips.

The very docility of woman has been a vital factor in retarding her development. It is the unusual woman, the path-breaker, the fighter, if you please, who has met the eternal opposition of man (and the weak echo of many women) and martyred herself to overcome it. But there was this difference in the struggle: whereas man's persistence sprang from the motive of selfish appropriation of life's best, woman's was born of the legitimate desire for growth.

One other fact explains the fewness of women geniuses. Not only were they suppressed and forbidden expression, but their actual fruits were appropriated by their male relatives! The most shocking example of this, *known*, is that of the Mendelssohns. Some of Felix Mendelssohn's finest compositions were the work of his sister Fanny. By contemporaries she was regarded as as fine a piano performer as he, yet her music and fame have been absorbed in his. He was educated under celebrated masters, was fêted throughout Germany, patronized by the emperor, adored in England,

while poor Fanny, with exactly the same God-given talents, had her compositions appropriated 19 wholesale, and is not even mentioned in the cyclopedia!

Gradually, step by step, grudgingly, man has yielded what was never morally his to yield, but was originally won by brute force, and then held by laws of his own making. Woman never has struggled to supersede man, merely to occupy a place by his side in the world's work.

What are the gains that once were timid, half suppressed longings of feminine pioneers, which were fought step by step, but now are accepted joyfully?

(1) Education—lower, higher, professional.

(2) Employment—industrial, commercial, (with financial returns for labor).

(3) Recognition—legal and civil.

Each of these has a long, pathetic history, as harrowing in detail as any of the world's battles. Every gain has been mad at the sacrifice for the path-breakers of much that woman holds dear. Nothing is so precious to woman as reputation—the opinion of society; it almost precedes self-esteem. She shrinks in terror from ridicule and disapprobation. Yet, these have been the portion of the new women who have sought to abolish the most flagrant abuses, even the existence of which the present century marvels at!

However, the past is not all bad. Women ruled upon the throne of Egypt and had every political right before the Christian era. There were mighty prophetesses in Judea; but in general, women were prized solely as a solace for men, and valued according to the number of sons they gave to their lord and their race. A few Jewish women fired 20 the hearts of warriors, and went before them into battle. Deborah was soldier, poet, prophet, judge. Vashti defined the canons of obedience to husband and monarch and risked death when she refused to parade her physical charms before the drunken court revellers, and was publicly disgraced for her courage and chastity.

If any have forgotten history, we may quote a few of the great of antiquity, to show the light in which the "old woman" was regarded:

The Hebrews (borrowing from the Babylonians) gave us the infamous Adam and Eve myth, which had done so much to degrade women, even in their own eyes!

Turning to the three mighty Greek tragedians, we find them, saying:

Æschylus: *"Ne'er be it mine, in ill estate or good, To dwell together with the race of women."*

Sophocles: *"There is not anything, nor will be ever, Than woman worse, let what will, fall on man."*

Euripides: *"Dire is the violence of the ocean waves, And dire the blast of rivers and hot fires, But nothing is so dire and dread as woman; No painting could express her dreadfulness, No words describe it."*

## 21

Even the great-hearted Victor Hugo put himself on record thus: "Dolls are the playthings of children, children of men, men of women, and women are the playthings of the devil!" Rousseau, who posed as the apostle of *human equality*, constantly insisted that as women were created solely to please men, they should be educated entirely with a view to delighting men.

The most potent menace to those women in the past who endeavored to use their talents was the utter ruin of their reputations. Sappho, "violet-crowned, pure, sweet-smiling," has been subject for thousands of years to vindictive slurs, yet scholars now claim that in her own age, she was celebrated for chastity as well as for brilliance. She was sufficiently honored by her state to have her face stamped upon its coins. On the sunny Isle of Lesbos, Sappho founded the first *woman's club*, and wrote immortal lyrics, 600 years before Christ! Nine volumes of her poetry perished in the fanatical flames of the Alexandrian Library. Æolian women were highly honored in literature and art. Sappho is said to have given passion a soul, while men-geniuses coarsened it.

In those days of aristocracy and slavery, neither men nor women cared for economic problems; their sole passion was for scholarship and culture. Erinna, a noble maiden of Sappho's circle, died at nineteen, having written an epic of three hundred verses, said to equal Homer's. The theme was of a maiden whose mother compelled her to do domestic tasks, when she wished to follow the muses!

Of the four immortal poets of Lesbos, three 22 were women. Mrytis and Corinna were teachers of the renowned Pindar, and Corinna defeated him five times in public debate. Telesilla, a poetess, armed the women in war against Sparta, and led them forth to victory. Her fame was celebrated for centuries, by an annual festival in which the men dressed as women, in delicate compliment to her achievements! In the small country of Greece, in the Golden Age, there were seventy-six women poets. In Italy, in the Renaissance, there were sixty. Most of their works of art were destroyed by fanatics and churchmen of the Dark Ages.

Athens, although a republic, humiliated women to a tragic extent. They were not allowed outside their houses, or to eat at the table with husband and male children, and had not the slightest acquaintance with other men. As a great concession, after they were sixty years old, they might

attend funerals! This subjection of woman has been assigned by students, as a prime reason for the dissolution of Greece and Rome. Certain it is, that it led to many terrible and unnatural vices. Greek men sought each other in friendship, intellectual companionship, and even formed romantic passions for each other. Another corrupt condition was the presence of heterai, or "stranger women." Absolutely the only way for women to be educated, enjoy freedom, and be *regarded highly* by men in Athens, in the "Golden Age," was to become what we term the demi-monde. We must not judge them too harshly. Sometimes, the name heterai, was merely nominal: that is, women not born in Athens, even if they married Athenians, 23 never were called legally wed, or their children legitimate.

*Aspasia*, brilliant "with beauty, love, and roses," came as a girl from Miletus, where women enjoyed great freedom. She calmly mingled with all the great of Athens, illustrious statesmen, sculptors, poets. She gave Socrates points in logic, and Phidias in art. The mighty Pericles divorced his narrow, domestic wife to wed Aspasia, and together they found Athens brick and left it marble. So unheard-of a state of a woman walking on the street with her husband, and conversing with other men threw Athenian society into rebellion. Aspasia, although the wife of the greatest man in Greece, was accused of bringing about the Peloponnesian and Samian wars, and was tried for impiety, (that easy accusation against people who do not believe as we do!) and only saved from death by Pericles' eloquence. He who undaunted had faced savage warriors, shed a tear at the infamy heaped upon his wife: mighty Pericles wept, and Aspasia was saved! Aspasia was undoubtedly the "new women" of Golden Greece. She founded a girl's school, encouraged the arts, and stood firm for domestic liberty, although reviled by the women she sought to free. Dying, the immortal Pericles said with joy: "Athens intrusted her greatness, and Aspasia her happiness to *me!*"

Of the power of women in various countries Cæsar speaks, and says, "Semiramus ruled Assyria, and the Amazons conquered Asia."

In Rome, women were degraded, yet developed an amazing executive ability, until the term "Roman matron" stands for ability and dignity. One triumvirate, undoubtedly exaggerating, said of women, "They govern our houses, our tribunals, our armies." Yet they were uneducated, and suffered many inequalities before the law. Beacon lights shone in Rome as elsewhere. The daughters of Roman senators must often be renowned. One senator's wife, Afrania, spoke often in the courts, and the plea of Hortensia for her sex in the Senate, is celebrated. The privilege of speaking in the Forum was withdrawn from women, because one woman abused it? Women built temples, established porticoes, and founded schools. Statues were erected to many women. In the golden age of Augustus, Ovid approved of teaching girls the Classics, and Cicero studied law with Laelia. But poor Juvenal, the satirist, wailed: "I hate a woman who never violates the rules of grammar, and

quotes verses I never knew!" His amiable conclusion is: "A good wife is rarer than a white crow!" However, another satirist, Martial, congratulates a man who is to marry a girl with the "eloquence of Plato, austerity of the philosophers, and verses worthy of chaste Sappho." Emperor Marcus Aurelius erected a gold statue to his wife Faustina, and Augustus gave his sister Octavia a national funeral. Livia, who was Augustus' wife fifty-two years, was decreed "Mother of Her Country," and one of the gods! She was termed "a Ulysses in petticoats."

The prevalence of divorces was due not to any freedom of women, but to bad laws and greed for gold. Under Roman law, men could appropriate 25 each wife's fortune, and turn her adrift. Naturally, they were anxious to marry as often as possible, and morals became very lax. Emperors separated families and broke up homes. Plotina, Trajan's empress, struggled to bring about purer conditions. The first woman to take her place in the senate and sign legislative decrees was Socinias. She also presided over a "Little Senate," a sort of woman's club. Zenobia, a captive from the Sabine hills, was empress, warrior, statesman and seer. Rome experienced the same fate as Greece in its influx of accomplished and brilliant "strangers," and fathers were obliged, if they would have their daughters marry, to educate them, which speaks well for Roman masculine taste, after all!

At one time Roman matrons revolted as a class against injustice!

After classic times down through the Dark Ages, many women re-acted in horror from the sensuousness of corrupted paganism, and embraced Christianity. Numerous beautiful, wealthy, popular Roman women threw themselves into the rigors of asceticism, and showed a strength and self-control foreign to most of the men. Marcella withdrew to her palace and founded the first convent, called the Church of the Household. Fabiola, Asella, and Paula forsook the orgies of wealthy men and devoted themselves to scholarship and charity. Many of these women spoke Greek and Hebrew. St. Jerome says of Marcella, "She discussed questions so thoroughly that often I ceased to be master and became pupil." Pope Anastasius used to consult this noble lady. Paula and Eustochium assisted St. Jerome in translating 26 the Bible which is now called the Latin Vulgate, and revised with him the psalter used today in Catholic churches; yet who ever heard one work of the credit of authorship given to these women! St. Jerome offers this tribute to "new women"—"Huldah prophesied when men were silent; Deborah overcame enemies when Borak trembled; Judith and Esther saved the people of God. Who does not know that Plato listened to Aspasia, Sappho held the lyre beside Pindar, and do WE not consider Cornelia and Portia among the glories of Rome?" At the fall of Rome, Marcella was beaten and tortured to death by an infuriated mob, as was in Alexandria, Hypatia, the philosopher and teacher, the last "feminine representative genius of the classic world."

Coming down to the Renaissance, we find women filling chairs of philosophy and law in Italian universities and discoursing in Latin with cardinals. At the University of Bologna, Novella d'Andra

lectured on Jurisprudence, her face screened by a curtain! Elena Cornaro, versed in mathematics, astronomy, and six languages, was crowned doctor of philosophy at Padua. Olympia Morata, at sixteen, became a professor lecturing without notes on Cicero, and speaking in Latin. This paragon was offered the chair of Greek at Heidelberg (in conservative Germany), but died early.

Caterina Sforza made a triumphal entry into Rome a bride of fifteen, and ruled like a queen. She rode at the head of troops and defended her rocky fortress of Forli. Another prodigy in affairs of state was the Duchess of Urbino, who died 27 at twenty-six, leaving seven children! Guiliano de Medici, a great Italian prince, considered women "capable of governing cities and commanding armies; any inferiority being accidental, not essential." Yet in Italy, men had legal right to beat and abuse wives, and murder and poisoning were overlooked. From the sixteenth century there is a book entitled "Superiorities of Women over, Men," and Boccaccio wrote "Illustrious Women." Another man wrote, "Immortal Triumphs of Eight Hundred and Forty-five Women." In a Temple of Fame, two hundred women were included. We must not forget in this hurried sketch, Vittoria Colonna, the finest poetess of Italy, the friend of Michael Angelo, and the type of perfection in womanhood. The best and most advance women of the Renaissance followed Savonarola in a passionate protest against corruption.

In Russia, even recently, women who desired education were obliged to flee to Germany, under the escort of, and a nominal marriage with some accommodating boy relative or friends, with whom they had the most platonic relations. One or two great women mathematicians are the result of this artificial method.

France gave many scintillating women who established the *Salon*, and made an *art* of conversation. These women had the genius of mental hospitality. But Frenchwomen never doubted but that they must work through men. Mmes. de Stael, Recamier, du Maintenon, du Barry, each made the fatal mistake of influencing nations by working upon the passions of one man!

## 28

Woman has ever been a sovereign or a slave. The new woman seeks only to be a *free individual*. John Knox, Calvin, and Milton contributed their flings at women. "One thing that is not French," said Napoleon, "is that woman can do as she pleases." He also said that that woman was most admirable who bore the most children. .... We would speak of Elizabeth, of Victoria, able queens of England, of Mary Wollstonecraft who alone championed the rights of Women, amid storms of derision from all save her husband, the economist Godwin, and her son-in-law, the poet Shelley. We have not touched upon the famous actresses, singers, painters, sculptors, but we have given enough examples to

trace a certain (all-unorganized) effort toward development and freedom, and to show that the new woman is perennial.

In the past, she must have been unusual to claim the barest notice in men's records of their own achievements. To-day, there are "more of her" than ever before. While the mountain peaks do not loom up so conspicuously, it is because the whole level has heightened. This is democracy! The few do not rise at the expense of the many, but all rise or fall together. Women number no Sapphos and Aspasia to-day, but no longer are despised and degraded, nor suffer under laws which permit wife-beating and wink at wife-poisoning. To be educated and active, we do not have to defy conventionality and lose our reputations; therefore should our achievements be the greater and our womanhood the nobler!

In America, the pioneers have not been poetic. 29 They have attacked antique laws that permitted men to abuse wives, forbade women to own their own property, clothes, or even the children they had borne, and denied them divorce from drunken brutes. Largely through our new women have these laws been abolished, but these pioneers are still subject to social suspicion and ridicule, the weapons of ignorance. There are intelligent men and *women* to-day who do not know what the race owes to Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony! They derive their scant information from comic newspapers! Most women can talk exhaustively upon Lincoln, Patrick Henry, Webster but never have informed themselves concerning the Grimke sisters, Abby Kelley, Ernestine L. Rose and Paulina Wright Davis.

How many realize anything about the marvelous sanitary reforms effected by the cultured and wealthy Florence Nightingale in the Crimean war, or appreciate the world-encircling Red Cross movement established by our own Clara Barton?

There are other subtler reforms needed, however, in the social world. New women to-day look with amazement upon the thousands of Americans who use the word "obey" in the marriage ceremony, often making a coarse jest of it, and cause the father, or some male relative to "give the bride away" to the groom, thus perpetuating the idea that a woman is a piece of property transferred from one man to another! Until man and woman, free, "from out the innumerable multitudes of earth, look into each other's eyes, love," and marry voluntarily, without parental 30 authority, or necessity for the girl to "be supported," what hope is there for the future generations?

The progress of women throughout the centuries has been a struggle, too often an ineffectual one. Many have died after an impotent beating of their heads against the stone wall of prejudice and tyranny. Yet, all unorganized as they have been, the constant effort has crumbled away much of the wall. We cannot forget that in 1803, a man sold his wife as a cow in the Sheffield Market (Eng.), and



in 1808, one sold his wife for six-pence and a quid of tobacco, and the local papers commented that these occurrences were getting *too frequent!*

Too much stress cannot be laid upon the universal and democratic educating of women. The very elements of our ideal republic are involved in the raising of the level. The successful women are those that have learned co-operation while men are still in the throes of competition! Our new women are the result of new conditions, which they in turn are creating. Through the efforts of the pioneers, within a century, girls have passed from no educational privileges to highest collegiate opportunities. In 1809, seven industries were open to women, (sewing, cooking, etc.); now three hundred and seventy-one offer employment. At that time, thirty-five women in the United States were working in factories; now, nearly four million are earning money. This shows the vast increase in industrial life, in the evolution of the new woman; and who shall say that the bright, self-supporting girl, who is not forced to marry to be supported, thus degrading 31 marriage almost to prostitution, or the widow who supports her family, is not as fine a product of humanity as the helpless domestic woman of the past.

Who does not know the inestimable value of the woman physician? It is amazing that delicacy has been so deadened by years of custom as to admit of women patronizing men physicians when there is any opportunity of securing a woman doctor.

Why the desperate fight against the feminine minister, when woman (whether justly or not) has been extolled for ages as the moral and spiritual superior of man.

Time was when woman, although considered fit for nothing but the rearing of children, was not thought fitted for teaching them. Now, four-fifths of the teachers of the country are women.

The finest achievement of the new woman has been personal liberty. This is the foundation of civilization; and as long as any one class is watched suspiciously, even fondly guarded, and protected, so long will that class not only be weak, and treacherous, individually, but parasitic, and a collective danger to the community. Who has not heard wives commended for wheedling their husbands out of money, or joked because they are hopelessly extravagant? As long as caprice and scheming are considered feminine virtues, as long as man is the only wage-earner, doling out sums of money, or scattering lavishly, so long will women be degraded, even if they are perfectly contented, and men are willing to labor to keep them in idleness!

Although *individual* women from pre-historic 32 times have accomplished much, as a class they have been set aside to minister to men's comfort. But when once the higher has been tried, civilization repudiates the lower. Men have come to see that no advance can be made with one half-humanity

set apart merely for the functions of sex; that children are quite liable to inherit from the mother, and should have opportunities to inherit the accumulated ability and culture and character that is produced only by intellectual and civil activity. The world has tried to move with men for dynamos, and “clinging” women impeding every step of progress,—in arts, science, industry, professions, they have been a thousand years behind men because forced into seclusion. They have been *over-sexed*. They have naturally not been impressed with their duties to society, in its myriad needs, or with their own value as individuals.

The new woman, in the sense of the best woman, the flower of all the womanhood of past ages, has come to stay—if civilization is to endure. The sufferings of the past have but strengthened her, maternity has deepened her, education is broadening her—and she now knows that she must perfect herself if she would perfect the race, and leave her imprint upon immortality, through her offspring or her works.

33

#### THE NEW PARADISE.

*God give us women—who will do and dare, And in the larger issues dare to do! Girls who are strong and brave as well as chaste, (And men as pure and gentle as they're strong.) Women who fear not petty social spite,— The fruit of ignorance, the cause of woe— But dare to THINK and ACT, that they may rise Toward the full stature of a sexless God!*

*We call our land a free one; let us prove What a democracy can rise to, in its power, With every voice, though feeble, recognized, And every daughter honored as a son. If such shall be, no longer men will sneer, Or fawn and cringe at passion's lightest whim; Mistress and queen will lay the scepter by, And “master” will be stricken from the book.*

*In the sweet reason of our larger day, Each must his work contribute to the whole, Knowing, together, we must rise or fall. Man will not look to God, and woman find “Her God in Man,” as sang the bigot-bard, But both will pray and toil in unison, Finding the sweetness of togetherness, United labor, heaven upon earth!*

34

#### IV. CO-EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY.

One would suppose that so simple, and natural a system as the co-association of boys and girls during the years devoted mainly to schooling, as well as those of childhood and maturity, would

need no defender; that, on the contrary, any artificial separation of girls and boys for certain stated periods, thus accentuating sex, would be called to account, and made to prove its right to be.

Yet this is not the case. For so many centuries, men monopolized the broadening benefits of education that when finally, women were declared fit to be educated, the conservative past tendencies the methods, so that girls were given only rudiments education, superficial studies, and thus, any attempt to place them in colleges already established for boys (already well-grounded in higher branches appealed to the popular mind as a dragging down of a university to the level of a convent.

Only the young West, with its new, liberal institutions, designed from their inception to accommodate girls and boys, grasped the primal idea that there is *no sex in education*, and that standard of study must be high, and fixed, thus placing a premium upon scholarship, rather than upon the incident of birth which made a child a boy, not a girl.

It is said in one of the oldest books of education, "By their fruits shall ye know them," and co-educational colleges invite this test of their merits.

Since the statistics of the United States Bureau of Education show that (excepting Catholic ones) eighty per cent of the colleges of America are co-educational, and that such institutions enroll 13,000 more woman than do women's colleges, and 10,000 more than do men's colleges, one would think that America had decided this question in the affirmative,—but since a reactionary flurry (started by Chicago University, because of an insidious half-million dollars promised as a reward of segregation) has disturbed and unsettled some people, a discussion seems pardonable.

Rufus Choate said in England that education is the chief industry of the American people! The first effort of the Pilgrims was to educate their offspring, and as "westward the star of empire held its way," the first thought of settlers and miners was to provide a log schoolhouse, and send East for a teacher. New civilizations adopt unquestionably the natural method (they do not buildup two schoolhouses side by side, hire two teachers, and placing the boys and girls in this relation furnish incentive for clandestine interviewers)—only an effete civilization corrupt in its conceptions, like that of France or Spain, secludes maidens in convents, fostering abnormal fancies of life; or an, overwhelming warlike country, like England or Germany, accentuates military schools and gymnasia.

That fact that old world considered woman not a human individual, but *sex incarnate*, accounts for the long centuries of mystery and seclusion. (Even so modern a poet as Pope, referred to women as "the sex.")

The new country with its new spirit of *camaraderie*, arising from companionship in building up a new civilization,—the hewing of the forests and building of homes by men, and carrying on of primitive industries by women within doors—made it possible to found educational systems upon a saner, freer basis; and *just in proportion as modern life grows away from healthy conditions, and tends toward aristocracy and idleness, it demands seclusion and separate education for its fashionable offspring.*

Even with the advantage possessed by this country, priority of schooling for the boys causes a lurking sense of their superiority, and while they always have been considered to deserved an education, girls have been required to prove their right to it! In all colleges, originally occupied by boys, to which girls have been admitted, this drama of masculine condescension has been enacted.

\*

---

\* Senator Leland Stanford, in founding Stanford University, declared that nothing would induce him to admit boys one year in advance of girls!

37

After the early New England days, when girls were permitted education upon boys' holidays, then, upon all school days, and at last, collegiate opportunities with their brothers, there remained but one conservatism for the alarmist to which to cling,—that of separate education.

Co-education is not a woman's problem, but a world one. It concerns woman only in that men were the first to be educated, and therefore, often object to co-education, because they feel that somehow they are sharing their prerogatives with girls.

Mr. William T. Harris, avowedly a co-educationalist, in spite of his official position as United States Commissioner of Education, points out that "since the public schools (ninety-eight per cent. of which are co-educational) are the only ones three-fourths of the people ever attend, the association of the two sexes as there maintained, must have a very great influence upon their social and business relations in after years. It explains \* \* \* the freedom that women enjoy in this country with respect to the pursuit of careers, and especially the large share which they take in the educational work. Where boys and girls are accustomed from early years to compete in intellectual exercises, they entertain a due respect for each others' powers, and false notions \* \* \* are dissipated."

In two states, Colorado and Idaho, women are serving in the highest capacity,—that of State Superintendent of Public Instruction. All this, in the writer's mind, is the best argument in favor of co-education.

38

The objections to co-education (or to higher education for girls) invariably are based *upon what man wants woman to be*. But rational pedagogists study the process of development which will effect the finest results with individuals, and the race,—and in the broad study of humanity, sex is but one branch.

The stereotyped objections are: It will unsex girls, and femininize institutions. How can girls become masculine, yet femininize a whole university! It is to say that the studying of boys and girls in the same classrooms will cause girls to become unsexed, masculine, yet, in some mysterious manner, the presence of girls will influence and make effeminate a whole university! Until it is admitted that a clear, well-trained mind, highly developed capacity for appreciation, and ability for skilled labor, are masculine, we cannot admit that education unsexes or masculinizes women. If a college becomes effeminate, it must be singularly lacking in the quality of its male students! \*

---

\* See recent complaints of Chicago University!

Another and an analogous complaint is that the morals of a college suffer, if the sexes are educated together, that there is an insidious risk in permitting young women and men to recite in the same classes. When one considers the feverish anxiety displayed by parents to throw young people together in social circles, this is somewhat amusing, but to answer it seriously, we quote Richter: †  
"To insure modesty, I would advise

---

† Richter's "Levana," cited by Dr. Clarke, in "Sex in Education."

39 educating the sexes together. Two boys will preserve twelve girls, or two girls, twelve boys, innocent, merely by the instinctive sense \* \* \* of modesty. But I will guarantee nothing in a school where girls are alone together, and still less, where boys are." Wm. T. Harris, quoting the above, says: "I have noticed that the atmosphere of mixed schools is desexualized, where that of separate schools seems to have a tendency to develop sexual tension." Of all strange inconsistencies, that of objecting to co-education upon the ground of danger from association, is the oddest, as the whole tendency of society is to bring about sex attraction and matrimony, and, prevailing art and literature do their best to foster high sex feeling, while the world in general is jocular on the subject, and forces the thought of sex even upon the unwilling. Suffice it to say that the records of scandal in co-educational colleges are a blank, whereas the result of convents and seminaries, with the inevitable military school around the corner, is incessant intrigue, frivolity, and often positive license.

Also, one set of objectors insists that co-education, by its daily association, *prevents* matrimony, while another set declares that elopements and marriages are its *constant concomitants*. One can scarcely refute two opposite accusations with the same argument! To the first we would say that he must be a very Schopenhauer of pessimism, to declare that association of young men and

women destroys their faith and pleasure in each other—(it heightens it!): To the second, we need only say that marriage is the goal of all mankind, 40 and the youth in colleges find more congenial life-partners than ninety-nine per cent, of those who meet in the artificial glare of social functions. Professor Slosson of Wyoming University says beautifully: “The future of civilization depends more upon the proper mating of the rising generation than on any discovery they make in the arts and sciences.” President Jordan, of Leland Stanford University, has stated, in the classroom, that in all his experience, he has never known an unhappy marriage among those who met and mated in college. As against co-education, sensational stories have been told even by a president,<sup>\*</sup> about “a certain college” at which the day after Commencement was set apart as the time for weddings! This is the most manifestly absurd statement the writer ever has seen in print. It is notorious that college engagements are long ones,—the girl often teaching four or five years, while the man goes through a university for technical training; or both doing graduate work in Europe. It is the fashionable miss, the blasé product of the new rich, who graduates from some superficial finishing school one day, and has a magnificent wedding the next, and is duly exploited by the sensational press, not the co-educational girl. It is the aristocratic, not the democratic, ideal which prompts such absurdities.

---

\* Mr. Twing, president of a small college in Ohio, in his “The College Woman,”

All of the stock arguments against co-educational,—the too great prevalence of athletics for girls, the use of slang, lack of specialized feminine training 41 (domestic science, etc.) apply at least equally to women's colleges.

One of the weakest, most amazing but ingenious excuses ever made by mortal man for the undeniable fact that girls are to-day excelling boys in scholastic work is made by that relic of mediævalism, Henry Finck:<sup>\*</sup> “We can easily gather one of the reasons why young men almost always are opposed to the *intrusion of young women into their schools (!)*. *They know instinctively that they are the stronger sex, intellectually as well as physically* and destined to achieve more than girls, *yet the rank-list and prizes indicate the contrary (!)*. This discouraging state of affairs is a real injustice to the boys, which can only be overcome by abolishing co-education!”

---

\* The “Independent,” New York, February 12, “Why Co-Education is Losing Ground.”

Not only does co-education not bring any evils in its train, but it does confer many decided benefits upon humanity.

1. The intellectual stimulus of sex upon sex is undeniable. The healthy competition which leads each to wish to develop his own powers, yet not necessarily to excel the other, is a delight to witness. For instance, a boy may be talented in oratory, and win an inter-collegiate debate. A girl friend is elated (and more appreciative of him than any one in the world not a college girl could be) yet cherishes a

desire to show him what she, too, can accomplish. Soon, she wins the prize for a story or poem, and the 42 boy is honestly delighted. (Incidentally, are they any less mutually proud and appreciative if they eventually, should chance to marry?)

2. There are many evils in modern life which college association goes far toward correcting. Plutocracy is rife in our cities, and in fashionable classes, women are becoming idle and non-productive, and at the same time, greater consumers and more extravagant than formerly. Girls' schools, of course, lay much stress upon dress, and the ideals fostered in many of them are ruinous to parents of moderate means. Co-educational institutions always are democratic, many of the brightest students actually earning their living while studying as much as others, and the snob or the supercilious soon finds his or her level, be he never so attractive and complacent.

On the other hand, girls naturally "tone up" a college socially. It is a standing joke that when boys are excessively verdant or boorish, it takes but a few experiences at a girls' reception to effect a self-wrought miracle in manners and toilet.

3. Men usually are more thorough than girls, because for generations, they have battled with necessity, and also have regarded their profession as a life-work. Girls at once see the contrast between this steady, purposeful application to one thing and their own towering and emotional ambition to do a little of everything,—and are benefited.

As has been hinted at, the morals of a co-educational institution are above reproach. In Eastern men's colleges of renown, drunkenness and 43 immorality are prevalent, <sup>\*</sup>—if not open then insidious; in co-educational colleges, misdemeanors are rare.

---

**\* I have been told that many parents in eastern towns where are situated famous men's colleges do not permit their daughters to become acquainted with the young men; such is their universal reputation for being "fast."**

The advocates of co-education are not theorists, who conduct columns in the "Home Journal" for the perusal of rural communities, but the great educators of America. After five years' wonderful pioneer work, Horace Mann wrote: "We have really the most loyal, sober diligent, and exemplary institution in the country."—(Antioch.)

In 1856, the president of Lombard declared: "The influence of the sexes in colleges is good and in all respects an aid toward sustaining good government."

Far back in 1968, a writer in the "Westminster Review," London, said: "I am convinced that in none of the male institutions, can there be found anything comparable to the moral elevation, refinement, and intellectual enthusiasm which characterizes the students at Antioch."

President Fairchild, of Oberlin, in 1874, said: "During my twenty-seven years' experience, I have never observed any differences in the sexes as to recitation."

President Angell, of Michigan University: "Women have done work admirably and apparently with no peril to health."

Andrew D. White, of Cornell: "The best scholar among 1,300 pupils was a woman. Also the best mathematician."

#### 44

Among other university president who have spoken publicly in favor of co-education are David Starr Jordan (Leland Stanford), Wheeler (California), Draper (Illinois), and nearly every president of a state university in the country. Dr. Schaeffer, State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Pennsylvania) asserts that, "All educators who have tried it, favor it."

Our United States Commissioner of Education insists that "the demand of women for equal advantages in education with men is not a mere temporary demand of sentimentalism, but an ideal of the social movement that underlines our civilization," and he goes so far as to say that in the highest epoch of industrial evolution yet attained, "*woman's sphere comes to be common with that of man*, and she needs an education in the sciences, arts, and accomplishment necessary to the man."

The majority report of the committee of investigation appointed recently by the Boston school board, abounding in statistics and testimonials, was enthusiastically favorable to co-education.

The pamphlet just issued by the United States Bureau of Education for the census of 1900 also is most encouraging. Although an *official government document*, it might be used as *as co-educational propaganda*, were a serious war waging.

The recent ripple caused by the segregation plans of Chicago University, is alarming only in that it is one of the many evidences of plutocracy in a republic. Perhaps no university founded by a living millionaire, can be wholly independent in instruction or policy. Certain it is that careful investigation in Chicago has brought to light shady dealings in the right to exercise the franchise



among the professors<sup>\*</sup> voting contrary to the will of the president, and scant heed has been paid the petitions of women students and professors.

---

<sup>\*</sup> Rev. Jenkyn Lloyd Jones of Chicago, investigated the matter thoroughly, and came to this conclusion, set forth in "Unity."

There seems to be a tendency toward retrogression in many directions in America the past decade; undue prominence of "ancestry"; a groping toward feudal customs; aristocracy; excessive extravagance and display; a revival of sensuousness and superstition in religion; even resuscitation of such archaic studies as astrology. The slight re-action in certain quarters against co-education is but one of these disastrous signs of demoralization, in a land struggling for pure democratic ideals.

Only the strong, normal common sense of our ancestors (not those of the decayed European nobility, whose crest we are unearthing for our stationery, but those sturdy souls who broke with existing conditions in an effect civilization and came to America for freedom and simplicity) can avert a temporary arrestment of progress, and for common sense and high, democratic ideals we may look largely to the products of co-education, (the natural and democratic system of cultivation,) who are useful citizens, and together have founded happy homes!

46

## **V. WOMAN'S PLACE IN THE WORLD'S WORK.**<sup>\*</sup>

---

<sup>\*</sup> Published in "California Ladies" Magazine," November, 1903.

Historians and sociologists agree that the civilization of any age or country is measured by the position of its women. It must, therefore, be conceded that the English-speaking peoples of the twentieth century are more highly developed than any races of the past, despite the spasmodic epochs of freedom and brilliancy scattered throughout the ages.

The primitive past consigned woman to a place of inferiority because physical strength was the tribal ideal. As men gained higher and nobler conceptions of living, they developed their minds, but were so accustomed to regarding women as weaker, that they did not question their general inferiority, and used the ascendancy they themselves had gained by brute force, to hold women in a position of subjection. They did not educate them, because they were but grouping at the value of education for themselves.

The great need men felt for wives caused them to place a certain value upon women, but merely a sexual one. The original marriage was one of capture. The zest of the "love chase" aroused all of

the masculine qualities,—bravery, speed, love of triumph and possession. This idea has descended to modern people through centuries of modification, in the custom of men proposing marriage, and making all advances; woman being valued as she *attracts, yet eludes*, and finally surrenders. The more ardent and difficult the pursuit, the more ecstasy in the final capture. \*

---

\* This is illustrated by homely anecdotes of a man running to catch a streetcar, but not finding it necessary to race when it is caught (marriage). Also, by youthful debates as to “which is the greater, the pleasure of pursuit, or that of possession?”

A vast ethical step was taken when marriage by capture was superseded by marriage by purchase. In this second form, the man does not consider all women legitimate prey, but supposes them to have a money value, and pays the parent for the bride. This savage custom has elements of greater rationality than the French dower system, in which the father pays a *dot* seemingly to get rid of his daughter, instead of the husband paying to get her.

The inevitable third step came when civilized man considered woman free to dispose of herself, and humbly begged herself as a boon, and accepted her decision as final, even if it were dismissal. The old barbarities are perpetuated, however, in the senseless forms of the father (or any available male relative) “giving the bride away.”

In the *division of labor* in the primitive industries, as well as in the simple social customs, the original functions of men and of women may be studied. In the first periods of human living, the nomadic tribes had few allotments of separate tasks. In their wanderings, each probably did the work nearest him. As the warpath became a factor in life, interspersed by the chase, it was natural that men should pursue both, because of their physical strength, and that if food was to be raised, and garments constructed of skins, these tasks should fall to the women.

*Farming was woman's first anchorage.* As the tribes became more peaceful, and men less occupied in militarism and protection, women were freed from the soil, and relegated to the hut. Cooking, fashioning garments, weaving baskets, and tending babies became their constant occupations.

Great nations being formed and wars less frequent, changes took place in the ideals of women's work, along with a growth in sentiment, until at last, they became (except in the peasant class) a dependent set of individuals, freed from nearly all labor, and set apart for the functions of sex,—to charm, beguile, and minister to men.

In feudal times, aristocratic ladies were set upon pedestals, and left there, idle and worthless, while men found their pleasure with the lower classes. A piece of embroidery was their sole allotment in th

world's work. \* In the Middle Ages, there came a time when men re-acted from the debauchery and self-indulgences they themselves had insisted upon, and turned in horror

---

\* See the Spanish Queen's complaints in Victor Hugo's "Ruy Blas."

49 upon woman as the medium through which they had so long found sensual pleasure. Everything pertaining to the home and marriage was looked upon as sinful; for the priestly classes, criminal, while it was allowed others as a concession to human frailty. Many men, with no sense of responsibility, deserted wife and children, and devoted themselves to penance in monasteries, so strong was the ascetic re-action.

Chivalry, or delicate and distant attentions to the idle, high-born ladies, and adoring service without reward, had its place in man's spiritual development, (although the continence toward the rich often was at the expense of the virtue of the poor) but it mitigated against a healthy industrial life for women. The influence of the ideal of perfect *leisure* and *uselessness* to be striven for by imitators of the great ladies vitiates life to this day. Every class strives for the leisure and luxury of the class above, for its women, and man is valued for the munificence with which he supports his wife, not the freedom he gives her.

The Renaissance brought a saner and loftier ideal, that of personal freedom, and an intense desire to develop one's talents. The Dark Ages had been fertilizing much seed that burst suddenly into blossom. Knighthood no longer was in flower, but individual genius and industrious labor never before were so prevalent. Women were rulers, professors, scholars, poets, and (especially in Italy) were recognized as vital factors in the making of civilization.

We have hurriedly reviewed the four phases of 50 historical human development: 1. Physical; 2. Ascetic; 3. Chivalric; 4. Individualistic. In all of these epochs, others have existed, as many types of civilization exist side by side to-day, but all are bound to be weeded out eventually to make room for the highest; when once the higher has been tried, there is no chance in competition for the lower. We can only study the highest one as it supersedes the former one, calling that the characteristic of the age. "In days of old when knights were bold, and barons held their sway," all women were not upon pedestals, yet the dominant ideal was the chivalric segregation of women as a class too lofty to be associated with in the simple industries of life. This new reverence (albeit questionable from so many standpoints) must be reckoned with as a step in advance, when tracing the development in the status of women. Gentlemen who swore to die for ladies would have refused to allow them to have the simplest share in the industrial development of the world, or to alter any of the outrageous laws then existing—yet until a high opinion of woman was sustained, there was no possibility of subsequent opportunities for her development.

Coming down to recent centuries, and following the band of illustrious, intrepid, but poor pioneers, who founded American civilization, we find the women burdened by the manifold duties of primitive industries, and child-rearing. Without slaves, without servants, the Pilgrim Mothers endured hardships which the well-to-do classes of Europe had outgrown. As prosperity dawned upon American, men no longer built their own 51 houses and made their own shoes, but specialized their labor, and sought the *highest quality* of work that each was capable of doing.

Inconsistently, however, for many generations, they expected their wives to keep to the primitive industries which they themselves had outgrown. The women did their own weaving, spinning, baking, cooking, sewing, knitting, and slavishly ministered to the men and children.

At last, the factory took all of the individual industries out of the household, and specialized laborers (men) such as the baker, the butcher, the launderer, the tailor, the mitten and stocking manufacturer; and also the washerwoman, and the dressmaker, left woman with little or no employment. To-day, some of the middle classes occasionally do their own housework, but many of only average wealth have servants and nursemaids to do the little labor of the average home, and tend the few children. Thus, except for the nominal functions of "overseeing the house," modern married women are practically an idle and parasitic class.

But parallel with this usurpation by men of all those occupations once believed to be exclusively women's, has been a branching out of a few women (usually unmarried) into those trades and professions so long appropriated by men. Completely rounded human life has not yet been attained, although it is more nearly approximated by men than by women, because the former have attended to both the problems of *personal life*, and the *vocation*, and usually solve them contemporaneously. They are husbands and 52 fathers, co-operators in home-making, and also bread-winners, giving to society the equivalent of what they take from it. Men do not carry out sex-functions as a profession, as women always have been required to do, but consider them as incidental. To all of their other duties, men have added those of citizenship. It is not surprising that these are not always performed with conscientiousness and brilliancy!

Specialization is carried to such an extent in the modern industries, that hundreds of choice foods are prepared in factories, and even fine cakes and salads, and cooked meats are sold in groceries, so that the problem of housekeeping is marvelously simplified. The crowded condition of cities, and the desirability of being located centrally have established the Apartment House, which is co-operatively heated and lighted, provided with janitor service, its provisions delivered, and its garbage carried away, with system and expedition, requiring scarcely a thought from the nominal housekeeper, who does even the ordering by telephone. In many cases, cafés of such excellence that many prefer them

to the ordinary private table, are attached to the apartment house. Thus, modern inventions and improvements by men have made it possible for the modern woman to be utterly idle, whereas men labor more arduously, as the demands of a higher civilization seem to necessitate a larger income.

Observing the phenomenon of the idle woman, many would solve the problem by forcing femininity back into the primitive individual industries, 53 at least, as far as cooking and sewing are concerned; this course would seem about as intelligent as to insist that men who have become specialized as bankers, lawyers, merchants, and editors, should become their own shoemakers, carpenters, and tailors.

Many women are groping for employment when they join every variety of club, feeling that somehow they must do something intellectually profitable; those still more thoughtful welcome any opportunity, and intelligent direction, in the line of civic improvement, such as procuring public playgrounds, public baths, clean streets, properly lighted and ventilated schools, and those numerous sensible measures which are nearest home, and therefor least strenuously opposed as not being woman's work.

Not only is woman apparently freed from the industries, but the size of families is greatly reduced through changing ideals and necessities, so that a very few years of a woman's life are actually set aside for child-bearing and rearing, and with improvements in dress, in regard for hygiene, and an accession of common sense, infant mortality may be lessened, and thus there will be fewer *needless* births. The kindergarten has encroached upon the home until the child of three or four often is given over into the hands of a specialist, while college extends almost to the bridal altar, so that the mother (sigh as she may) has little of the actual care and company of her child.

Thus, do we see in all but the poorest classes, a peculiar condition of living; men working slavishly 54 to maintain a certain standard of luxury, the ideal of most being to attain to the class above them; too weary and busy for intellectual improvement, or civic activity, while their wives in the main are indolent, extravagant, and unproductive,—in their dress, *a walking advertisement of the husband's earning capacity!* Women rapidly are gaining upon men in education, girls predominating in High Schools, because “boys must leave school early and get to work,” and women's literary clubs predominating, because men have no leisure by day, and are too tired in the evening to enjoy anything, much less make any intellectual effort. Yet the women who flock to clubs, who are learning to be valuable members of society, to speak in public far better than most men, to feel the stir of the civic conscience to go forth and do for others, are not productive from the economic standpoint, but are essentially parasitic.

However, the number of dependent women has been reduced with amazing rapidity during half a century—men used to support a large number of relatives, but seldom now support more than wife and children. Generally speaking, widows and spinsters are independent, and many girls now earn their own living, relieve overburdened fathers, and frequently pay board to them. Thus the parasites have been narrowed down to the class of married women, and the spirit of independence has encroached upon even their ranks. There is the old fallacy to be overcome that somehow a woman *earns her board* by living with a man—as if, forsooth marriage were not the voluntary union of two loving souls!—and the still more revolting idea that somehow women must be paid for motherhood, which is termed their *business in life*, as man's is laboring for money! So strong are these ideas ingrafted in the average mind that often it is difficult for wives to share the financial burdens of the family, even when they and the husbands desire it, and there exist no reasons for their being denied employment.\*

---

\* Many cities in this country forbid a married woman teaching in the public schools irrespective of her fitness, leisure, her husband's willingness, or their financial need.

*The only logical step in the present trend of civilization seems to be the industrialization of women. They must enter the arena, well equipped and fairly paid according to their worth, without injustice on the one hand, or sentimentality on the other, if progress is not to be retarded.*

Idleness is not only waste in life, but is the parent of much evil. Women's idleness leads them to grasp any activity to “kill time.” Hence, whist lessons and many useless clubs, consuming days and weeks, incessant fancy work, accompanied by the gossip of an idle mind, and endless Receptions and Teas, which have neither the merit of originality, nor the result of giving pleasure.

Working against constant opposition, women have increased the number of industries open to them, during one century in America, from 7 to 371. They fill acceptably numerous amazing occupations, such as that of pilot, letter-carrier, sheriff, etc., and meritoriously, many political offices, such as city clerk and Commissioner of the Court of Claims; and in some States represent 56 their people in the Senate! It is but puerile for society to follow up each individual woman with detective-suspicion, to see if some family is being neglected. It seldom is; for fidelity and conscientiousness exhibited in one department of life, usually are conspicuous in every one. In any case, a woman is an INDIVIDUAL (not an adjunct) responsible to society, only as a man is, and the assumption of the past is false that men must guard the race, lest it be neglected and perish. There is no reason to doubt that women are at least equally anxious with men that the world be a good one. The problem of the careful reproduction of the species is as much their concern as men's—nay, more, because the burden falls more heavily upon them; and, also, the affairs of city, state, and nation, are their

concern as fast as they become educated into a sense of civic responsibility,—a sense in which *most men* are still deficient.

So strongly has the pseudo sentiment of the past governed modern minds that few people can think clearly upon woman's place in society. Yet, *every step toward justice granted women by men to-day is an example of a higher chivalry than the knights of old ever dreamed of*. Men have believed from the Middle Ages that they were worshipping Motherhood, when they merely worshipped their own agreeable sensations. How were mothers treated who were *not also wives*? Their *maternity* wrought for men them no reverence, no compassion—they were reviled by the very men who were the fathers of their children. Unlegalized motherhood was and is the depth of disgrace.

Men, also, have firmly believed they were reverencing 57 the *Home*, when they really were delighting in good beds and fine cooking. A loftier ideal has come over the spirit of our dreams, however, and we are learning to say, "Home is where the heart is," and are considering that home-making is not synonymous with, or even dependent upon house-keeping, and depends for its success upon husband as well as wife.

This is the Factory epoch. Inventions cause the world to whirl along, busying thousands of people, and a woman sits *looking back upon an active past, toward an idle future*, unless she enters the arena, and finds new occupations. She had but two alternatives: either to be idly supported, or to follow her tasks out into the world! If she follow the former, she will make little progress with empty mind, and will find her dearly-bought education of little value. That men sanction or urge this idleness is no excuse for it. Hereafter, woman (findings old burdens taken from her) *if she is idle*, will occupy much the position of a "mistress," being willingly supported by a man, because she pleases and charms; if she accept this degrading position, she can scarcely complain if he, wearying of her, feels little responsibility as a husband.

To-day one in five women are working, industrially. Most of the others are economically valueless. No one objects to allowing women to take in washing, scrub floors, or work in factories. It is only when they are capable of, and ask for positions of honor and high salary, that a sensation is caused, and they are reminded of their "sphere." A woman physician has a hard struggle; a scrub-woman 58 is paid gladly, and never questioned as to the whereabouts of her children.

It is to be expected that in the transitional period, there will be many mal-adjustments; but from personal observation, one is amazed that there are so few. Women always will tend to *selected* industries. They will find certain physical limitations, yet these will be more than compensated for by their endurance, patience, and tenacity of life.

Trade unions have come to recognize that the danger in woman's competition is not in the *fact* of her labor ( *for every woman wage-earner lightens the burden of some man* ) but in her being underpaid, and thus underbidding men; and so these unions generally demand equal wages for equal work.

We can know nothing of the results of a free social order until the experiment is tried of having all professions, even the highest, open unrestrictedly, to all women, married or single. All that the most advanced ask is a free field and no favors. It is presumed that men have not withheld equal opportunities from women for centuries because they feared competition!

The greatest bar to woman's effective work is its *temporary* character. Too often both the thoroughness of preparation, and the quality of labor are lessened because she believes her profession only a temporary occupation tiding over from school to matrimony. Surely, society would not desire incompetent work, nor would it exact that women remain single; therefore, the only logical solution would be for them to continue their profession in matrimony. If this become the ideal, women naturally could choose those occupations which are adaptable to married life. \*

---

\* Teaching is the best, because the mother's hours conform to the children's; but there are many congenial tasks that may be carried on at home.

A new society in which women shall share the economic burdens pre-supposes a capable domestic class, and this is a possibility, if the position of household laborer is *dignified* and *well-paid* . With a double income, families easily could pay for skilled domestic labor, the product of the manual training schools already turning out excellent cooks and housekeepers. Those women whose tastes and abilities fit them for high grades of labor could as easily turn over their household work to those who enjoy and do well domestic tasks, as men who are naturally in professions turn over their gardening and office work to others; but in both cases, the only method of securing competent help is to pay well, and permit a certain dignity to crude labor.

If women are *not* to be bread-winners, their only hope is to utilize their time in social usefulness. *We have but caught the vision of social service*. Women cannot be accused of being in reforms for emolument (has politicians are) and they can carry housekeeping into the streets, and make political economy indeed the law of the city household. †

---

† Economy, from Greek, means "law of the house-hold."

The ideals of future women must be physical, moral and intellectual perfection. They should regard virtue, not innocence. They must include careful matrimonial selection, conscious motherhood, not blind obedience to cosmic forces. *Women must be strong enough to live without love, if love does not present itself as compatible with the highest social ideals*. They must not consider *negation* the



highest feminine achievement, but feel their responsibility to society, and demand opportunity for fitting themselves for useful citizenship. Whether or not, woman become a member of the productive community, she must have a voice in the choosing of public officials, and must no longer be governed without her consent, or taxed without representation. Whether *demande*d by her, or *thrust upon her*, this must be, if democracy is to prevail. Intellectuality among men is decreasing, among women, increasing. Already, it is the condition in the average family that the wife attends lectures, concerts, clubs, reads magazines and books, while the husband is chained to business interests. The final outcome of this constant separating of intellectual activities is alarming to contemplate. For the men's sake, that they may have leisure for culture, as well as for the women's, that they may develop civic responsibility, men's economic burdens should be lightened. Once women bore more than their share of life's activities; now they do not bear enough. When there shall be a re-adjustment of financial labor, as well as co-operation in civic work, then and only then shall we have a united man and woman, and such quality of offspring as the world has never known.

61

## VI. THE NEW DOMESTICITY.

In early civilization, so entirely was the very existence of society dependent upon the rearing of many children that the "home" meant solely the structure built by the man, wherein his mate might be sheltered during those years given up exclusively to child-bearing, and the necessary domestic drudgery involved.

As infant impressions have a peculiar tenacity, and as human beings tend to view the past through memory's rosy mist, obliterating unpleasant experiences, sorrows, and bitterness; causing to glow forth happy moments, and crises of delight,—so we come to shroud *home* —the home of our childhood—with an unearthly bliss. "*I remember, I remember, the house where I was born, The little window where the sun come peeping in at morn,*" sings the poet; yet should he return to that primitive cabin, after having sojourned in the 62 world, he undoubtedly would experience a decided pang, made up of varied psychological experiences, and certainly he never would be content to settle again in the village of the old-time habitation: this not necessarily to this discredit. Virtue does not always consist in preferring primitive conditions, and it is not always a worthy motive which imputes to one's own home, attractions possessed by not other dwelling, as does Burns: "*I hae been east, I hae been west, But my ain hame is best!*"

It is not the actual house or system of housekeeping, but the *associations* that endear the home, which gives rise to the fierce defence of it. Our sentiments and personal experiences crystallize into an actual deification of the house in which they took place. Now, if it can be proved that these

associations (like the household gods of ancient peoples) may be carried about with us, without detriment to the individual or to society, we may safely loosen our vise-like grip upon some of the conservative forces that go to make up the home.

One of the most vital of popular savings is the truism, "Home is where the heart is." How much more subtle and analytic is this than the couplet of Burns referred to. The Scotch poet suggests creature comforts: a blazing fireplace, an arm-chair, a pipe, a mug of ale, perhaps; but the other phrase gives glimpses of that all-perfect love which laughs at distance, is indifferent to physical luxury, and follows the adored one even to 63 the gallows. *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* had lived in many places; with her family, with the wealthy and vicious Alec; but her only HOME was the forest, in which she wandered the last fatal week before she was executed, with her husband, Angel Clare, both realizing too late the perfection of an exalted love. Home should be indeed an ethical and spiritual condition as well as practical place. Alas, it is merely a house to most of us! Yet many a palace has been occupied by those who were homeless; and hovels also often contain no conception of homeness.

The individual house, owned by one man for the occupation of his immediate family, has up to the present time been considered the ideal of domestic existence. In this, woman has occupied the position of cook, washerwoman, cleaner, seamstress, gardener and nurse, with no salary except board and lodging, and such clothes and pin-money as the wage-earner saw fit to furnish. In the wealthy household, the woman has relegated all duties except that of supervision to hired servants, and devoted herself to society interests, supposed to redound to the husband's credit. With both poor and rich, woman has been a parasite, being non-productive, yet a consumer. She is dependent upon a man financially,—thus, forced to cater to him, and attract him through his passions, in order to exist at all. This condition has bred many evils, and been conducive to much "legal prostitution," surely not too harsh a name for many marriages. Women, uneducated for self-support, observing the perils of poverty, the struggling of a woman and numerous children 64 to live upon the small salary of the average man,—naturally bethought themselves that if their lot were *to be supported*, their shrewdness should choose for them a man who could *support them well!* This crude cynicism is expressed unconsciously by hundreds of "society girls," and in the popular phrase that "a married woman is sure to be disillusioned; therefore, it is better to see one's ideals fade, when in a coach and four, than in an omnibus." The premium thus has been put upon the *richest* man; as in savage tribes, it is put upon the *strongest* man; whereas, clearly, it should be upon the *best* man! If women would so choose, each generation of children would be better born, and rise higher than the preceding one. Without discussing the economic dependence of women, treated in another essay,<sup>\*</sup> and so marvelously expounded by a noted author,<sup>†</sup> we may quote a few facts.

---

\* "Woman's Place in the World's Work."

---

† “Woman and Economics.”—Charlotte Perkins Stetson.

*As woman becomes independent financially, she becomes relieved of the necessity of marrying; and thus unites with man voluntarily, cheerfully, with eyes open, from pure love.* The evils of her past dependent position were somewhat mitigated by her unconsciousness of them, or by her acceptance of them, as necessary, and as “God-appointed duty.” Thus, while many conditions of marriage were galling to some women, they were accepted by many, as duties, or calamities from which there was no redress.

It remained for this age (incomplete, and semi-civilized 65 as it still is) to postulate the startling decree, that *woman owns her own person*. In all the centuries since the dawn of legal marriage, public opinion shouted disapprobation upon the man that assaulted a young girl's virtue; but the husband, once he captured a maiden, by force, threats, or persuasion, was regarded as her owner, and she his property to command at will, irrespective of her health or inclination. Modern America has developed a type of man that cries shame to this theory, and even among those most conservative regarding women's right to education and independence, there is an inkling of that finer feeling which permits a wife the control of her body, and some voice as to the size of her family.

Thus, imperceptibly, there have crept into the ideals of modern people, a few elements of the new domesticity. Surely, even taking the lowest form of the average marriage, there is more satisfaction to the modern man in being the recipient of affection than in being a tyrant, as in the past. In financial matters, the “allowance” once opposed so bitterly, is now usually conceded. Thus, women learn a measure of business management, and do not have the servile duty of accounting for every cent. In many enlightened households, the wife manages all of the money, the husband being busy making it! It would seem that this should be regulated by individual ability to “make a dollar last,” rather than by any arbitrary decision.

The old idea that the actual *house* constitutes the happy home, retains a tenacious grasp upon our conservative minds. Yet among thousands 66 there is a groping after a more satisfactory and expeditious mode of living than the ordinary manner of housekeeping. The home is our little “ark of the covenant,” which we sentimentally carry always with us. Even if we enjoy hotel life, are passionately fond of travel, somehow that imaginary housekeeping comes up for extolling. As a matter of fact, the well-ordered home is the exception, and in many even of the seemingly satisfactory homes, the woman sighs that her “worries overbalance her comfort and enjoyment.” The servant problem is well-nigh insoluble, and must be remedied if ever, in a democracy, by elevating the work to the rank of a well-thought of and highly paid profession. The condition of private houses in general, is that of factories at their inception; chaotic, unorganized. Our homes are unsystemized because of the *diversity of work*, required in *each petty domain*, and the *lack of*

*skilled labor*, and of *capital*. Each home requires as much expense for heating and lighting for two as for ten. Yet if ten were co-operating in sharing the expenses, the saving would be a considerable item. A maid is sought who can combine the art of cooking with the strength for heavy cleaning; the taste for attractive personal services, and the moral qualities absolutely essential. This combination of abilities and virtues is sought in the ignorant girl who is willing to give all of her time and labor for two or three dollars a week, and be called *servant*. In reality, artificial selection has weeded out the clever, the tasteful, the able, for "higher professions," leaving those who can do nothing else, for the occupation most poorly paid, and having unlimited hours' work. The extreme expense of maintaining housekeeping along lines at all comfortable, combined with the desire to be in the center of cities, and growing distaste of women for the position of unclassified, underpaid general toiler, has induced thousands of couples to compromise on boarding or light housekeeping, both of which are beset with evils, but lighten expense and labor, and enable women to assist their husbands in many ways, and to do their share in the philanthropic and civic work, which requires so many devoted toilers.

Public opinion still frowns upon those who board, as essentially indolent, selfish, and prone to shirk. Yet, the immense amount of leisure gained, might be and often is, utilized to the lasting benefit of society. Sociologists are beginning to discuss "the selfishness of the home," in that it appeals to the weary man in the evening, offering creature comforts, and tempts him to neglect civic and political duties; also, in that the home calls for so much thought and expenditure, that none is given to the needs of society,— *the greater is absorbed in the lesser*.

Some who love license always creep into the paths opened up by freedom. Thus, a few women, who gladly abandoned domestic drudgery, but have not the wit and ambition to assume public obligations, bring down condemnation upon all who board. The "boarding-house gossip" certainly exists, but probably is no more obnoxious than the *back fence gossip*, who views the world from her limited domain; but the former is more in evidence.

68

The housekeeper and the home-maker are two distinctive functionaries, who may or may not be synonymous. The woman who has a suite of tasteful rooms, with bath, and every luxury except the dining-room and kitchen, may present an atmosphere of neatness, and charm, of books and flowers, and fragrant hospitality to husband and guests more truly "home-like" than can the overworked housekeeper, warm and tired from actual preparation of meals.

Not that boarding is the final solution of the problem. It merely is a step toward socializing the domesticity, by furnishing one buyer of provisions at wholesale rates, for twenty or more consumers; one skilled cook (at high salary) to save the expense of twenty worthless ones; several neat

chambermaids, for twenty slipshod maids-of-all-work; one plumber, electrician, etc., for twenty called in at great individual expense. That boarding places are crude, if cheap, or expensive if elegant, merely shows that they are in an elementary stage, and not yet perfected.

*Co-operative housekeeping* offers a rational solution which should be given a fair trial. Either pretty, individual, modern homes, or apartments, with a *dining-room in common*; or individual dining-rooms, where meals are brought by the *common competent cook*, thus abolishing numerous kitchens, poor cooks, and individual management, might be systemized as are vast business enterprises, and made to “pay” (in the sense of reducing expenses for individual families) and to be at least as satisfying to individuals as the present 69 loosely organized housekeeping. All these are practical problems of the new domesticity.\*

---

\* **Co-operative housekeeping has been experimented in, fitfully, for many years; but is now being worked out in many cities of Europe and America. Conditions never before were so propitious.**

One conspicuous feature of modern marriage is the frequency of the phenomenon of women wage-earners. In New York City, 20,000 women support husbands and families. Teachers, stenographers, and numerous workers, although sometimes bending under the burden of the present economic system, as do men, usually find that *art is woman's joy in her work* (to paraphrase William Morris), and that no emotional or social pleasure is greater than the satisfaction of classified labor, and the stimulation of financial independence. We may deprecate, we may utter tirades against the new *régime*, but if we study tendencies, and simply observe, we will see a deep-rooted happiness between husband and wife (under normal conditions) who labor side by side (as at an editor's desk) or each at his own vacation, and have the precious evenings of recreation, and Sundays of rest, enjoying the healthy stimulus of equality.

The “new man” is not ashamed of nor apologetic for his wife, nor does he glory in her ignorant helplessness, as did David in Dora's. He takes a genuine pride in the talents and business ability of the woman who showed her good judgment in selecting him! She is more than a “*help-mate*”; she was not created solely to *assist him*, 70 but together, they exemplify reciprocity and co-operation.

Men have found their strenuous life vastly beneficial to themselves, as well as necessary to the development of the world. Women have been regarded as indirect agents. They have even been denied communication with Deity! Milton coolly remarks that man looks to God, and woman finds her God in man! The most agreeable masculine atom of humanity would scarcely satisfy the spiritual cravings of an intelligent woman, much less the specimens of husbands extant in the time of Milton!

Men and women meet in social and business relationship, but it is in the life partnerships (beginning now to be real partnerships for the first time) that each realizes the full glory of being and doing,

sure of sympathy and appreciation. Congeniality of tastes can exist only when both people have *tastes!* To be *two in unity*, is better than to be *one!* Women in the past who were clothed and fed, but forbidden education, could not develop discrimination and taste. The modern man does not regard woman merely as the possible mother of his sons, nor does the woman look upon man as the provider of an "establishment."

The new domesticity in its completeness will be a safeguard to the home. With its relation of mutual independence and voluntary affection it does not breed jealousy, which is the product of inordinate exclusiveness, distrust and desire for possession. The man who kept a harem, bought for his gratification, or a wife, procured <sup>71</sup> by wealth for the same reason, was maddened at the thought of any one's beholding his property, *for he could conceive of no sensation in man, save the desire for possession.* The modern man appreciates his wife no less because he trusts her, and he also trusts other men, assuming that there is variety in taste, and also believing in virtue.

Marriage is said to be the artistic adjustment of two personalities. Each new union is a complicated problem. No fixed rules can govern the household economics, the financial dependence of one upon another, the size of the family, the spirituality of the relation, or the strength of the bond.

Home is indeed where the heart is. The vitality of the relation of members of a family, and its value to society, is determined by no stereotyped kitchen- or laundry-domesticity, but by the adjustment of the personalities to each other, and to the whole race. Love is not, as novel writers would lead one to suppose, confined exclusively to the attraction of the sexes, but should include all humanity. While experiencing, as we do, that deepest, closest home-feeling, which nature gives to birds and mankind, we cannot but feel that the home does not suffer from a broad affection for humanity, but rather profits by it.

The new domesticity then includes marriage, not for convenience, not the sexuo-economics kind, but an independent choosing of soul by soul, involving complicated relationships; the union of two who may have come from afar, looked into each other's eyes and loved. Such a union is not to be entered into hastily or unadvisedly, yet <sup>72</sup> is capable of possibilities so beautiful that they can be but faintly imagined by the unwed, and never could be comprehended by participants of the old-time union based on tyranny of man, and subjugation of woman, harmful, alike to both, and disastrous to the offspring.

73

## VII. THE FIRST CAUSE OF DIVORCE. \*

---

\* Published in "The Arena," September, 1904.

*"I cannot dispute the proposition that in the great process of evolution, divorce is an indication of growing independence and self-respect in women—a proclamation that marriage must be the union of self-respecting and mutually respected equals, and that in the ideal home life of the future, that hideous thing, the subjugation of woman, is to be unknown."* — Rev. Frederick Hinckley.

Before bewailing the remarkable increase in the number of divorces in America, following the "laxity" of divorce laws,<sup>†</sup> it behooves the

---

<sup>†</sup> Originally, it was almost impossible for the most mistreated person to obtain legal separation. Now, South Carolina is the only state which refuses divorce. New York is the only one which makes adultery the sole excuse. The list of causes in various states is as follows:

Habitual drunkenness—all except eight states.

Wilful desertion—most states.

Felony—all except three.

Intolerable cruelty—all except five.

Failure of the husband to provide—twenty states.

Fraud and fraudulent contract—nine.

Absence without being heard from—six states.

Ungovernable temper—two.

Outrages and excesses—six.

Indignities rendering life burdensome—six.

Attempt to murder other party—three.

Insanity or idiocy at time of marriage—six.

Insanity lasting ten years—Washington.

Incurable insanity—North Dakota, Florida, and Idaho.

Husband notoriously immoral before marriage, unknown to wife—W. Virginia.

Pregnancy of wife before marriage, unknown to husband—many states.

Fugitive from justice—Virginia.

Gross misbehavior or wickedness—Rhode Island.

Gross neglect of duty—Ohio and Kansas.

Refusal of wife to move into state—Tennessee.

Mental incapacity at time of marriage—Georgia.

Three years with any religious society that believes marriage unlawful—Massachusetts.

Joining any such sect—New Hampshire.

Incompatibility—Utah, Indiana.

Vagrancy of husband—Missouri, Wyoming.

Excesses—Texas.

Where wife uses intolerable cruelty—Pennsylvania.

74 student to investigate the subject in its several phases.

First:—Can it possibly be claimed that the ease in obtaining divorces *causes* unhappy marriages? Surely not. People whom married life satisfies, who are congenial, or who even find their union bearable are not affected by the passing of new divorce laws, any more than people who do not desire to travel are impelled to leave home by a new railroad rate. The attempt of legislators to make divorce attainable upon many grounds, is an honest effort to relieve the already wretched, and could scarcely be construed as an invitation to the *happy* to sever their relationship.

## 75

Second:— *Making public* an unhappy union does not *create the evil* —it merely exposes it. Corruption in the human body is more easily treated when it breaks out upon the surface than when it remains in the system. This is equally true of the evils of the domestic or social body. A fact which most conservatives never grasp is that domestic misery has existed from the first marriages. It is a part



of the “growing-pains” of monogamy. As marriage is a delicate adjustment of two lives voluntarily dwelling together, there must be in the very nature of the new adjustment, *a possible failure*. It is usually conceded by the initiated that there is no purgatorio in matrimony—it is either paradiso or inferno! With the possibilities of the former, in mind, it is not surprising that so many risk experiencing the latter!

To return to our premise: Divorce does not create, it merely exposes marital infelicity. No historian has ever portrayed the broken hearts and ruined homes of the past, (before divorces were permitted)—surely as pitiful and revolting, as those sensationally reported by our modern yellow journals. Therefore, we assume that the marriages of our forefathers were models of continence and felicity! That this was so, we have every reason to doubt.

While the ideals of womanhood have been changing, they scarcely have exceeded the rapid changes in the ideals of men. The American man of the twentieth century is as much superior to his grandfather in his treatment of women, as his electric lights exceed his grandsire's tallow dip. 76 To him, woman is not a chattel, a plaything, blighted by a primeval curse. She is many things to him: the romantic idol of his boyhood, the loving sharer of his joys and griefs, his jolly comrade, his sentimental ideal, the practical companion of a prosy business, the inspiration of his ambitions, any or all of these, but seldom, the meek subordinate of his ancestor's days.

With all these improved conditions, we naturally expect fewer unhappy combinations in the matrimonial alliances. The writer firmly believes that there *is* less misery. However, as ideals become higher, adjustments in personal relations grow more exacting,—and properly so. The woman who, in the eighteenth century, was thankful that her spouse did not have advantage of the English common law, and beat her with a “*stick no larger than his thumb*,” where she living now, might exact sobriety, good temper, and a divided income! Undoubtedly, many men in the past, strictly adhered to the seventh commandment, yet made their wives so utterly wretched, that these might have welcomed a rival who would have engrossed their husband's attention, and left them some measure of individuality and freedom. Undoubtedly, many others did break the seventh commandment, but their wives were compelled to endure martyrdom, first because they had no redress from the law, and later, because public opinion was so violently opposed to divorce, the *the woman in every case, even when innocent*, became a social outcast; and always, because she was financially dependent upon the man. America was overwhelmed with disgust and horror, 77 when Elizabeth Cady Stanton asked the New York legislature to grant women divorce for habitual drunkenness, in 1852.

The writer once knew a “happy, old-fashioned family.” The man was a prominent judge, “of excellent habits.” They had eleven children, out of which seven died early, and one “went to the bad.” The woman had married at fifteen. A year after her marriage, she went to her father, and begged him

on her knee to receive her at home, promising to do the work of a servant. Shocked and severe, he sent her back to the husband she had promised to obey. *After this*, she had eleven children by the man whom she dreaded and despised. People considered their home a typical happy household, and a separation would have caused a sensation, and been regarded as a family disgrace, yet no one in their day would have given any thoughts to the social crime of propagating that family, or had compassion for the *woman's daily crucifixion*.

We are not to suppose, then, that the past was redolent of sweet unions, because most people lived together until death cut the gordian knot of the marriage tie.

The past was not pure, but women were trained to endure. The prevalence of divorce is but a frank acknowledgement of an age-long malady. It has been stated in print that Washington, the father of his country, met his death when going to keep an assignation with a woman. One of our more recent but highly respected presidents was just to be sued for divorce when he was nominated, and only his party's entreaties to his wife, 78 not to ruin the campaign silenced her. Many of the public characters, statesmen and warriors, who are held up as idols for rising generations to worship, could not bear the searchlight of a more exacting age. They do not come down in history as conspicuous for immorality, because of lower standards for men in former epochs, and because there were no divorce in their time, to show forth the wrongs of the women.

*Men have made codes, creeds, and customs.* The woman's side the law has yet to be expressed. In the state where full woman suffrage has prevailed for thirty years, there are more marriages, and fewer divorces than in any state in the country! \*

---

\* Wyoming.

Divorce has many assigned causes. The final reason is usually known, (unless covered by the cloak of "incompatibility"). The *first cause*, however, of all marital misfortune, is the primal mistake in selection. If laws could regulate marriage, instead of divorce; if a beneficent social control could supervise the first step, many of the intermediate sorrows, and the final tragedy or scandal, of the last step might be avoided.

It is safe to assert that ninety-nine marriages out of one hundred are founded upon passion. A number also, upon caprice and chance propinquity. The attraction of sex plays upon susceptible youth. Without judgment or consideration, life-union is rushed into by immature fools, while angels stand abashed.

The record of divorces among college-bred people is almost a blank, for these universally marry 79 with respect and congeniality as a basis. The law practically places no restraint upon uniting

in matrimony, except age limitations, and these merely provide against extreme youth, not against extreme age, or abnormal disparity in the ages of contracting parties. Consanguinity debars from marriage in some states, but the law can be evaded by traveling to others. Some states have enacted laws against persons afflicted with loathsome diseases marrying, but no examination is called for, thus, no provision is made for the enforcement of the law.

Insanity and viciousness are transmitted freely by the inter-marrying of invalids and criminals. One criminal pair in Indiana, the Jukes, produced 1,200 offspring, of whom one-fourth were paupers, and devitalized, three hundred died in infancy, there were seven murderers, fifty prostitutes, sixty habitual thieves, one hundred and thirty general criminals, four hundred wrecks early in life, and many, imbecile and insane. This criminal family, the result of the unbridled passion of one couple, cost the State thousands of dollars. It would have been fortunate, had this primal pair sought a divorce court, early in their career!

The problems here sketched, are presented as a suggestion for twentieth century sociologists, who will grow to consider more earnestly not divorce, and the undeniable tragedies of broken homes, but the canker at the root of all divorces, thoughtless and immoral alliances.

80

### **VIII. THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN PROPAGATION.**

Our first ancestor, the amoeba, or tiny piece of protoplasm, swimming in the green ooze of ocean, had no pains or problems in reproducing itself, and giving the world a new generation. It simply divided in two, and so simple and indiscriminate were its organs and functions, that each of its new selves was provided with a stomach, the first and primal necessity of being.

As man developed, with his manifold desires and requirements, he obeyed nature by taking the line of least resistance. He did not like to resist, and recognized no reason for doing so. In the course of time, the world became densely populated, and only escaped overcrowding, through the agency of frequent battles, famine, and pestilence, which, destroyed millions of adult lives, each of which had been purchased at the sacrifice of much agony in woman, and reared by much toil in both man and woman. Primitive man represented the survival of the fittest,—first, through physical force, then mental, as mind began to assert itself over matter, and the brain of a chief came to exercise an almost hypnotic power, and triumph over the brawn of his underlings.

The need for numerous offspring was great, to insure the safety, the actual existence of the family in time of extended war, or to till the ground and tend the flocks, in time of peace. As civilization

began to shape itself, petty tribes grew into nations, until warring was no longer man against man, family against family, clan against clan, but nation against nation. The need for many individuals still was recognized, not as a conscious sociological necessity, but as the delight of man in woman, his pride in parenthood, and the naïve competition in rearing brave sons. The desirability of numerous warriors was recognized alike by sovereign and subject, and individual and family pride and social control compelled large families. Thus, the woman who bore "her lord" the most sons attained the highest glory; and so much stronger ever is love of approbation and a sense of well-doing in feminine consciousness than physical cowardice, that women gladly, eagerly, repeatedly, went through the valley of the shadow of death that they might "bring forth a man-child."

This was the condition reached in Bible times. The ancient scribes who compiled the Old Testament made the Lord say, "Go forth and multiply," and this, having once become incorporated into what has for centuries been regarded as the very Word of God, compelled obedience even from those who were beginning to doubt the economic necessity for large families. Priests, desiring to strengthen infant religions, called upon superstition to add her command, and incorporated into their creeds the idea that the Lord had an especial blessing for those who produced the most numerous progeny.

The natural result of following in Nature's unthinking paths, or obeying the Church's rigid requirements, was an enormous increase of population, checked only by war and pestilence, the result of man's ignorance of ethics and sanitation. The very crowded condition of certain localities proved an agent of extermination, by breeding plagues, leprosy and fevers, which swept away hundreds, and was deemed a "Judgment of God" for real or fancied evil. It was really the punishment of nature for obeying too zealously her command to reproduce!

As in ancient Israel, Greece and Rome, and early New England, and in all new religions, such as Mormonism, every expedient was tried to increase most rapidly those of the favored tribe, sect or community, so in modern China and in Catholic families large broods of children strengthen numerically and are therefore commanded of parents.

To-day, the times and conditions of modern life are wholly different from those of ancient. Peace and sanitation in the most highly civilized countries are *removing the exterminating influences*. Therefore, if every married couple should produce from eight to fifteen children, as was formerly the custom, new countries would soon become as sadly over-populated as is China, and as the quantity increased, so would the quality diminish. Degradation and distress ever are the concomitants of over-populated communities. Heroes and noted people proverbially have sprung from sparsely populated rural districts.

Fortunately, however, a new individual freedom (often termed individual selfishness), possibly with no thought for the changed conditions, has taken upon itself the solving of the problem of an over-populated world and has refused to rear large families. So strong have been the Churchly mandates, so vital although invisible the bonds of the accumulated insistence of the patriarchal past, that these took many centuries in the breaking. Great temerity was required for the individual man and woman to say, "This is, at least partially, a personal problem." Yet slowly, surely, the truth has asserted itself. As long as the birth-rate exceeds the death-rate in a community, so long may the individual family exempt itself from obligation. If a time comes when a country finds itself really dying (as is the case of France alone in the world), then the problem of its continuance may become a public one; but even then the premium should be placed upon quality rather than quantity.

Modern America does not recognize the necessity for large families. Modern America is said to produce the most charming women, and also the best husbands in the world. Nowhere to-day (unless in England) has the recent experiment of educating women had opportunity to flower. It will require several generations to estimate the real results, but we have had one generation of 84 college-bred mothers, of women and men upon a fairly equal social plane. The son of such parents does not condescendingly explain some subject to "dear, stupid old mater," nor can the daughter relegate the blooming matron to the realm of pots and kettles, while she entertains company.

The modern married couple, whether from love of ease and luxury, from selfishness, from high motives of wishing to bring into existence only those children for whom they can provide bountifully and educate,—from whatsoever motive, do not have more than two or three children, if any. To assume that this condition is due to disinclination upon the part of the woman only is to cast aspersions upon the will of the husband, and it is manifestly absurd to presuppose that the wife rules in every household. The facts, without regard to whether or not we approve them, are that the average couple do not desire a numerous offspring.

An inquiry into the various probable motives of people in abstaining from prolific reproduction may be of value, for that small families are voluntarily small can scarcely be doubted by any one who studies the sudden drop in the birth-rate of this from the last few decades.

*1. The economic struggle of the modern world is beginning to be viewed seriously by a vast number of people, with an effort to ameliorate conditions.*

There is no question in the mind of the sober, industrious citizen that the economic struggle for existence crowds out the over-burdened as well as the incompetent. The problem of living 85 upon a small salary is increased ten-fold if there are ten human beings dependent upon the one salary.

Actual necessities are difficult to procure for more than two or three, upon the salary of the average man, not to speak of the small pleasures and luxuries his habits and training demand; and his very self-respect is lost if he is powerless to provide these for those he loves. Seeing that he alone can do little toward controlling the cruel conditions of industry, he no longer weakly cries out against "the Lord," nor curses his employer, but looks to his own life, and conscientiously decides not to make manifold his poverty and lack of opportunities by increasing the number of consumers when powerless to increase the supply of food and clothing. Often, if the wife of the poor man is not burdened by numerous small children and the numerous ills of child-bearing, she too can earn a salary, and thus the combined income will lighten their distress. This course of reasoning, more or less imperfectly formulated, is found with increasing frequency among the better class of people of small incomes. If it were considered oftener, many worthy and congenial young people might marry who now live in loneliness because they know that they dare not bringing up a family upon the salary of the man.

Even the young professional man, whose salary does not preclude a few small luxuries, finds that he has so many obligations attendant upon his position that his actual living income is not much better than that of the "day laborer." He and his congenial young wife wish to save a little money for travel, for books; they feel the necessity<sup>86</sup> of investing in life insurance and building and loan associations, to insure against calamity, and they dare not and desire not to add voluntarily to their financial burdens, and rob life of its few æsthetic pleasures, by rearing a large family. They know that to do this would bring about illness and drudgery, and *they see no necessity for it*.

2. *The modern woman is regarded as of some use besides that of reproducing the species.* With the industries taken out of the home, and with opportunities for education and activity, woman has been able to develop many latent energies and tastes. She sees beyond her home and church. This does not imply that she is any less important in either of these. As "love divided doubles," so energies and functions exercised in many directions, increase many times. Only the woman with a poor sense of proportion and discrimination plunges into public work, civic or philanthropic, at the expense of duties near at hand. Man's very assumption of the support of the family should make him welcome relief from many civic duties, such as those relating to schools and charities, when he becomes convinced that women are intelligent and willing. The orphans, cripples, paupers, criminals, all the dependent and defective classes, are a dead weight upon society, and should be the especial study and care of women who have not assumed the gaining of a livelihood, and are no longer weighted down by the extensive cares of domesticity.

Both men and women are groping for these new sociological phenomena, and the very belief which intelligent men hold that woman is worth<sup>87</sup> something as an individual, and should share the

peculiar burdens of civilization, and woman's feeling that for countless ages she has wanted to do these things, develop a sense in both man and woman that all virtue does not consist in the thoughtless begetting of numerous offspring.

3. *Modern people do not want the responsibility of rearing large families.* There is every reason to believe that many people wealthy enough not to be governed by the first cause, and indifferent to the second, do not have large families for the simple reason that they do not want them; and who shall say that even these, although the least noble in their motives, have not a right to their own solution of domesticity? Who shall say that any couple, old or young, rich or poor, intellectual or insipid, philanthropic or indifferent, shall not enjoy congenial companionship, romantic love, quiet domesticity, or co-labor in professions or business (if they have satisfied society by marrying), without being forced to rear unwelcome offspring for a world already over-stocked, and unable, under present economic conditions, to supply food for all its inhabitants?

Besides these sociological reasons, there are many personal ones. Individuals with insanity or consumption in their blood, people who do not feel competent physically or morally to bring up future citizens, are becoming more conscientious, although society still censures non-production rather than encourages it. How much better were social control to legislate against the perpetuation of the insane, the diseased, the indigent and the criminal, than to insist indiscriminately on the divinely appointed virtue of parenthood! This same public opinion has slurred over the agonies of child-bearing; it has trained both men and women to speak optimistically, even flippantly, of birth. Observe the rooster mount the gatepost, crow vociferously to attract the attention of the neighborhood because the *hen* has laid an egg! Observe the average father emerge from the darkened room of her who has suffered torture equal to that of any soldier in battle (without the stimulus of glory and excitement) and stroll down town to be congratulated and toasted by his jolly male companions as *his achievement!*

*There is no greater evidence of civilization than the reduction of the number of progeny,* which implies an intelligent control of passion, and a tender regard by men for the many rights their wives should enjoy besides that of motherhood. It is believed by some that intelligent men and women live upon a more *spiritual* plane than in the past; however this is, their lives seem to be well-ordered, according to their best belief and intention.

Undoubtedly, the effect upon women of the cessation of perpetual maternity is most beneficial. They are freer than formerly from the condition of being "over-sexed," as a recent writer luminously puts it. Their whole life is not absorbed in endless physical details. They find sweetness and light in

the sunshine outside the home to take to their children, as well as finding joy and inspiration in the little souls to carry forth and give to the world.

Perhaps more important than all else is the 89 benefit accruing to children from their scarcity. He who is born into a family of ten is fed and sheltered and clothed until he is able, poorly equipped, to earn his own bread. He receives a rudimentary education, and goes forth at fifteen to enter the maelstrom, his recollections of home being a confused babel of sound, of quarrelsome young ones, of weary, irritable, or martyrlly patient mother, and glum, over-burdened father. But he who is born into a less populous home, may enjoy peace, quietude, careful education, a "start in business," and an intelligent espionage until he has passed the dangerous years of dawning manhood. We cannot accurately estimate the subtle differences between the welcome, beloved child, and him who is born into an already over-crowded family, whose advent is unwelcome, who is the cause of bitterness because he is "one more," a source of friction between parents. The most terrible picture in literature is the suicide and murder of his little brothers (Hardy's novel, *Jude, the Obscure*), of that monstrosity eight years old, who realizing the hopeless poverty of his parents, and the children's unwelcomeness, left the note: *Dun because we were tu meny!*"

The conservatives who cling to the past because it is past cry out against the modern woman because she is not prolific. Rather should she be blessed because she strives for an enlightened motherhood, studies kindergarten methods, is almost super-conscientious, realizing the awful responsibility of directing a helpless human soul—and refuses to incur that obligation unless she loves a husband who is virtuous, has health and 90 fair income and feels that its coming will be a blessing.

Perhaps the first person to view the problem of reproduction as a serious social problem, and the existing unchecked prolificacy as a menace to human welfare was Malthus, an English professor of the eighteenth century. He startled the world by proclaiming that food productivity increases arithmetically; consumers of food, geometrically; so that unless the rate of increase of population be rationally checked, the population would increased to the point of pauperism for the majority. Malthus was inspired by the historian Hume's essay upon the populousness of ancient nations. Hume showed that the absence of census-taking, and the inexactness of early peoples led to gross exaggerations that have come down in myth and tradition, of vats numbers in tribes and armies; for, by calculation, *the numbers stated to have existed could not have lived upon the possible food supply of the areas of land known to these people*. It having been proved that the multitudes described by ancient writers were exaggerate, Malthus realized that the numbers of human beings are increasing with the centuries, and the exterminating influences of war and pestilence, decreasing with the progress of civilization, therefore, he deducted the fact that unless the so-called *artificial* methods



of self-control and reason were applied to the propagation of the human species, over-population and starvation must ensue. He scientifically worked out the problem of the ratio of consumers to the productive possibilities for future consumption, and drew the obvious conclusion 91 that, as we cannot very materially alter the amount of productivity of land, we must lessen the needless productivity of human beings!

Although man raised a fierce cry against this deduction, because it was an innovation, because it seemed to criticize theology, and because it involved a curtailing of his supposedly unassailable right to unlimited sexual indulgence, time is proving its correctness, and modern America (for one reason or another) is acting upon it and checking prolificacy.

Scientists now claim *that the fewer children that are born, the lower the ratio of infant mortality, and the better the quality of children.* That is, the woman who gives birth to but a few, with sufficient time between births to recover robust health, naturally gives each infant a finer constitution. If fewer infants die, nature's end are served as well as if a larger number are born, in rapid succession, out of which many are sickly and perish; and what anguish of birth- and death-pangs are spared the mother in the former case! It is a humiliating commentary upon our human wisdom and ability, that scientists have declared that an average of four children must be born to every family; two to continue the species, and two to die!

The large family is a thing of the past, as is the supreme authority of the monarch and the church over the conduct of the individual. Hand in hand with the subjection of woman has been the exaggeration of sex, both the result of the selfishness of man, which emphasized the physical 92 delights and neglected the mental and spiritual. This is the reason that the civilization of an age or a country can be accurately gauged by the position of the women—this being determined by the height of self-control attained by the men. Today the poor (improvident) and illiterate are the ones who are reproducing themselves most prolifically. The problem of propagation is being solved by the thinking few, by a process of elimination.

The real solution is not (as some believe) for society to encourage the wealthy and intellectual and moral to “race” with the foreign and vulgar in the over-stocking of the market, but it is the training of the illiterate and low-born (possibly the compulsion of the diseased and criminal) to cease from undesirable reproduction! \*

---

\* See the history of the remarkable Juke family of criminals, page 79.

Lecky, in his *History of European Morals*, nearly thirty years ago declared (and this furnishes an effective reply to President Roosevelt's sensational accusations of “Race Suicide”): “Belief that rapid

increase in population is always eminently beneficial, which was long accepted as an axiom by statesmen and moralists, has now been replaced by exactly the opposite doctrine, that the very highest interest of society is *not to stimulate, but to restrain multiplication*, diminishing the number of children.

Were this problem seriously attacked, as a branch of public prevention of crime, and recognized as a first cause, the number of the parasitic 93 and the predatory could be reduced so rapidly that the conditions of the second generation would suggest a veritable Utopia or Millennium, a social dream come true!

94

## IX. THE FUTURE OF THE WOMAN'S CLUB. \*

---

\* Published first in "The Arena," April, 1902.

The amazing fact is that women's clubs ever came into being! Civilization awaits the first daring path-breaker, and those who follow in the beaten road marvel that it took so long for the first dauntless one to mark it out.

That woman—the weak, the despised, the priest-ridden, believed to be the original sinner, the ruin of the human race, an unclean thing, a beast of burden, unworthy of education, forbidden the perusal of the scriptures, veiled in a harem, burned on her husband's funeral pyre, considered cursed in giving birth to mankind (or, in mediæval times, respected for maternity, yet still man's inferior, his chattel, his toy), at best and least, esteemed solely for motherhood—that this being should timidly venture forth into the arena of intellectual and civil life, gently wrest from man, one by one, his pre-empted prerogatives, and persuasively, serenely assume "his" education and professions, this is the marvel of the ages!

A century ago, a "liberal" education was by no means "the birthright of every America citizen." 95 In the early days, of even our new country, girls picked up crumbs of learning upon half-holidays when the schoolroom was not needed by their brothers, or not at all. Fifty years ago, women's colleges were practically unknown; thirty years ago, co-education was a venture; scarce half a century ago, the first faltering woman's organization of modern times was born.

The school is mother to the club, as the college is to University Extension. Those fortunate enough to be educated wish to keep their intellectual activities in practice, and those not so situated desire a post-youthful education. The first women's clubs were timid affectations. They were but a step removed from afternoon teas, yet in that step lay all the embryonic genius of feminine organization.

The first club, then, was an extended tea-party; the twentieth century club is an organic factor in social life, federated for the progress of the world. The first "lady speaker" was a frightened apology; the modern woman is an orator and a parliamentarian.

The first woman's literary society on record in America was founded by that noble pioneer, Lucinda Stone, at Kalamazoo, Mich. in 1852. A Philadelphia society, the New England Woman's Club, and Sorosis of New York followed in 1868; the last two being the first famous ones. Mrs. Stone, the mother of clubs, lived to see their marvelous progeny, for they have multiplied like the fish of the sea, until to-day, they encompass the earth, and perhaps are too numerous to accomplish the highest degree of effectiveness.

The growth of America's clubs since 1852 has 96 been phenomenal. Every village has its attempt at a club, more or less imposing, while every city swarms with societies, in which the same women are apt to duplicate and reduplicate their membership. The National Federation has nearly 4,000 clubs, including a membership of 220,000, and of course but portion of existing clubs are federated. Besides the federation of literary clubs, there is the National Council of Women, the broadest conception thus far embodied, as its scope is nothing less than the union of all National bodies of women, of which there are in this country about *one hundred*. Already the National Council comprises twenty-four organizations, each of which is National (such as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union) of which the Federation of 4,000 clubs, should it join, would be but one! The Council of the United States numbers over 1,000,000 women. There are now twenty-three countries that have National Councils of Women modeled upon our own (Great Britain, France, Italy, Sweden, etc.) and all of these, in 1898, at the instigation of an American woman, united to form an *International* Council of Women, which is larger and more comprehensive in its scope than any body of men, with *diversified* interests, in the world. Its president, Mrs. May Wright Sewall, a brilliant educator and one of the finest organizers and parliamentarians in this country, ranks among the great feminine powers of the world. The International Council now represents seven or eight million women. It has just convened in Berlin (1904), being the most magnificent body of women ever assembled.

## 97

This brief summary of federations of vast women's organizations is necessary to give some idea of the numerical greatness of the organized efforts of women. The scope of these is as extensive as the needs of humanity are numerous. Only the uninformed or indiscriminating praise or blame women's clubs as if of one class, devoted to the pursuit of a single object or branch of knowledge. The aims of modern clubs are far greater than at first would seem possible, considering that women are also active in domestic life, church work, and dozens of philanthropies, besides one-fifth of them being bread-winners. Besides the hundreds of philanthropies absorbing women's exclusive

attention, are numerous organizations in which they co-operate with men. The subject of this study concerns the work of women's clubs only.

Besides every possible variety of literary club, from Shakespeare to the faddists, there are art and music clubs, ethical societies, kindergarten associations and Mothers' Congresses and historical institutions (Daughters of the Revolution, Colonial Dames, Daughters of the Confederacy); there are women's village improvement societies, and associations of Collegiate Alumnæ. Then there are the infinite philanthropic enterprises, whose missions are as varied as are the needs of the submerged classes. There are study Clubs in Parliamentary Law, in economic and social conditions, in penology, charities and corrections. Also, in industrial conditions, home and foreign missionary work, in connection with every religious denomination. There are secret lodges and 98 fraternities, insurance corporations, (such as the wealthy Ladies of the Maccabees), temperance and social purity unions; likewise a great Woman's Relief Corps for the G. A. R., a Universal Peace Society, a national body of Jewish women, and of colored women, a federation of American business women, a national association of nurses, and many political organizations.

The comprehensiveness of each of these is vaster than can be described in a superficial review. Some of the philanthropic clubs furnish the basis of the life-work of many individuals. Every large well-organized club in these days has its *departments* of finance, of education, of literature, reforms, civics, arts and sciences; also, its *committees* to investigate State institutions, industrial conditions, and laws concerning women and children. Although, speaking generally, women are financially dependent, the great Woman's Club of Chicago raised \$200,000 for girl's dormitories at Chicago University. Here and there, clubs concentrate their efforts upon practical humane measures—such as having police matrons placed in jails where women and children are confined, women physicians in insane asylums, and women placed upon school boards and library committees—and render many other similar valuable services to the unfortunates of their sex. The scope, then, is extensive and varied.

One sometimes speculates as to the result of the psychological action of the club upon the individual woman, in the past and the future. We have only to review what the *club idea* has done for women, in order to foretell its infinite possibilities. 99 It has made them more democratic—less narrow and exclusive. It has heightened their plane of thinking; it has taught them habits of concentrated study; it has multiplies their available topics of conservation and eliminated the constant personal note therefrom; it has lifted them bodily from the pettiness and restraint of domestic drudgery. No one can question the benefit to the home and to society of broadening and deepening the life and experiences of the “home maker.” Women, through club work, are learning the value of

coöperation, the sacredness of friendship, the necessity for tolerance and charity, of magnanimity and considerateness. The club develops and harmonious, a well-rounded individual.

Having traced the *development*, *scope* and *benefit* of the clubs of American women, and witnessed their attainments in organization and their achievements along definite and numerous lines of labor, we naturally speculate upon the *destination* of this mighty new current that has swept aside all former conservative estimates of feminine possibilities—enlarging woman's "sphere" until it is co-existent with the globe that limits the activities of mankind—and we venture the prophesy optimistically of the work of women in the twentieth century.

The prophet must be a student of history. With knowledge of the past, he feels the pulse of the present and predicts the future. He knows he will be crucified for suggesting innovations that we, in our blind clinging to traditions, fight 100 against, yet are sure most come. But it is not given to all to prophesy truly. Most of us lack sufficient imagination to conceive the wonderful possibilities that cause each age to exceed the wildest dreams of the preceding one. Who, in 1852, could have foretold that the little band of "ladies" in Kalamazoo would be the nucleus of national and international organizations of women, whose ideals would permeate the whole civilized world and whose scope would include all human and social activities? What has any other class of people accomplished during the last half century that can compare with the rapid advancement of women?

There are those who suggest reaction—who believe that the woman's club has fulfilled its mission and accomplished its work. To a certain extent this reactionary movement is wholesome. We are club-ridden to-day; we are sociomaniacs. Women especially scatter and diffuse themselves with the tendency to be superficial. There are large numbers of us for whom a "little knowledge" has proved a "dangerous thing"; yet surely a little is better than *no* knowledge, and we must correct the fault by finding our "Pierian spring" and "drinking deep!" As Lowell said, "the cure for too much freedom is—more freedom!"

We have seen that women's clubs no longer are merely literary; Emerson, Ruskin, Browning gave them inspiration in their formative periods, but now they must act upon the divine impulses, and work out the race-salvation, for nothing is accomplished by generating emotion unless it expresses itself in action.

## 101

The future woman will not need to look to clubs for education; she will enter the arena fully equipped with thorough education, and her post-college cravings will be satisfied by individual study, and the ever-multiplying popular lectures, Chautauqua courses, University Extension, through which she may procure the best the world affords. What need for amateurs, when she will have

ever-increasing opportunities to hear professionals? We have witnessed the rise and fall of private theatricals—we are seeing the substitution of the great musician on the one hand, and the pianola on the other for the once ubiquitous maiden piano-player in every household. The newspaper syndicate with its corps of writers does away with every village contributor to local Sunday papers. Thus, in the future crowded life, the professional lecture, the educated minister, perhaps, may efface the multitudinous writer of club essays of cyclopedic source.

It is true, in sense, that clubs have fulfilled their mission in the peculiar lines formerly followed. But there is still the gigantic problem of a semi-barbarous world crying to be civilized. The poor we have always with us; likewise the criminal (in and *out* of jail). Our morals still spring largely from policy, our religion from superstition. Our social system is a rough compromise, blocked out by our ancestors, who groped for wisdom, and settled upon the highest plane at the time accessible—but one inadequate to our growing needs. Our government is the best yet attempted, but it us even now feeling 102 “the growing-pains of evolution,” and our politics, thus young, is seriously diseased.

Organization is one of the highest achievements of modern life. Organization is effectiveness. It is the secret of success. It made the Catholic Church a world-force; it has given the Standard Oil Company and the Steel Trust their Titanic power. Women now are more or less perfectly organized throughout the world. *Organization implies responsibility*. The machinery is awaiting women; it would be immoral waste to allow it to rust. Through it must be worked out many of the social and industrial problems of the future.

The woman's club will be in the broadest sense a civic club, because civic life in only less vital than home life, which is its foundation. City government is only housekeeping upon a large scale. *Economy*, from the Greek, means “law of the house,” and political economy is the law of the household carried into the community. Women have the training of the ages back of them in domestic economics; what class is better fitted to undertake the problems of our cities?

Of course, women never can work with absolute effectiveness until they are enfranchised. A person can do some things with his hands tied, but is better able to work when free. The eternal feminine has expressed itself through indirect channels long enough. It has been the power behind the throne and ruled nations—by playing upon the passions of one man. But in democratic times and countries we believe in expressing ourselves frankly and honestly, with each individual free to 103 act and to choose for the good of the whole. Women desire no vicarious labor or sacrifices. Political and industrial freedom is but a means to an end— *the perfecting of human society through the individual*; and for this alone do the schools, the churches, and the clubs exist.

The future club will be eminently practical. It will influence legislation and give especial thought to the improvement of industrial and social conditions. This program is broad enough to last a century.

Last but most important, the women's clubs of the future will not be women's clubs, merely, but clubs of *men* and women! The clubs have enabled women to catch up with their husbands in education, but now the women are tending to go beyond them. The statistics of colleges, even of high schools, show a preponderance of girls, which to many seems alarming.

American men are money-mad, and have no time for culture. To a certain extent, the average woman (especially the modern wife, who has no industrial life and whose domestic duties are lighter than ever before in the world) has more time for self-culture and the philanthropies than her husband who is the bread-winner. But men must not fall behind in the art of living because they are struggling for the means of livelihood; and one of the future problems is a new social adjustment that will give more leisure to the over-burdened, and more work to the drones.

*There is no ideal life that does not include both men and women.* While certain lodges and clubs, as certain colleges, may possibly preserve the one-sex limitation (although most of these have provided for women in all manner of "auxiliaries" and annexes, showing a growing need for them), it is safe to predict that most of the future clubs will combine the complementary efforts of both. If there is differentiation in the masculine and the feminine intellect, then surely the man needs the chastening sweetness of the feminine, and woman the strengthening stimulus of the masculine. *As we approach perfection, we come nearer together,* and nothing ever is lost in a constant social and intellectual companionship between men and women. Such conditions make purer men and nobler women, and to do this must be the purpose and ultimate result of the future club.

In the coming years, women's clubs will not be so numerous, but they will be more thoroughly organized. They will concentrate, not diffuse their activities. They will work along the lines of the most progressive ones of to-day; their programs being practical, their efforts, the solving of economic and social problems, the improving of legislation, and the systemizing of philanthropies. They will be perfectly federated, realizing that the most efficient results are attained through organization, and concentration. And they will combine the ideals and labors of both men and all women, working together for the betterment of humanity.

105

## **X. WOMEN IN TRADES AND PROFESSIONS.**

*"Self-support is as much the duty of a woman as of a man. Service dependence in money matters is no longer deemed honorable."* — Phillips Brooks.

The independent, self-supporting business woman is generally accepted to-day as a matter of course, along with new improvements in machinery, which are violently objected to at first by the few men whom they replace, and then, are philosophically accepted, as these men adjust themselves to progress, and fit themselves for other employment.

If women have in some instances supplanted men in certain occupations, it has been because employers found them better adapted to the especial work, and *every self-supporting woman has lifted the burden of her maintenance from some man*; so that things are at least equal, economically. The only danger recognized by labor unions (and all will admit that they guard their own interests jealously), is that women may underbid men, this is fought against by all sensible women also; for, although women can and do live more cheaply than men, they do not desire small salaries, and only accept them because of fearful pressure. It has been the effort of pioneer women for ages to raise the scale of feminine wages, as well as to secure opportunity for proper education, and high standards of workmanship.

The greatest menace to healthy industrial conditions usually is conservatism. Ignorance and sex-prejudice have for centuries handicapped one-half the race, and yet expected progress from the offspring of these untrained and servilely dependent mothers. The Civil War destroyed the flower of American manhood, for war always is *selective*, leaving the least fit, physically and morally to live, stay at home and perpetuate the race,<sup>\*</sup> but it did not take from American *womanhood*, which had to adjust itself to new conditions, unfamiliar tasks and universal bread-winning. This was particularly true of the South, where the executive ability suddenly developed by those soft-voiced "ladies" is a marvel even to-day.

---

\* See David Starr Jordan's "The Blood of the Nation."

Thus widows and wives took upon themselves the task of supporting selves, children, and the male wrecks of battle.

The child that has stood alone, its baby face illumined by joy at the newly discovered power of locomotion, never again is content to creep on all fours; and the woman who has stated the pleasure, self-respect, and power of economic independence never willingly returns to idleness. For several centuries, women were in a state of arrested development, but modern women throughout the world are forging ahead, seeming in their eagerness to be trying to make up for lost



time. Many yet bask on the “sleek social side” of life, but thousands voluntarily are assisting men in shouldering the world's responsibilities and burdens.

While economy is admirable, poverty is lamentable. “An empty purse makes a coward of its owner.” The deacons were shrewd who prayed “Lord, you need not trouble to keep our beloved pastor humble; we will do that by keeping him poor!” There is enough work in the world for all; if properly distributed. If there is *not* enough, the rational solution would seem to be, not to put a fence around one-half humanity (woman-kind) and compel it to stagnate from inactivity, but to readjust economic conditions, or to allow the population to decrease for a century until the supply of labor could catch up with the demand for it! For, every adult should work, and give to society full value for benefits received. Moreover, every one should labor at the *highest and most congenial tasks possible to him* (not, of course, applying merely social tests as to “high” and “low”).

To decide upon one's vocation is of course far more difficult than to labor diligently in a rut when it is found. The problem is even more complicated for women than for men, for several reasons:

- (1) Until recently, the number of vocations permitted them was limited; hence, those few were 108 overcrowded. Also, training was difficult to secure.
- (2) They seldom count upon permanent work, as matrimony has been considered an immediate bar to continuing it, and opportunities for matrimony largely a matter outside their own volition.
- (3) Social ideals are so vital to women, and public opinion so dominating that the number of possible professions is artificially limited by the “ladylike ones,” except for those who must actually work, to eat! Thus, numerous women flock into the over-supplied professions, irrespective of personal aptitude, while other trades offer excellent remuneration, yet are scorned. Until false social standards can be ignored by women, they will find almost insurmountable obstacles in most departments of labor.

Even after the choice has been made, several conditions contribute to the lack of high success for the average woman. They are:

- (1) Lack of initiative.—Hampered by past traditions and heredity, women hesitate to seize opportunities fear to take the initiative, shrink from financial risk. They have been trained to hoard money, to “scrimp and save,” not to spend wisely. They are apt not to advertise enough, not to see the wisdom of spending \$100, in order to earn \$1,000.
- (2) Self-depreciation and undue modesty.—These are not productive of success in business, however they may be lauded by poets. The *apologetic* attitude does not convince the public or one's worth, or

bring patronage. The woman who would succeed must have faith in herself 109 and in her business! Moreover, she must impress this faith upon her would-be customers.

(3) Superficiality and inexactness.—Rapidly women are overcoming these tendencies and learning thoroughness. They realize that if they will prepare a fine quality of goods, whether it be canned fruit or lectures, there will be a market for them.

Efficiency, self-respect, earnestness, and sensible dress, a spirit troubled by no secret longings to propitiate or imitate the “smart set,” will bring success to any woman in any work. Fitful application is impotent to achieve success. *Women are obliged to struggle to overcome the feeling that they were created for luxury and ease.* Ambition and a realization of ability spur them on, yet many hesitate to make sacrifices. They desire to have their cake and also to eat it.

Even the most artistic callings have their business side, and usually, women who have a little talent and much business acumen succeed even in the high arts better than those possessing great talent and no business sense. Many small attributes (often deficient even in men, with their training of centuries) are fundamental for success. Such are punctuality, courtesy, willingness to accommodate, or co-operate, alertness, clear-sightedness, willingness to risk something and sacrifice something. Common sense and morality should be the underlying principles of business. Persons err who undervalue even personal purity in business men. Mrs. Logan once needed money in a strange city. She attempted to cash her husband's check, but could not be identified. At 110 last, she took out a locket and showed a miniature of Logan. The banker at once cashed the check, saying, “John A. Logan never would give his portrait to any woman but his wife!” If virtue as well as honesty is required in the business man, how much more in the business woman, who is *on trial for the future freedom of her sex.* The general principle of feminine liberty is judged (albeit unjustly) by the conduct and success of *individual* women, who are pioneers.

If women have seemed to usurp some of the trades believed to be more appropriate to men, men also have grasped numerous lucrative industries long supposed to be pre-eminently the province of women. (Cooks, bakers, ladies' tailors, trained nurses, etc.) An ideal civilization may sort out people according to exact aptitude, but at present, freedom of choice must be allowed the individual, irrespective of sex.

Pioneer women are pushing their way into nearly all of the three hundred and seventy-one professions now open to them (in America). Yet many offer excellent livelihoods that are not yet thoroughly “worked” by women. Such are those of the photographer, architect, pharmacist (and drug

clerk), fancy sign painter, engraver, piano-tuner. The following very roughly classified facts may serve as a matter of interest and novelty, and also, indirectly furnish suggestions:

*Doctors.* —In America, there are nearly three thousand practicing physicians (women). There are in England, and other countries, house surgeons, head doctors of hospitals, asylums, etc. In Paris, there is a woman medical examiner of 111 girls for the public schools. Several of our women physicians have a national reputation. There also are several hundred women dentists. The first dentist in the Philippines was a woman, Dr. Anna Sawyer. One New England dentist employs six assistants.

*Druggists.* —There are four hundred women pharmacists in the United States. Women are especially adapted to the delicate tasks of weighing drugs. In Manhattan, twenty women own and manage drug stores. The highest rating *ever* given an examination, was awarded Mrs. Marietta Harman, of Syracuse, by the New York State Board of Pharmacists.

*Teachers.* —This occupation is conceded to be the most perfect and “feminine” one existing. Four-fifths of all the teachers in the United States are women; yet in 1845, women were paid four dollars a week, and suffered many injustices. Women now are county and state superintendents, principals, college presidents. Their kindergarten work, service for the blind, etc., is unsurpassed.

*Lawyers.* —Several hundred are practicing in America. They have even pleaded before the Supreme Court, but are still unpopular. Italy, Brussels, Switzerland are struggling for the right of women to practice. Swedish women can, and one is law-lecturer at the University of Upsala. During the Italian Renaissance, several women lectured upon Jurisprudence in the universities. The feminine side of law as yet has had no expression.

*Ministers.* —The Universalists ordained *Rev.* Olympia Brown, in 1863. Now, the Unitarians, 112 Congregationalists, some branches of Methodists, Baptists, etc., but no ritualistic churches, permit women to preach. A few have filled fine pulpits in the worldly sense, have founded *institutional* churches, and done brilliant work. In Grand Rapids, for eight years, a woman was chaplain of the Michigan Soldiers’ Home!

*Lecturers.* —The multiplicity of feminine lecturers is amazing. Stereopticon work upon art, travel-talks, literary addresses, reform speeches, club and parlor classes, Current Events’ instruction and Parliamentary Law drill, all claim cultured women. The University of Chicago, and Cambridge, England, have at least one University Extension lecturer (woman) upon their staff.

*Astronomers.* —Boston, Hamburg, and several other great observatories are in charge of a woman astronomer. The director of the Observatory at Rome is a woman. Many women have discovered

comets, written mathematical treatises, from early Greeks and Egyptians, through a brilliant list in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. France, Germany, Italy, have contributed Caroline Herschel, Maria Mitchell, Mary Somerville (who died at ninety-one, after having given two children, and seventy years' mathematical labor to the world!), Mlle. Klumke, the famous director of the Paris Observatory; Mrs. Maunder, officially connected with Greenwich; Lady Huggins, and others. Our own Harvard has Mary Fleming and a staff of women helpers; Russia contributed many, such as Sophie Kowalewskaya. The University of Stockholm has a woman in the chair 113 of Mathematics, as have many colleges at present and in the past.

*Designers.* —Thousands of women now design carpets, wall papers, silk, book-covers; do illustrating, draughting, etching, etc. In upholstering, Miss Charlotte Robinson of England, decorated the interior of the *Campania*, one of the largest and most elegant steamers on the Cunard line.

*Photographers.* —Women are colorists, finishers, and photographers. The finest colorist of stereopticon slides in the United States, a lady in Chicago, charges five dollars apiece for slides.

Knoxville, Tenn., boasts an excellent woman *sign-painter*.

*Architects.* —In Germany, a girl of twenty-five has been commissioned to build a great hospital. In Manchester, England, women furnish drawings for ships, and do general engineering work. A woman architect planned the Woman's Building at the World's Fair, and Josephine Chapman, Boston, designed the New England States Building at the Pan-American, a Dormitory at Harvard, and several fine churches. Women are needed to plan homes hygienically and with a view to economizing labor for housekeepers.

*Artists.* —From the time of Madame LeBrun, Rosa Bonheur, and Harriet Hosmer, women have been painters and sculptors. Also, there are several famous illustrators to-day. Amalia Küssner, an Indiana girl, does the finest miniature painting in the world, and has painted most of the crowned heads of Europe, receiving \$500 apiece for miniatures. Marie Herndl, of Milwaukee, a 114 student of Munich, has won national fame by her art glass church windows. Goldsmith's craft or art metal work is being studied by girls at Pratt Institute, and is a most congenial and dainty task.

*Journalism.* —This field is overflowed with women. Thousands of reporters, society and general, editors of Woman's Pages, etc., are scattered over the country. *McClure's* has women at the head of its three departments: Magazine, Syndicate, and Book-publishing. In Chicago, a woman gets \$5,000 a year for writing heavy political editorials. Mary L. Booth received as editor of *Harper's Bazar*, \$8,000 yearly. Several New York women, who accomplish original reportorial feats, receive \$100 per week. Managing editors receive \$15,000 a year, and such positions are open to women. Women own and

manage periodicals in many countries,—in this, such as the New Orleans *Picayune*, *The Criterion*, *The Woman's Journal*, *Frank Leslie's*, *The Club Woman*, etc.

*Authors.* —From Sappho, Aphra Behn, Maria Edgeworth, the Brontés, Jane Austen, George Eliot, George Sand, to Harriet Beecher Stowe, Mrs. Humphry Ward and the host of modern novelists, powerful feminine pens have depicted human life. Some of the most heavy and valuable magazine work is being done by such women as Jeannette Gilder and Ida Tarbell, the latter having commanded national attention by her histories of Napoleon, Lincoln, and the Standard Oil Company. Advertisement writing has become an art, and one of the conspicuous successes has been achieved by a girl of sixteen, whose cleverness is rare. It is said that a girl received \$30,000 as a prize for suggesting a famous title to a firm!

*Book Agents.* —Publishers are crying for good book agents, yet so unpleasant are the personal relations often accruing from the profession, that few women have the courage to pursue it. Tact and perseverance bring in excellent emoluments, however. Usually, the agent gets forty per cent., and many make \$2,000 a year.

*Musicians.* —For a long time, the world has recognized no sex in music. The woman music teacher is ubiquitous. Conservatories employ women. In vocal work, grand opera, light opera, concerts, they are highly efficient, and well-paid. There are women managers of opera, advance agents, and inventors of musical kindergartens. Fanny Mendelssohn was a great composer (although denied credit) as are Charminade and others.

*Actresses.* —Since Shakespeare's day, actresses have been recognized as valuable artists, and paid high salaries. No other profession gives more equality of opportunity for the woman of good health, serious ideals, and talent. The character of the actresses of America is of a high class, and the stage is beginning to be recognized as legitimate and valuable.

*Inventors.* —The first patent was taken out by a woman in America in 1808, but thousands of inventions undoubtedly have been patented in the name of male relatives. One American woman has patented a telephone, folding flat-iron, musical fountain, eyeless needle, and surgeon's implements. Although women are less accustomed to machinery, many valuable farm implements have been invented by them. It is claimed that silk weaving was invented by the wife of the fourth Chinese emperor; bronze work, by a Japanese woman; cashmere shawls by women of an East Indian harem, and Venetian point lace by Italian women. Among the first American patents taken by women were those for a fountain pen, a baby jumper, and the first cook-stove. Mrs. Ada van Pelt recently invented a permutation lock, with three thousand combinations. One invented the

Burden process of making horseshoes, which has saved the country \$25,000,000 in fourteen years. Another woman was offered \$20,000 for a paper bag process.

*Government Experts.* —Since President Buchanan, thousands of women have been employed in all of the government offices, and under the present civil service, considerable fairness exists, although in some cases, in Washington, we have reason to suspect that the heads of departments and skilled feminine workers are not paid more than one-fourth the wages of men in exactly the same positions. In many departments, such as the Dead Letter office, and the Treasury, women's delicacy of touch and deftness render them much better fitted than men for the peculiar work.

*Bankers.* —Many banks now employ women as tellers, cashiers, and clerks. A few women in our country are bank presidents.

*Electrical Engineers.* —Edison is said to prefer women machinists for their fineness of touch. Mrs. Ira Tott, of Long Beach, Cal., has founded and managed an entire electrical plant successfully. 117 She is an expert engineer. She superintended the building of her plant, bought the machinery, and supervised the minutest detail.

*Dressmakers and Tailors.* —Costuming women would seem to be an unusually feminine occupation, yet ladies' tailoring is almost monopolized by men. However, many fine modistes make an art of their profession, study in Europe, love their labor, and make enormous incomes. With the present lightning changes in fashions, there is always employment for good dressmakers.

*Milliners.* —The highest of these are sent to Europe semi-annually as buyers for great stores, and the occupation is one of the best for women.

*Professional Shoppers.* —These represent a very modern want. They are employed by ladies in many towns surrounding the large cities, select whole wardrobes, and work on commission from the stores. Professional trunk-packing for the very rich is resorted to by many clever women. Hair-dressing, manicuring, massaging, giving Turkish baths, fancy costuming, and osteopathy also claim many industrious women. It is possible for girl hair-dressers to earn eighteen dollars a week.

*Trained Nurses.* —A brilliant example of skilled labor, carefully classified and federated, is furnished by trained nurses. With no money put into education, and only two to three year's apprenticeship, the command a salary of twenty-one or twenty-five dollars per week, with board and lodging. The (woman) Superintendent of Nursing in our Army bears the title of Assistant Surgeon, U.S.A. In the recent war, there were 1,700 118 women nurses, in Camp and Field Hospitals. There are women at

the head of every hospitals training school, clinical instructors, on metropolitan asylums boards, and in the highest positions possible.

*Horticulturalists and Agriculturalists.* —Western women are accomplishing wonders along the farming lines. Bee-keeping, poultry-raising, fruit and nut-growing, and expert dairying receive intelligent study. The soil cries for cultivation, and health and wealth await the tiller. California orange and peach, olive and apricot ranches, violet and rose farms are especially well-worked by women. Silk culture and ostrich farms present possibilities. There always is an eager market for fresh vegetables, fruits, cheese, butter, chickens, and fresh eggs. In Belgium and England, women are on agricultural boards, professors in scientific dairying, students of landscape gardening. In Sweden, they interest themselves in market-gardening, farming, and even care for graves. A landscape gardener of Illinois, is Mrs. Annette McCrea. She is employed by the Rock Island R. R., and also has charge of Lincoln Park, Chicago. The most successful woman farmer known is Mrs. Harriet Strong, of California. She has two hundred and twenty acres. She has twenty-five miles of walnut trees, and ships seven cars of nuts a season, eleven cars of oranges, and has sent as many as 160,000 pampas plumes to Germany. She also has immense petroleum interests. In 1878, a woman pioneer in the raisin industry invented methods that are employed to-day. Two girls 119 started, in California with a capital of two bags of poppy seed, and now own and manage ten greenhouses. Elise Buckingham has the largest fruit orchard of any woman in the world. She ships six hundred tons a season. It would take fifty cars to transport the fruit, from the thousand acres managed by her.

The first orange box made in California was fashioned by a woman's hands.

*Typewriters and Stenographers.* —These are almost exclusively women. In the profession of the amanuensis, there is always room at the top. Authors sigh for grammatical typewriter girls, and court stenographers command \$100 and \$150 a month. Business high schools and colleges are struggling to maintain a higher degree of education for the average stenographer. Several cities employ women as official stenographers.

*Bakers.* —Of all needs of the world, which the world willingly pays for, good cooking is the first. Vienna bakeries, cafés, women's exchanges, working girls' lunches, are profitable, and positively philanthropic. An occasional woman offers good food, and attractive surroundings in lieu of the ubiquitous and awful railroad eating station, and causes the desert to blossom as the rose. Confectioners and caterers of all people should be women. Those who specialize on food for the sick can command fancy prices, in cities.

*Librarians.* —These, like teachers, are almost entirely women. Cataloguing and all branches, in the training schools in cities are conducted by 120 women. Toulmin Smith teaches library work in Manchester College, Oxford.

*Handicrafts.* —The delicate fingers and infinite patience of women fit them for the arts and crafts. Needlework, embroidery, burnt wood-work, brass and metal work, water colors, china painting, wrought iron, burnt leather, gold and silver filagree, tissue paper fancies, illuminated texts, precious metals and jewels, carpet and wall paper designing; art furniture and books, revived by William Morris and imported by Elbert Hubbard and others, are especially congenial to women, and furnish home work. In Denmark, there are feminine cabinet-workers, carvers, engravers, draughts-women, locksmiths, watchmakers, fresco painters, potters, photographers. Two are “master joiners” or artisans: each employs twenty-five men in a flourishing business.

*Eccentric Trades.* —There are many unique occupations indulged in by women, some of which the most radical reformer would not recommend to the sex in general but no one should deny to any particular women, if her lines seem to fall in strange places, and she does no harm. “Tom Grogans” are not unknown in real life. There are women coal dealers, and contractors. There are pilots on the Atlantic and the Pacific. There are famous archæologists and excavators (Mrs. Stevenson, the most famous, is a Doctor of Science, and has been officially sent to Rome and Egypt). Also, insurance agents (especially employed to insure wealthy women or those who are bread-winners), notaries public, receivers of banks, civil engineers, commercial travelers number 121 women in their fraternity. A girl of eighteen, Nevada Stout, is the engineer of a stationary engine, at Dyerville, O. Mary Oren is the manager of the Florida telegraph system. There are feminine undertakers, and engravers on tombstones (Kansas and Canada), canal boat captains (Miss Stanton, Newton Creek, N. Y.), street car conductors (Lilian de Garmo, Long Island line), miners (Mrs. May Hutton, who read a paper before the International Mining Congress), police officers (particularly in connection with the Humane Society's work), stage-drivers (South Dakota), managers of great business concerns (National Biscuit concern, Pittston, Pa.), hotel managers (the finest hotel in Jacksonville, Fla.), managers of saw-mills, barbers (two women in San José Cal.), boss contractors, ocean lighthouse paraphernalia inventors (Mrs. Coston of the famous Coston signals). These suggest but a few of the actual voluntary employments of women.

In Sweden, statistics prove that since the accession of women in the ranks of business, the moral standard has been raised; that the *number of prostitutes has decreased in proportion to the economic freedom of women*. In spite of the tendency of modern life toward skepticism, the asserted increase of crime, as the population masses into cities, the number of Swedish illegitimate children has



actually diminished fifteen per cent during the last thirty years, the period in which the professions have been opening up to women.

We are living in a period of transition. Business women are pioneers with the eyes of the 122 world upon them. With them rests the freedom of future women. Their conduct does not need to be merely *as* frank and open and decent as that of the average business man, but must be *exemplary*. They must be all tact, discretion, must use a nice sense of discrimination,—there must be no obtuseness of sex in business, yet no bold loss of it. In short, they must possess the diplomacy of the French salon, but must banish its coquetry. The woman in business must possess *camaraderie* without coarseness, self-reliance without self-consciousness, wholesome morals, firm principles, and good sense.

123

## XI. WOMEN IN CIVIL OFFICE AND CIVIC REFORM.

In their new leisure, women are positively thirsting for civic expression. Housekeeping has been their sole occupation for thousands of years, and the instinct for *cleaning things up* is inherent with them. The metamorphosis of the “old” woman into the “new,” is attended, therefore, with no more alarming symptoms than an expansion of work and opportunities. The passion for housekeeping has been carried out into the streets, and transformations have taken place in cities,—even in the slums—under the intelligent direction of women.

Not only have women leisure and capability, but the machinery with which to labor. A few years ago, clubs were regarded as an unsexing innovation; now they are accepted as a normal feature of modern life. Women have plunged into them, taken them seriously, delightedly seized upon household economics and child-study, until every home is a experimental laboratory, from which are expected good results.

Civic reform is being introduced into clubs, by the more advanced women, insidiously and 124 rapidly, and the masses rush into it, as to a newly discovered duty; for women have a gentle mania for duty! Wherever avenues are opened up, intelligent women show maternal devotion and true feminine zeal in the work of municipal improvement. Public playgrounds, public baths, street-cleaning, factory-inspecting, the placing of women as matrons of jails, on governing boards of state institutions,—forestry, traveling libraries, all receive enthusiastic attention.

An alumnae association (Boston) of five hundred women has investigated drainage and sewerage, and compiled statistics that are welcomed as of great value, by specialists.

Carroll D. Wright found the studies made by Miss Gail Laughlin, the brilliant young lawyer, so valuable, that he had her appointed a member of the United States Labor Commission.

Chicago women have specialized upon street-cleaning, until they have reflected credit upon all American women. Immagene Paul has been street commissioner, and out-distanced all men in her achievements, personally supervising every detail of the work. Jane Addams was made garbage inspector of the worst district of Chicago, around Hull House, after fruitless attempts of the city to find an honest politician for the place. At Hull House, a club of three hundred children is trained in municipal tidiness, and picks up the stray bits of paper on the streets, for its recreation. While masculine commissioners draw fat salaries, many women are gratuitously striving to remove the strata of dirt accumulated during years of masculine administration. Some of the newspapers go 125 so far as to advocate that all of the work of street improvement and sanitation be officially placed in the hands of salaried women.

The women of South Park, Chicago, have formed an Improvement Association and taken the work of their district into their own hands. The West Side Club held a great mass-meeting to stimulate interest in its locality.

At Bethany, Mo., the women called a public meeting in the court house, and organized. In four months, the aspect of the entire town had changed.

The Woman's Health Protective Association of New York is struggling with the problem of overcrowded street cars. It also has petitioned the Common Council for a crematory for garbage.

In Honesville, Penn., a village society of women, built a retaining wall along the river, constructed a river boulevard, a fountain and a park, where once a dump of refuse and a frog-pond threatened the public health.

The Civic Club (women), Philadelphia, induced the council to pass a law protecting girls who walk the streets as vendors of flowers, etc.

Salem, Mass., through its women has provided a bath-pavilion for women and children, near Salem Willows, where suits and towels are free.

The New York College Alumnæ are building a club-house for women graduates, to be a center for women alone in New York. It is already endorsed by five hundred women.

New Bedford, Mass., has a library worth \$12,000 purchased by women.

The New York State Federation has just entered 126 into some "missionary" work. It has established a free library at a foothill village, Phoenicia.

Lake Charles, La., has been revolutionized in its drainage, cemeteries, and sanitation by a club of one hundred and twenty-three women.

Almost every state federation of women's clubs has its department of forestry, traveling libraries, village improvement, or a corresponding one.

The women of Montclair, N. J., are working along twelve different line of improvement. Especially attention is paid to the city milk supply, street signs, drinking fountains, and the reforming of the almshouse.

The sociological section of the Chelsea, Mass., Woman's Club is working with thousands of children, trying to induce habits of cleanliness, politeness and good citizenship.

The Brightelmstone Club, Boston, is interesting itself in a floating hospital, a vacation school and a home for crippled children.

A club in Somerville, Mass., has labored with the aldermen to have conditions in the women's department in the jail improved. It has been successful.

At a town election in Brookline, Mass., a woman was elected on the commission for planting trees. Women also are school commissioners, and overseers of the poor.

Michigan, Wisconsin, and other states have women factory inspectors.

New Orleans women abolished the open sewers which had been that city's disgrace since its inception. 127 The delicate Southern ladies presented a petition of two thousand names, and fought for good drainage and pure water.

A grand Rapids woman deserves most of the credit for having introduced manual training into the public schools, of which the city is extremely proud. She is a valuable member of the school board, and was obliged to appear five consecutive years before the council and plead with them, besides instigating mass-meetings to educate the people up to manual training.

Police matrons are now an established fact in all well-governed cities. Mrs. Augusta Church, of Buffalo, receives a life pension for valuable services. In Cleveland, O., they have been eminently successful. Woman-like, they usually try to reform their girl prisoners, and occasionally succeed.

A colored philanthropist, Mrs. McDonald (Chicago), is doing excellent work as a probation officer in the juvenile court.

Miss Florence Cross, a young girl resident of a college settlement in New York, acted for a year as probation officer in the Essex Court in the slums.

Not only do municipalities that employ women find the work conscientiously and painstakingly accomplished, but they are amazed at the reduction in expenses. Not alone are women trained in small economies, but they do not loot the city treasury!

So nearly allied are municipal reform and civic offices, that already several instances of women filling the latter have crept into a brief study 128 of their work in the former! A good city official ought to interest himself in municipal betterment, and perhaps that is why in this article, the two are somewhat interwoven.

In states where woman suffrage is enjoyed, women have not rushed into office, but have formed a small proportion to the men office-holders, and usually are chosen or elected on account of *conspicuous attainments* which make their fitness impossible to debate. There is no danger of objectionable women receiving civil positions, for so strong in the ancient prejudice against women in any municipal offices, that even the finest women who can be selected receive opposition,—and a less fit woman would be tabooed instantly; whereas, men usually are selected merely for politics, with little consideration of their ability or morals.

In states where women do not vote, they still are filling every office to which they are legally eligible; so that denying them the franchise seems powerless to stop the mighty current of progress. In the following examples of women's untiring energy, no distinction as to suffrage or non-suffrage states is made.\*

---

\* All of the individual cases cited in this article are selected almost at random from hundreds already known.

Mrs. E. A. French, of Helena, Montana, is chief deputy collector of Internal Revenue.

The Acting Governor of New Jersey last summer was Miss Agnes Gill, a young girl, who disposed of all official duties creditably, issued requirements, 129 and also took the place of private secretary and executive clerk.

Miss Rosalie Loew, of New York, has been elected General Attorney of the Legal Aid Society, and position long held by Carl Schurz.

Miss Julia Mack, of St. Louis, is city weigher,—the only one that the Mayor endorses. Last year, she turned in eight hundred and thirteen dollars' profit from her scales to the city, whereas all of the former weighers insisted that they could barely meet expenses. She works ten hours a day, and has held her position through three administrations.

Mrs. Mary Wright, member of the last Idaho Legislature, was unanimously elected Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives. Five other women in the House, and two in the Senate, were elected to important positions.

Mrs. Evangeline Hartz, member of the Colorado House of Representatives, has been Chairman of the Committee on Enrollments, and Member of the Committees on Appropriations and Expenditures, Education, State Institutions, Temperance, and Public Health. She introduced a bill providing for compulsory arbitration in labor disputes. For a considerable period, she acted most acceptably as Speaker of the House.

Miss Permeal French has been several times re-elected as state superintendent of public instruction of Idaho. Governor Steunenburg declared her to be the best the state ever had.

The same compliment by the people and by the governor was paid Mrs. Helen Grenfell, of Colorado. She had the largest vote ever cast for a 130 candidate in the state, ran ahead of the ticket for governor, and for president of the United States.

The office of Commissioner of the Court of Claims, in Santa Fé, New Mexico, is held by Grace Kennedy. She was previously secretary of the Bureau of Immigration, and also of the Republican State Central Committee.

Another girl of twenty is assistant superintendent of the Chicago Board of Charities. The position is one of extreme responsibility.

The inspectors of streets, garbage, etc., in Chicago, have been voted. Now the ranks of society are being invaded. Mrs. Potter Palmer was offered a position, which was later accepted by Mrs.

Horatio May. It is the lady's duty personally to inspect garbage boxes, to see that the law is enforced requiring metallic cans, and report upon hygiene.

The office of deputy prothonotary of a county in Pennsylvania is filled by Mrs. Belle Wood. She has full charge of the business in the absence of her superior, and also is clerk of the Quarter Sessions and Common Pleas Court, administers the oath to jurors, witnesses, and records verdicts.

Mrs. Cornelius Stevenson, president of two important civic clubs of Philadelphia, is a member of two sub-committee of the National Export Committee. She is trustee of the Philadelphia Museums, secretary of Archæology in the University, and member of several scientific, philosophical, and Oriental bodies. She was placed by the Mayor upon an advisory board, to consider a loan bill of \$11,000,000.

### 131

The United States Treasury Department has appointed a young Michigan woman, as clerk to the Comptroller, which is a distinct innovation in our government. Miss Gleacon will write legal opinions for the government. Her salary is \$1,800.

The corporation of Sheffield, England, employs four women health inspectors. These receive good salaries. There also is woman to train inspectors for the position.

A woman colonel of the Military Staff of the Government of Georgia, is Miss Mamie Morris. Her duties are reviewing regiments, making speeches, and attending social functions. She was appointed in recognition of services, and fulfills the duties of office well, appearing in uniform with sword.

The illinois Senate confirmed the re-appointment of Miss Bartelme as public guardian of Cook County. The press declared her appointment one of public rejoicing.

Mrs. Mary Kincaid is chairman of the San Francisco School Board, a high-salaried office. Women are eligible on school boards in over half the states, and as members of Boards of State Institutions in fifteen.

In Kansas, last year, twenty women were elected county superintendents (school) and a large number, country treasurers.

For thirteen years, Mary Meyer, of conservative Boston, has served in the Democratic headquarters. She is nominally executive clerk, but is said to be authority on candidates, state news, parliamentary

law. Although feminine in appearance, 132 she has been able to work forty-eight hours at a stretch, in campaign time.

Nebraska has a woman auditor, Miss Mamie Muldoon, who is twenty-one years old, and receives \$1,800.

Miss Edith Hill, of Greenwich, Mass is one of a number of United States letter carriers.

City clerks of the feminine persuasion are becoming common in the West. Miss Walker, of Holton, Kansas, was endorsed by three political parties, and elected by a large majority.

The City Council of Lowell, Mass., elected Mrs. Rowena Palmer, trustee of the public library.

An innovation has been introduced in Wyandotte County, Kansas, of having women act as judges and clerks at the primary election. The Republican Central Committee invited the women's clubs to present names of suitable women.

Miss Harding has been re-elected to the Omaha (Neb.) Board of Trade. In this city as in many others, there is a woman coroner.

Miss Margaret Ziliox, of Hamilton, O., has been for seven years deputy probate judge of her county.

Rev. Caroline Bartlett Crane, who has a national reputation for her efficient success in establishing a People's Church, doing institutional work, in Kalamazoo, Mich., has spent a winter in the effort to get a bill through the legislature, providing for meat and milk inspection. A delicate and spiritual woman, she has visited all of the Chicago slaughter-houses, and many of the Michigan ones. She has made seven trips to the capitals, and was allowed a speech before the legislature, 133 which speedily won over the opponents to a reconsideration of the bill, which already had been defeated. Although so unqualifiedly a sanitary and moral measure, many of the legislators at first bitterly opposed it.

During the past eight years, eleven women have served in the Colorado Legislature. Mrs. Alice Ruble was chosen to nominate the United States senator, the first woman in the world to be thus honored.

The vice-chairman (who acts as chairman) of the Colorado Republican State Central Committee, is Mrs. Ina Thomson.

The chairman of the Democratic Campaign Committee is the most brilliant example Colorado has produced of the young woman in politics. Mrs. Helen Belford is in her twenties, and is a natural diplomat.

Three political parties have strong women's clubs, whose presidents are social and intellectual leaders.

All of the women members of central committees, of the Legislature of Colorado at the present writing, are wives and mothers, several of them noted for their housekeeping, upon which they bring to bear their executive talent.

Nearly all of the State Boards of Control for the benefit of defective and dependent classes of Colorado, have women serving upon them. Nor is charity their only outlet. They are holding elective and appointive positions in connection with the institutions of learning. The president of the State Board of Charities and Corrections 134 was Mrs. Decker, the president of the National Federation of Women's Clubs.

The greatest achievement of Colorado women is the founding of the Civic Federation, non-partisan, whose women were the first advocates of *scientific municipalism* in the State. Colorado now is distinguished for civic reform.

135

## **XII. WOMAN AS CITIZEN. (CONCERNING SUFFRAGE.)**

*The Ballot: "A weapon that comes down as still  
As snowflakes fall upon the sod,  
But executes a freeman's will,  
As lightning does the Will of God!"* — John Pierpont, 1800.

Could an investigating and unprejudiced stranger enter America, he would find some startling legal and industrial conditions, semi-civilized conservatisms existing within our vaunted democracy. Perhaps the most glaring inconsistency of the republic would be the fact that half the population of seventy-six millions, being in sound mind and morals, a good per cent. American born, are wholly disfranchised. From infancy, we are regaled with the foundation maxims of our national independence; "Governments derive their just power from the *consent* of the governed," "No taxation without representation," yet here are some thirty-eight million people governed without consent, and all these millions taxed without representation!

136

What is the cause of this singular paradox? Why did our country enter into a heartrending war to free a race of illiterate black people, making the final issue, the giving of these black men the citizen's badge of honor, the ballot; yet totally ignore the intelligent, moral white women in every home, utterly deprived of political power? Never were women so competent, so well-educated as



to-day, yet the press utters not a word against their absolute civil inpotency, while it hurls stormy denunciations at a Southern State which dares disfranchise its negro men!

Let us dispassionately review for a moment the pages of history. How many of us realize that the primitive form of government was the matriarchate, or Mother Rule? Women, through their motherhood, were the arbiters of home and tribe. Paternity was uncertain, but maternity was the conservative, established fact, the unit of the family. Woman sat in the councils of war and peace; through her was the line of descent and *family name*, —at the dawn of Christianity, she was the high priestess. This state can be traced through Egyptian, Persian, German, Aryan dynasties. When men assumed sway, it was by the right of physical force. In an age of brute-strength ideals, the weaker sex naturally was relegated to an inferior position, in home, church, and state. The Roman laws retained some favorable conditions for women, until touched by the “icy fingers of canon law,” which became the Saxon canon law of our fathers, which we call the English common law. Charles Kingsley says, “This will never be a good world for women until 137 the last remnant of the canon law is swept from the face of the earth.”

Of fourteen authors who have written treatises upon the modern election laws of England, only four express any doubt as to the common-law right of women to vote for members of Parliament, yet they are not permitted to vote for these.

In America, it is regarded as a huge joke, if some one says, “We may have a woman President of the United States one day!” Do we forget that Great Britain was ruled over sixty years by a woman, that Spain, the Netherlands, and many countries have had and do have girl and women sovereigns? However, we are concerned chiefly with woman's political position in our so-called democracy. In the thirteen original states, the word male was not placed in the Constitution. New York was the first to restrict some of her citizens from exercising the privilege of voting, by inserting the word “male.” Massachusetts and the others quickly followed. What is, to-day, the basis of elimination? Is it a property qualification? No. Women own and manage millions of dollars' worth of property, which their negro or Swede coachmen may vote to tax. Is it educational? No. The girls of the country are flocking to the universities, in what is termed alarmingly large numbers. Is it a question of morals? No. Men in all times and climes unite in claiming that women exceed them in purity, honesty and spirituality. What then discriminates against women, preventing them from exercising the simple and undeniable right of franchise 138 in a government of the people? Their sex, alone!

What can a rational, logical mind deem that sex has to do with church or state? Why should the home, the family, the personal life be dragged into the argument? Is not the home composed of *two*? If the husband can find five minutes in his great business enterprises, to steal away, and express himself upon political issues,—matters regulating schools, state institutions, local sanitation,—

cannot the wife leave her duties five minutes for the same purpose? The man and the woman have personal and domestic duties, but why this eternal cry of motherhood, with the tragic silence as to fatherhood? Objectors to the simple proposition that feminine as well as masculine adults should enjoy the sacred functions of citizenship, begin at once to discuss *personal functions*, as if our individual life should swallow up our civil life. They do not haggle at the admission of the illiterate foreigner, or the "immoral" negro, but woman—ah, woman's nature is a thing apart,—it is emotional, irresponsible, capricious, ungoverned!

Now, these anti-woman suffragists who insist upon woman's lack of logic, are the least logical speakers upon the platform! Instead of reading history, conning statistics, examining justice, they dash into maudlin emotionalism. With expanded chest, these orators exclaim—to an audience honestly desiring information as to woman's legal, constitutional and ethical rights—" *Who will rock the cradle while the mother's is at the polls?*" We might reply to him, "Who rocks the cradle while 139 mother is attending progressive euchres, or is taking in washing to support a drunken husband and eight children?" But to be convincing, we must tell him that only five per cent. of the women of the United States are taking care of young children at one time. That is, calculating the number of children born to each family, and the number of years of a woman's life, she is confined at home by the care of infants only a short period, and there are ninety-five per cent. at any one moment who may appear at the polls and assist in the purification of politics.

We assert that there is not one legal or constitutional or ethical ground upon which women should be denied full suffrage. We cannot combat sophistry. There are two grounds upon which the intellectual women of America demand the ballot: (1) justice, or their absolute right to it; and (2) their desire and ability to improve legislation. Even granting that the entrance of women into politics will not bring about speedy reforms (and we do not grant this), the justice remains the same. As we have said, the arguments against woman suffrage are of a sentimental nature. Conservatism cries: "We dare not take so radical a step." Caution declares, "Why run risks, when women do not want to vote?" What is there in it so radical? No half a century ago, our fathers exclaimed, "What, educate our daughters, as well as our sons?—preposterous!" But an entering wedge was put through a crack in the school door, and now thousands of girls are receiving university educations. When one thinks of the enlarged opportunities of the present generation of 140 children, reared by educated mothers as well as fathers, amid sanitary surroundings, equipped with the power to become factors in the struggle for existence, he cannot combat education.

Next, woman begged to be teacher, preacher, physician; to speak aloud if she had aught to say.—Another storm was raised, men insulted her, preachers hurled invectives at her, and quoted St. Paul! But she persisted at the expense of much that she held dear, for the weapons of ignorant

conservatism are ridicule, denunciation, and slander. Now, we see thousands of women teaching our children, healing the ill and wretched, speaking at religious, literary and philanthropic conventions, preaching, doing hundreds of things well, that once were considered of a strictly masculine nature.

The next step was to plead to be placed upon school boards, boards for the management of the criminal and insane (especially unfortunate women). This has been accomplished in some twenty states, but some legislature continue to vote down such petitions, apparently preferring *such scandals, as constantly crop out, from employing men only, in institutions for women*, to placing one woman upon a board to protect her insane sisters from the barbarity still existing in men as a class!

The achievement of women, individually and as a class, during the past fifty years is marvelous, when we consider that they have been hampered by law, by conservatism, public sentiment, physical inferiority, the care of home and children. Risen they have, and their progress, when they 141 shall be unhampered by constitutional restrictions, and popular prejudice can scarcely be predicted. *Opportunity to share in the weighty problems of government is the last favor they need ask from men.* Thereafter, co-operative labor can be carried on, hand in hand.

One of the most cruel and pathetic circumstances in history is the present demand that intelligent women, well-bred, frequently highly intellectual, the mothers of the race, should *prove* their right to the franchise; to bring all their logic and eloquence to bear to show just cause why a simple due should be granted them,—one which the most renegade young scamp inherits naturally on his twenty-first birthday, by virtue of being a male American, and one which the most illiterate and vicious emigrant gains by mere existence in the United States for one year! Those favoring woman's enfranchisement are asked if they are certain she will immediately purify the pool of politics which generations of men have made filthy!

Apart from any fore-knowledge upon this subject, or from any flattering facts of what women have accomplished where they are enfranchised, there are many weighty reasons for granting women the supreme right of citizenship. Foremost among these are: (1) Woman's need for the franchise to develop herself, and (2) the need of the community for woman. What is the most glaring lack in the average municipal management? Not brain; brilliant men abound. *The penitentiaries are full of them!* The paramount need is for conscientiousness! What class of 142 people are super-conscientious, often morbidly so? *Women!*

In 1848, the first Convention called by women as an attempt to recover their ancient rights, was held at Seneca Falls, N. Y. Such women as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, and such men as Wendell Phillips and Wm. Lloyd Garrison began the agitation. At this time, married women had no property rights. An heiress, finding her husband an intoxicated spendthrift, had no recourse to law.

She was told that the fortune was her husband's, she a pauper. Not only money, but her very clothes belonged to the husband,—and her children were not hers in the eye of law, but her husband's, to be disposed of, as he saw fit. Divorce law was rigid. There were few grounds, not even drunkenness, upon which a woman could rid herself of an obnoxious partnership formed in youthful ignorance. A man, until ten years ago, could, in Illinois, shut up a wife for life in a insane asylum, without a physician's certificate. To-day, the common law holds good in England, that a man may beat his wife with a stick no larger around than his thumb! Slowly and painfully, law after law in each state has been attacked, —timidly, but persistently, have women gone before legislative committees, pleading for better conditions, not for themselves (often enjoying wealth and protection), but for the poor women engaged in underpaid industries, abused wives, widows struggling against injustice and poverty, young girls, who in some states were only protected against the violence of man, up to the age of *eight*. 143 In behalf of such, courageous women have entreated legislation, and subjected themselves to every humiliation to gain it.

In spite of being a disfranchised class, misunderstood, and working in opposition to public opinion, a few women, led by such martyr spirits as Susan B. Anthony, have altered and improved the laws of every state in the union. Yet to-day women are classed with “idiots, paupers and criminals,” as the disfranchised body!

It is difficult enough to accomplish reformatory legislation with the ballot; it is almost impossible, without. In 1894, a constitutional convention held in New York, aroused much enthusiasm, and resulted in a petition bearing 625,000 names, asking that the word *male* be struck from the State Constitution. The amendment was lost by a vote of 97 to 58.

Wyoming has had equal suffrage for thirty-two years. It refused to come into the Union as a state, unless it could bring woman suffrage along with it. Colorado, nine years; Utah, seven years; Idaho, five years. Large numbers of states have school suffrage, or municipal, or both,—the logical, outcome of partial suffrage being, of course, full suffrage.

A curious thing is the universal opposition of the saloon element to the enfranchisement of women. Conversely, the suffrage in the hands of women will surely work havoc upon the saloon interests. <sup>\*</sup>  
(Not that women as such stand for

---

<sup>\*</sup> There is no doubt that several woman suffrage state campaigns have been defeated by the liquor interests. See California, 1896.

144 prohibition.) National legislation has been sought every year since 1869. A respectful hearing in committee is given the leading women of the country, and the bill then laid upon the table!

Women in Great Britain vote upon every issue except Parliamentary elections. Full suffrage is enjoyed in South and West Australia. In New Zealand, that Utopia where industrial conditions have approximated perfection, where there are no strikes, tramps, millionaires, or paupers, where municipal ownership of all public utilities has settled labor problems, there is universal suffrage.

Upon woman's political status, depend chiefly her civil rights. Her position in the industrial world has changed, through the introduction of machinery, which lightened her duties in the individual household,—giving her more time, and placing a monied value upon her work. She has thus been enabled to enter trades and professions, to be self-supporting,—the ethical value being that she may now remain single, or marry for love, whereas in the past, she was obliged to marry to be supported. The moral effect upon children, from marriages of inclination, rather than necessity, furnishes a vital argument in favor of woman's freedom to choose. *Industrial independence begets a desire for political independence.* Self-supporting women come into a knowledge of, and contact with, unjust discriminations against a disfranchised class. Self-support is teaching women self-respect, and inspiring in them a vital interest in governmental matters. The National Woman's Council, and the Federation of Women's Clubs (two separate organizations), 145 the W. C. T. U., and other great bodies, are educating a race of parliamentarians. The International Council, organized in 1888, now includes the aristocracy of Europe (titled ladies, more democratic than many Americans) and the so-called working classes, laboring side by side, in the cause of woman's development, and almost universally desiring her political emancipation.

Working men are learning that it is the underpaid women in industries who are harming them by unfair competition. Equal wages and opportunities for equal work will benefit men as well as women. The industrial situation is inseparably connected with the political. *As it is the pioneers of Woman Suffrage who have gradually opened up all the avenues of wage-earning to women, so women who are engaged in industries learn that justice and equality before the law may be found only in equal suffrage.*

No man can “represent” a woman. If all humanity were divided into couples, and all couples agreed in politics, the man might be the official representative, but even then, he should cast two ballots!

Thus in cities, woman must obey the laws, pay taxes, is subject to arrest, to fines and imprisonment, but has no vote in choosing mayor, aldermen, or any of the officers upon whom depends the righteous enforcing of the laws. *Chivalry does not exempt women from taxation;* even the widow and the orphan are required to grade their streets, but are “too delicate” to vote upon questions vital to their homes and pocketbooks.

A word about the purported *indifference* of 146 women. Unfortunately, it is partially true that the majority of women are not keenly appreciative of the value of citizenship! Ignorance and inexperience militate against *all* radical measures. Natural conservatism, the desire to please men (who are assumed to be hostile to the admittance of more voters), cause many women to feel or feign indifference. But we cannot prophesy what will happen, unless we are guided by what has happened. In four states, the ballot has been secured by men, and a few pioneer women, and placed in the hands of the rest. The official reports of the last national election, November, 1900, are an unconscious argument for equal suffrage.

### **Wyoming.**

"The women of Wyoming exercised their right of suffrage to a greater extent than ever before, and it is estimated that they cast at least 7,000 out of the 23,000 votes polled." As one-third of the population are women in Wyoming, it would seem that almost every woman voted!

### **Idaho.**

"At no time in the history of the city" (Boise) "has the vote turned out so early in such numbers. The women took an equal part in the election with the men, and did as much and as effective labor in getting out the vote, as did the brothers, husbands, and fathers. Men and women stood around in swarms, waiting a chance to put in their ballots."

147

### **Utah.**

"It was remarked early in the day, how much more interest the women were taking this year, and they did not wait until their husbands took them to the polls. The women of the Fourth Precinct did themselves proud, and came out in great numbers. The saloons very generally obeyed the closing order."

### **Colorado.**

The Denver dispatch says: "The woman vote increased from 46,720 last Presidential election to 866,943.

"In the Capitol Hill districts (the fashionable residence part of Denver) the women voted early, and the polling places were actually alive with loyal women, who had come early in order to cast their ballots for better government. The largest woman vote in the history of the city was reported."

The *News* had an editorial entitled, "What Won the Victory," which closed: "And then, the woman! God bless the women of Colorado! Never in political annals has there been such an uprising of pure, unselfish women, striving to keep untarnished the good name and fame of their beloved state."

Wyoming and Utah went Republican; Colorado and Idaho, Democratic, so we cannot declare women's politics in advance, but we know that the majority will ever be for the best candidate, irrespective of party.

Besides these gratifying reports as to the large 148 numbers who use the ballot, universally good tidings come from public officials, and all of the well-known men, as to their approval of the results of woman suffrage. Careful investigations are constantly made by suffragists and bitter opponents, and no dissenting voice is heard from the suffrage states, except that of an occasional disgruntled office-seeker. *Kansas* is somewhat conspicuous for municipal suffrage. The leading men testify that women, as a class, stand uncompromisingly for morality; especially against licensing houses of ill-fame as a means of revenue for the city. Women are less partisan than men, selecting candidates for integrity and decency. One speedy result of woman suffrage has been the raising of the standard of candidates. Separate ballot boxes for men and women have been maintained, in order to study the feminine vote. *Not one of the evils has come to pass.* Women do vote (in larger numbers than men), and especially when some moral issue is involved. They are employed in many important municipal and state offices. The women mayors have been highly commended. In Wichita, in twelve years, the feminine vote increased eleven-fold.

Of the states with full suffrage, Wyoming reports that a disorderly primary is unknown. One of its prominent men says: "No other extension of the suffrage ever had so much of advantage, and so little of disadvantage."

*Wyoming* boasts a magnificent school system, practically in the hands of women. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction and most county ones are women.

*Utah* sends women delegates to State and national conventions. Women act upon political committees. Such work has tended to elevate them. Gratifying numbers vote. In Senate and House, two of the most wealthy and popular districts are represented by women.

In *Idaho*, women defeated a social favorite, because he stood against municipal reform. A law legalizing gambling stood for years. The first session after women's enfranchisement, it was repealed.

In *Colorado*, Governor Adams asserted: "Women need not the defense of results; it is not a question of expediency, but of justice." Eleven women have been in the legislature eight years. They have been chairmen of important committees. There is a woman member of the Democratic State Central Committee. Mrs. Grenfell, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, deserves national credit. The Governor said she was the *best officer the State ever had*. The Woman's Civic Federation (non-partisan), originated scientific municipalism in Colorado.

The "Supreme Sacrament of Citizenship" is a term used by Colorado women.

In the face of statistics, we cannot urge that women, however thoughtless, ignorant, or indifferent, in regard to the franchise, will refuse to use it conscientiously, when it is obtained for them.

The writer has chanced to meet many distinguished women among whom she can recall not one who is not an advocate of equal suffrage, nor are there many among the really great men. Ex-President 150 Cleveland, President Roosevelt, Ex-Speaker Reed, Eugene V. Debs, Robert Ingersoll, men differing as greatly as may be, in politics, have united in being staunch advocates for woman suffrage. In the past, the champions were Lincoln, Seward, Chief Justice Chase, John Stuart Mill, John and Jacob Bright, Wendell Phillips, Geo. Wm. Curtis, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Emerson, Beecher, John Quincy Adams, Jas. Freeman Clarke, T. W. Higginson, Whittier, Longfellow, Jas. Russell Lowell, Phillips Brooks, Horace Greeley,—a mixture of all the distinguished preachers, politicians, editors, poets. Most of our university professors, and presidents to-day, are advocates, and Wm. T. Harris, our great Commissioner of Education has recently delivered an address, commending it.

A fraction of the magnificent work accomplished by woman, with and without the ballot, has been set forth in a previous essay.<sup>\*</sup> The excellently filled civil offices, in which a woman must have been not only as good as a man in the same position, but *much better* (because her remarkable worth was needed to overcome the prejudice against her sex), and their rapid increase, testify highly in favor of women's success. *The innovation of one age is the natural order of the next*. When it is seen how



acceptably women are filling positions of trust, in states where they enjoy the franchise, how can an intelligent person deplore their having it? And when one views their admirable work in municipal

---

\* "Women in Civil Office and Civic Reform."

151 tidiness, voluntary labors for civic betterment, in localities where they have it not, how can he deny them the credit, and the most effective medium for public improvement,—the ballot?

There is no half-way home in democracy. The logic which grants school suffrage to women, must grant full suffrage. The evils that are to befall the community and nation, will do so (if they are the inevitable result of enfranchisement) as quickly when women go to the polls to elect school trustee, as president!

Even enthusiast do not claim sudden revolution which shall establish a new order, the moment women vote,—but believe that the feminine element will improve conditions, and that, irrespective of this, every adult woman citizen of the United States deserves the privilege of citizenship, under the same conditions as her brother!

As Rev. Anna Shaw says: *"The millennium may not come when women vote, but it never will come, until they do vote!"*

THE END.

Gift of NAWSA, Nov. 1, 1938 JK1881 .N357 Sec. VII, no. 63 Rare Bk Coll