

THE RIGHT AND EXPEDIENCY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE liberty of a people consists in being governed by laws which they have made for themselves, under whatever form it be of government; the liberty of a private man, in being master of his own time and actions, as far as may consist with the laws of God and his country.— *Cowley.*



OWLEY'S definition of liberty is the definition of a thoughtful, wise, and benevolent monarchist. We should hardly be content nowadays with a liberty which in the last resort is dependent upon another's will, or on a decision in which we have no part. American women are part of the American people. But they certainly are not governed "by laws they have made for themselves, under whatever form it be of government." For myself, I prefer, in discussing this question, rather to speak of self-government than of liberty. Liberty is worse than useless except it be as an opportunity for self-government. The Creator of the universe has placed mankind in this world that it may attain to that height of moral being which comes from resistance to temptation and from self-control or self-government. The sublimest thing in the universe, except its Creator, is a human will governing itself by a law higher than its own desire. The sublimest manifestation of that self-control is the self-government of a free State in which each of its citizens has his or her equal share.

I am not one of those who are impatient with the slow movement of the cause of woman suffrage. Its advocates seek to change a relation which has existed from the foundation of the earth. It is but a century since the experiment of a government in which all grown men could be admitted to an equal share was well under way, and even in that every sixth man was a slave. Many persons now living remember the time when it was not considered safe or decent that a married woman should control her own property, or that any woman should speak in public, or attend a public banquet, or practise medicine, or engage in many other honest and praiseworthy occupations. The changes of the last fifty years have demolished one by one most of the prejudices and most of the arguments which woman suffrage has now to encounter.

So, instead of discouragement, I am filled with astonishment and joy at its great hope. In two States in the West women vote for all officers, and are eligible to all offices. There is no doubt that several others will soon follow their example. In others they vote in muni-

cipal elections. In England the leaders of the Conservative party announce their readiness to give women the franchise for members of Parliament, and in municipalities, on the same terms as men. So the cautious, hesitating States of the East are not unlikely to find themselves beset behind and before.

I lament that Lucy Stone should not have lived to see the full triumph of the cause to which she devoted herself. We hear often of gentlemen of the old school. Lucy Stone was a lady of the old school. Her gracious smile would have been a most precious ornament in any household, however exalted or however humble. Her appearance by the sick-bed would have been a healing power like that of the best physician. Men and women would have intrusted their children to her, and the children would have gone to her without a misgiving. If she had been a queen, her personal qualities would have prolonged the life of a monarchy. She was an embodied argument for woman suffrage. The universal testimony to her loftiness, sweetness, uprightness, and wisdom is but a new challenge to those who are to undertake to tell us, if they can, why Lucy Stone should not have been permitted to vote.

Nor am I one of those who think that the right to vote is denied to women by men because of a tyrant's desire to keep to themselves the rule of the State. There are some exceptions; but I think it is chiefly an honest desire for the good of the State, and an honest desire for the welfare of women, that we have to deal with. We convert men to our cause almost as fast as we convert women. What we have to deal with is a misunderstanding of the true nature of men and women, and a misunderstanding of the true nature of government. It is the same misunderstanding and prejudice that the advocates of freedom have encountered from the beginning of time.

The chief single argument of the opponents of woman suffrage is that women do not want it. They say that whenever a majority of women in any State desire the right to vote, they ought to have it, and will have it. Just consider what this argument implies. The greatest single political question which can arise under a free government certainly is the question whether one half of its people shall be excluded from

a share in the government of the State. No person who sees destruction or peril to the State in admitting women to the suffrage, and certainly no person who sees degradation of women in its exercise, will deny this. Yet our opponents concede that the greatest political question which can come up should properly be left to their decision. It would seem that it would be difficult to make an admission more destructive to their contention than this. But I do not think this glib utterance bears serious examination. What single step toward the emancipation of women has been taken in obedience to their desire? I think it is quite doubtful whether the women of Turkey would be allowed to go abroad with unveiled faces if the question were left now to their decision, and the other sex disapproved. The admission of married women to control their own property, which has come to pass within a generation, is due to the law-making sex, and I think there was quite as much hesitation and opposition to it on the part of women as on the part of men. Miss Alice Stone Blackwell said in my hearing the other day that the various successive changes that have taken place in regard to the person and property and educational and professional liberties of women during the last fifty years were made before a majority of the women asked for them, and even in spite of the disapproval of a majority of women. She added that when a merchant in a town in Maine for the first time employed a woman in his store, the men in the place boycotted the store, and the women upheld the men; that when Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell studied medicine, the women refused to speak to her, and that their contemptuous and irritating attitude was more painful than any masculine objection; that in India the masses of Hindu women are so much opposed to the idea of education that when a progressive Hindu proposed to educate his daughter, the other women of that family threatened to commit suicide.

But nobody that I know of proposes to compel reluctant women to vote. The proposition we have to deal with is to allow such women to vote as may desire to, and upon the same terms and conditions as are prescribed for men. You may have any provision to secure intelligence, to secure education, to secure a property qualification, require residence in a State, or the payment of taxes as a contribution to its maintenance. All these things the governing power in the State must settle. What we say is, as we say about negro suffrage or Indian suffrage, that where these conditions exist the question of sex, as the question of race, is totally immaterial. I agree with Miss Blackwell in thinking that most of the women who now object to the responsibility of government would

have objected to the responsibility of property, and would have thought the change of custom which has thrown open to them so many vocations dangerous to their womanhood.

All the evils of misgovernment affect women, and, in many cases, affect women far more than they affect men, while women are ordinarily free from the temptation which would lead to their continuance. Women are a little more than one half of the population, but they endure far more than one half of the suffering and evil caused by bad legislation or bad administration. The mother commonly knows best if the child is growing up in a bad school, and is most distressed by the knowledge. If the husband comes home besotted from a den of vice, his faculties benumbed to an unconsciousness of his own degradation, the purer and gentler the wife the more intense is her suffering. If the home suffers, she suffers most whose place is always at home. If the husband is out of employ, or his wages are cut down to a point which will barely keep his household from starvation, the worst of it is for her. If she has an interest in these matters, if her wish or her welfare is to be considered, pray, should not her vote be counted?

There cannot be found, either in our constitutions, or in the discussions of this subject by great philosophers, any definition of the right to vote which does not include women.

When it is said in the Declaration of Independence that "we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," no man will claim, I suppose, however restricted or however extended a meaning may be given to the language, that the general proposition is not as applicable and as true in the case of women as in the case of men. The mechanism of our constitutions, State and National, is imperfect, and has needed repair and change from time to time. It has not been in all cases consistent with the general principle upon which its framers propose, in their bills of rights or preambles, to construct it. But there never has been any serious fault found with their statements of fundamental principles. So far, at any rate, nobody has been hardy enough to propose to strike out these statements of fundamental principles from any constitution, State or National. The Constitution of Massachusetts repeats in substance the opening sentences of the Declaration of Independence, which are taken from the Bill of Rights of Virginia. It goes on to declare that the various powers of instituting, constructing, and administering government belong to the people, and that the several magistrates and officers

of government are their substitutes and agents; and that no men, or association of men, have any title to particular and exclusive privileges distinct from those of the community other than what arise from the consideration of services rendered to the people, and that the idea of a man born a magistrate, law-giver, or judge is absurd and unnatural. It further declares that the people alone have an incontestable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to institute government, and to reform, alter, or totally change the same when their protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness require it; that all the inhabitants of the Commonwealth having such qualifications as they shall establish by their frame of government have an equal right to elect officers, and to be elected for public employment; that no tax ought to be laid without the consent of the people or their representatives; that no subject ought to be arrested, imprisoned, or deprived of his property, or of his life or liberty, but by the judgment of his peers.

The Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 seems to me as perfect a system of government for its purposes as was ever devised by man for mankind. I am almost tempted to say there was never a good amendment to it. At any rate, there never was nor will be a good amendment made to it except to carry into practical effect the logic of its fundamental principles. But if there were to be anywhere a conflict between the principle and the mechanism, there, as everywhere, the principle must abide, and the mechanism must be changed. This constitution, like every constitution of that day, was framed by men for men. But the inexorable logic of its principles demands of us a constitution framed, adopted, administered by the whole, men and women alike, for the whole people. If it had been attempted to deny to a woman any right declared in the constitution, except the right to vote and the right to be tried by a jury of her peers, the answer would have been that the constitutional terms, "the people," "every subject," "every citizen," of course and beyond question include women as well as men. What I have said in regard to the constitution of my own State applies equally to the constitution of every free State. It applies equally to all constitutions where the government is partly free, and partly the government of a privileged class. With monarchies, with a rare exception in those to which the Salic law is applicable, a woman may succeed to the highest function in government, even that of the throne itself. So if you look to the statement of fundamental and universal principles contained in any existing constitution, you find that those principles involve an affirmation of equal title to woman to share in the govern-

ment, and her rightful title to that share is established unless you can bring her within the excepted or disqualified class which arises out of personal unfitness for the function, of which the other examples are idiots, lunatics, criminals, children, and foreigners.

Take next the definitions of the right of suffrage given by writers on such questions.

I have never seen anywhere any well considered statement of the conditions upon which the right to vote ought to depend except these:

- (1) A stake in the country;
- (2) Attachment to the country;
- (3) Capacity to judge of the character of candidates;
- (4) Capacity to judge of the public interest;
- (5) Contribution to the cost of the government;
- (6) Capacity to serve it in public offices;
- (7) Capacity to bear arms in its defense;
- (8) An intelligent interest in public affairs;
- (9) Sufficient education.

I am but repeating a familiar argument. I am repeating what I have said many times, and what others have many times said better. Does any land-owner, any director of business enterprises, any man who bears a great family name, or has inherited a great title to public gratitude for the services of a famous ancestor, possess a stake in the country like that a mother has in her children?

Whatever the boy may get of instruction, or stimulus, or example, from his father, he best learns the lesson of patriotism, as he best learns the lesson of religion, at his mother's knee. The love of country is the highest and purest emotion of which human nature is capable. Whatever dreamers or moralists may affirm, whenever the love of humanity at large overcomes this passion in the human bosom, it is diluted, weakened, and spoiled, and the man becomes worthless to his own country and to mankind. There has been but one example to the contrary in all history, and that example is divine, not human. This loftiest and purest of human passions surely is as lofty and pure in the breast of woman as in the breast of man.

2. Does any man claim that in whatever other respect he may excel woman, that in the capacity of affection she is not his superior? Man values the objects of his affection for the comfort and dignity and benefit that comes to him from them. Woman values herself only for the comfort which she can be to the objects of her affection.

3. The intuitive and instinctive judgment of personal character especially distinguishes women. One of the acutest, most philosophical,

and most conservative observers of modern times, in a great political speech, declared what everybody agreed to, and which will be always accepted as the literal truth, except when uttered from a woman-suffrage platform. Rufus Choate, in his great speech to the Whigs at Salem, in 1848, says:

I do not suppose I enter on any delicate or debatable region of social philosophy, sure I am that I concede away nothing which I ought to assert for our sex, when I say that the collective womanhood of a people like our own seizes with matchless facility and certainty on the moral and personal peculiarities, and character, of marked and conspicuous men, and that we may very wisely address ourselves to her to learn if a competitor for the highest honors has revealed that truly noble nature that entitles him to a place in the hearts of a Nation. We talk and think of measures; of creeds in politics; of availability; of strength to carry the vote of Pennsylvania, or the vote of Mississippi. Through all this, her eye seeks the moral, prudential, social, and mental character of the man himself—and she finds it!

5. Whatever contribution to the public maintenance of the State is to be required of men who vote should of course be required of women, whether in the way of paying taxes on property or polls, imposts, excise, or the maintenance of whatever other burden.

6. I do not think that the capacity to bear arms, which is sometimes suggested as essential to the right to vote, has anything to do with it. It is said that it is not just that any class of persons should have a voice in deciding whether the nation shall go to war that is not itself exposed to the perils of war. But we apply no such principle to the large number of persons who are above the military age, the persons who are physically unfitted to bear arms, or the persons whom we exempt because of their profession, as clergymen, or because of their being assigned to other public duties, as legislators. Certainly the woman who cannot go to war does not so much deserve to be disfranchised as the man who can go and won't go. Besides, in modern times women have to bear a large share both of the risk and the burden of carrying on war. That new occupation,—I am sometimes tempted to say the most valuable and useful of all professions which in our time has been added to the list of highest human employments,—that of the trained nurse, belongs to women. Since Florence Nightingale visited the Crimea, and since Clara Barton's services in the war for the Union, the strength and efficiency of armies has been due almost as much to the corps of nurses as to the commissariat itself. Besides, that man must hold human nature cheap who thinks the suffering of war does

not fall as heavily upon the mother, the wife, the sister, or the daughter of the soldier as upon the soldier himself. The husband will be quite as likely to be willing to go to war in an unjust cause as his wife to send him. The wife and mother, who have always in our own history shown themselves willing to give the life of husband or son for the life of the country, have made the sacrifice with a keener pang and heavier burden of sorrow than fell upon the youth or the man whom they gave.

Whatever educational test, also, we impose upon the voter, should be imposed equally upon both sexes. So, in considering whether women could comply with the conditions upon which the right to vote should depend in a well-ordered State, it is immaterial what opinion we may form as to the fitness of an educational test.

Next, the capacity to serve the State in public offices. I am quite willing to agree that no class of persons who are permitted to vote should be excluded, as a class, from holding office. But it must be remembered that eligibility to office, or exclusion from office by the constitution of the State, is quite a different thing from the right of the individual belonging to that class to be elected. There is a vast number of persons whose occupation in life does not fit them to be judges of our highest courts, or even to be inferior magistrates. They are never, or almost never, appointed to such places. But they are not disqualified by the constitution. I do not think any bartender has ever been appointed to the cabinet; but the law does not exclude the bartenders from appointment to these places. Eligibility to office is one thing. It is treated in our constitutions, with some few exceptions, as a matter of common right. Being elected, or appointed, to office is a question of individual and personal quality, and depends upon the judgment of the appointing power, whether the people or the executive, as to the capacity and character of the person under consideration. But I shall, I think, show in a moment that the public functions for which intelligent women are fitted are quite as numerous and quite as important as those for which men are fitted, and I think this will be admitted, upon consideration, by our opponents.

The discussion upon this point, as of the two other conditions upon which the right to vote ought to depend, namely, the capacity to judge of what is for the public benefit, and an intelligent interest in public affairs, requires us perhaps to look somewhat more deeply into the subject. The reluctance on the part of wise and honest men and women to admit women to the privilege, and to impose upon them the duty, of a share in the government comes from

a conception of the nature of the government, and a conception of the nature of women, not perhaps very clear, and not commonly avowed, even to themselves, by the persons who are controlled by it. But doubtless many intelligent people feel that the nature of woman and the government of States have something in them which are repugnant to each other; that women will debase government and that government will debase women. You hear the phrases, "Shall our mothers and wives and daughters leave their place in the household and plunge into politics?" "Shall they be contaminated by the vile company of the ward room?" "Shall they scuffle and quarrel at polling-places?" "Shall they learn the devices by which elections are manipulated and the will of the majority is defrauded?" "Shall woman turn her thought from plans for making home happy to the abstruse problems of finance or currency, for which she has little aptitude?" "Shall she forsake the cradle or the sick chamber for the jury-room or the House of Representatives?" Such people cannot conceive that a modest and pure woman shall do or help to do these things without changing her nature, or of these things being done under the direction of feminine intellect without being badly done.

Now I am disposed to concede to these reasoners, or to the people who make these suggestions, whether they depend wholly on reason or not, pretty much all that they ask. I am willing to concede that there are large domains of legislation and administration, of intelligent direction of the conduct of the State, for which the great mass of women are, and are likely to be, so little fitted that, even if there are some conspicuous exceptions, it would be better to exclude them as a whole from this domain than to admit them as a whole.

But is not this true of all our most intelligent citizens? How few in proportion to the whole number ever reason intelligently on questions of finance, or currency, or protection, or ever know the facts in regard to questions of foreign policy? Men take their opinions about these things from their political leaders, or follow their political party. One man is interested in finance, one in education, one in protection, one in the Chinese question, one in the question of State rights or honest elections, and each takes his opinion on most subjects upon trust or authority. There is still a large proportion of our voters in large sections of the country who cannot read or write. A much larger number who claim these accomplishments never use the power to read or write as a means of receiving or conveying information. Many workmen, and a good many men of wealth and leisure, read some news-

paper of a Sunday, from which they get very little, in the way either of counsel or of fact, that is trustworthy on many very great political questions; and that is all. They attend a political meeting two or three times a year, and vote with their party. They love their country, and would give their lives, if they were needed, to preserve the Union, or to preserve the honor of the flag. Somehow and someway an intelligent and wise government, which deals pretty well with most public questions, is the result, whatever party is in power. Even those persons whose spirit is a public spirit, and who give much labor and thought to the common weal, deal with some one matter alone, and leave other things to other men.

Now I maintain that the management of schools—whether it depend on legislation or administration; the management of colleges; the organization and management of prisons for women, of hospitals, of poor houses, of asylums for the deaf and dumb and the blind, of places for the care of feeble and idiotic children; the management and improvement of the hospital service in time of war; the collection and management of libraries, museums, galleries of art; the providing for lectures on many literary and scientific subjects in lyceums and other like institutions; the regulation—so far as it can be done by law—of the medical profession, and of the composition and sale of drugs; the management of our factory system, and the employment of children; and a great many other kindred matters which I might mention, taken together, ought to make up, and do make up, a large part of the function of the State. To these we may add what has not been in this country for some generations a part of the duty of the State, but still is a political function of the same kind, the government of parishes and churches. Now for all these things women are as competent and as well qualified as men. I do not see why a woman like Clara Leonard or Clara Barton, who knows all about the management of hospitals and the care of the sick and wounded, is not performing a public function as truly and as well as a West Point graduate like General Hancock, who can lead an army, but who thinks the tariff is a local question. If women keep themselves to these things, and keep off the ground which the opponents of woman's suffrage seem to dread to have them occupy, they still are helping largely in the work of the State. I do not see how it is to degrade them to have their votes counted, or why their votes, when they are counted, are any more likely to work an injury to the State than the vote of a man who knows nothing except the management of a ship or the management of an engine.

If ninety-five per cent. of the school-teach-

ers of Massachusetts are women, why should not their votes be counted in the choice of the governor who appoints the Board of Education? If women have charge of the stitching-rooms in our shoe-factories, why should not their votes be counted when the laws which determine for what hours and for what part of the year children may be employed in those factories, or even when the laws on which some of us think the rate of wages in these factories depend are to be framed?

The vote of the father has not yet quite accomplished the rescue of the children of our manufacturing States from overwork in crowded and heated factories. It might be well to have the voice of the mother also.

About thirty years ago, when I was beginning to think seriously on this question of woman suffrage, Mrs. John Ware of Lancaster, Massachusetts, one of the wisest and most accomplished persons in this country of either sex, addressed to the legislature of Massachusetts a remonstrance, which she headed, against the suffrage of women. A few weeks after, she came into my office to enlist me in a movement for the establishment in Massachusetts of a separate prison for women. She knew all about it; she had studied the subject at home and abroad. She gave an interesting account of the experience of Ireland and Germany and Belgium. She said there were many girls of sixteen or eighteen years of age, who were committed for some first offense, who could be saved and become good mothers and wives if they could be put in the charge of a humane and kind woman, and kept from prison association with vile and abandoned criminals. She said if they were associated with hardened criminals, and brutal turnkeys were put over them, their cruel and vulgar speech and behavior made the poor children sullen and morose, and crushed all hope in their bosoms. The plan was afterward carried out, largely through the influence of Mrs. Ware and Clara Barton. Mrs. Ware wanted to know whom I could think of among the people of influence in Massachusetts to whom she had better address herself to get the public interested in the matter. I said to her, "Why, Mrs. Ware, what do the brutal turnkeys think of this thing? Are they in favor of it?" She said, "Well, I suppose not; but what has their voice to do with it?" I said: "Their opinion, not yours, of course, ought to prevail. This is a matter of government. When you are advocating this thing you are a woman in politics. I think you are quite right, and the doing of these things not only elevates politics, but it is politics in the true sense. The only difference between you and me is that when you have understood the subject, and have made the people of Massachu-

setts understand it, and they come to decide the question, I think you should help decide the question yourself, and not leave it to the brutal turnkeys."

Clara Leonard is another of the women who are the pride and ornament of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. She is a great authority on the management of our hospitals. The governor of Massachusetts, some years ago, thinking to advance his political ambitions and to commend himself to the enemies of his State in the South, made a foul charge against the management of the almshouse at Tewksbury. Clara Leonard wrote a letter,—just a few lines,—saying that she had looked into the complaint, and there was nothing in it. The governor's charge fell, and nobody troubled himself any longer about the matter. Mrs. Leonard, a few years afterward, addressed to the Senate of the United States a remonstrance against granting suffrage to women.

The mistake of these good ladies was not in their desire that woman should not be debased, or her nature changed, and that she should not be called to the coarse and vulgar and vicious employments of base politics, but in not seeing that the thing they themselves were doing all their lives was public and not private, was a part, and a great part, of the management of the State, and that nobody wanted to change them one iota. All we want is that Clara Leonard shall give her vote on the questions she understands and has studied, and that Clara Barton shall give her vote on the questions she understands and has studied. We will run the risk that when they vote on the questions they have not studied, they will, each of them, vote as wisely as the majority of their masculine fellow-citizens vote on the questions they do not understand or have not studied. When Clara Leonard was one of the Massachusetts Board of Lunacy and Charity, when Clara Barton was the superintendent of the prison for women at Sherburne, when Mrs. Hale acted as one of the trustees of the great hospital for the insane at Worcester, these women were holding office, were engaged in politics. Will you, pray, tell us, if they were fitted to do that, why their votes on these matters should not be counted? If Alice Freeman Palmer and Kate Gannett Wells are upon the Board of Education, they are helping govern the State, they are engaged in politics, they are contributing as large, important, direct, and practical a share in government as any of their masculine companions in these offices. I know something of the men who are associated with them, and these women, each of them, would carry to all political questions which their votes would affect quite as wise, safe, and intelligent an understanding for their

solution as any of their masculine associates in these public functions.

I have never been able to see that women who can give high counsel are not capable of lofty action. Why should not the heroism of the Spartan mother, which inspired the individual son, contribute directly its share to that splendid heroism which we call Sparta? Why, if we agree that woman may teach, inspire, control, conduct, all the most important institutions of the State, if the State is to be kept largely in the pathway of honor and glory by the stimulus which she furnishes, why is it that when the question whether the State shall act wisely, or shall go on in the pathway of honor and glory, shall be taken, her voice shall not have its direct influence, and her vote be counted in determining the result? How often in the crisis of great historic occasions the warning or the encouraging voice of the woman has been heard, sometimes to be obeyed and sometimes to be disregarded! When Pilate ascended the judgment seat, his wife warned him to have "nothing to do with that just man." When Lord Croke gave his judgment for Hampden in the case of the ship-money, it is said he had first written an opinion for the crown, and changed it in obedience to the remonstrance of his wife. Lord Nugent says:

This noble lady cast the shield of her feminine virtue before the honor of her husband, to guard it from the assaults equally of interest and fear; and with that moral bravery which is so often found the purest and brightest in her sex, she exhorted him to do his duty at any risk to himself, to her, or to their children, and she prevailed.

When D'Aguesseau was summoned to Versailles by Louis XIV., who demanded of him an unjust judgment against his conscience, he was about departing from his house trembling and prepared to submit. His wife laid her hand upon his shoulder, and said to him, "When you appear before the king, forget your wife, forget your children, forget everything but your duty and your God." It was this counsel that saved that matchless judicial reputation among the treasures of mankind.

To my mind the one most touching story in human history is that which Burnet tells of the parting of Lady Rachel Russell from her husband when he was about to die.

Lady Russell returned alone in the evening. At eleven o'clock she left him; he kissed her four or five times, and she kept her sorrow so within herself that she gave him no disturbance by their parting. As soon as she was gone he said to me, "Now the bitterness of death is past," for he loved her and esteemed her beyond expression, for she well deserved it in all respects.

He ran out into a long discourse concerning her,—how great a blessing she had been to him,—and said what a misery it would have been to him if she had not had that magnanimity of spirit, joined to her tenderness, as never to have desired him to do a base thing for the saving of his life.

These examples have been given to mankind by monarchies. Cannot a republic match them? When it does match them, when the forces of faith and wisdom and patriotism and self-sacrifice are measured against their antagonists to determine whether the conduct of the republic shall be wise and brave and honest, shall not the influence and votes of such women be counted?

The counsel of Lady Croke, or Lady Russell, or Mme. d'Aguesseau, the monarch himself might well heed. Each would have graced the throne. If one of them had been upon the throne, what shame and calamity would have been spared England or France! Would not the same counsel be worth listening to by the people? Should not the woman who was fit to wield alone the scepter of a powerful kingdom be held fit at least to share the self-government of a republic?

There are a great many things women are not expected to do. There are a great many things that no doctor of divinity or college professor, or very old man or very young man, is expected to do. If the process of voting or attending political meetings will degrade women, it will degrade clergymen. If it will soil the purity of delicate and refined ladies, it will soil the purity of delicate and refined gentlemen. Meanness, coarseness, selfishness, violence, and fraud are not of the essence of government. If the fastidious refined scholar or man of wealth will not leave his palace in Fifth Avenue to go to the polling-places in the city of New York, the government of that city will perhaps be abandoned to the base and criminal classes. But give his wife and daughter the right to go, and he will go with them, and he will see to it that the process of voting is conducted under conditions and with surroundings which will make it decent and clean, and fit for the participation of every refined person of either sex.

Shall women leave the cradle, or the parlor, or the kitchen, to plunge into politics? No. Shall our farmers leave the farm, or our scholars the study, or our workmen the factory, or our sailors the ship, to plunge into politics? No.

Women can contribute their share to, and exercise their right in, the government of the State with no more sacrifice of the other duties of life than is made by their husbands or brothers. There are some public duties which require the devotion of a large part of the working-

hours of life, and in some cases the entire life of the citizen to whom they are assigned. As many of these duties can be performed by women as by men, and the public duties which can be performed by women as well as by men are as important to the well-being of the State. There are many duties for which most women are unfitted. There are some few for which all women are unfitted. There are many public duties for which most men are unfitted, and there are some which—as I hope it may come in the course of time to be seen—are unfit for any human being, man or woman, to perform, and which in the better time that we look for will cease to be considered duties at all.

The same arguments with which we have to deal have been used against every extension of suffrage. Good and wise men dreaded to admit the large mass of ignorant and poor, men easily excited by passion, to the great and sacred work of ruling the State. But history and experience have shown us that on the whole that State is best ruled where the largest number of citizens have a share in its government. The evils of universal suffrage, whatever they are, can easily be shown to be less than the evils of oligarchy, or of a government by any privileged classes.

There are plenty of disturbing causes to swerve the governing power in the State from the simple course of wisdom and rectitude. But I believe that the larger the number of persons who share in the government the more likely the simple natural law is to prevail and the disturbing forces to disappear. Personal ambition may control the government given to one man. Give the government to twenty men, and you have twenty interests to control the disturbing cause. Each of the twenty will be likely to have some prejudice and some interests which conflict with those of the others. The larger the number, the less likely the disturbing causes to operate and the more likely to control one another. Add 100 per cent. to the voting population of this country, and you decrease the proportionate power of the disturbing forces operating to overcome the simple law and the interests of the nation which should direct and control its government. You make it harder to buy up votes in numbers enough to corrupt the community. The passion on one side is neutralized by the passion on the other. The rogues have less influence, because rogues do not agree. One has one motive of selfishness, another has a different one. The appeals to class prejudice, attempts to excite contempt and derision or ignorance or jealousy and envy toward wealth and education, abound, unhappily, to-day. But I believe they are less than they were in the time of Washington and Jefferson. The questions asked to-day on our politi-

cal platforms, as to the matter which is up for discussion, are: Is it right? Is it just? Is it humane? Is it for the highest welfare of the State? No speaker touches a public audience better than he who appeals to the best, purest, and highest motives in our nature.

Some of our friends who admit that the argument is on the side of the champions of woman suffrage point to a few indiscreet or ungainly persons who appear on the platform at woman-suffrage meetings, and ask if we are willing to enlist ourselves under such leaders, or work in company with such companions. Doubtless this appeal frightens some sensitive women and some fastidious men. But it is an old story. Many a man remained a Tory in Revolutionary time because he did not like to have his sleeve rubbed against the sleeve of Sam Adams, or to be taunted with the leadership of Tom Paine. Many a good man in the North kept out of the antislavery movement who believed thoroughly in its principles, because he could not bear to clasp hands with Henry Wilson, or to be confounded with the followers of Garrison, or to appear among the grotesque figures that were visible on the Free-Soil platform. But we are getting past this in the movement for woman suffrage. If anybody's taste is shocked by an occasional exhibition of a queer character at a woman-suffrage meeting, or if his ear is pained by the shrill or strident voice of some feminine orator, we will invite him to a comparison—even if it were a question of mere taste—of the conspicuous opponents of woman suffrage with its conspicuous advocates. When they have matched, or over-matched, Lucy Stone or Lucretia Mott in everything that constitutes a sweet and gracious womanhood, we will ask them to find among the opponents of woman suffrage four masculine figures whom they will like to select as leaders or companions rather than Abraham Lincoln, Salmon P. Chase, John G. Whittier, and Ralph Waldo Emerson.

I go for all sharing the privileges of the government who assist in bearing its burdens, by no means excluding women.—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

I think there will be no end to the good that will come by Woman's Suffrage on the elected, on elections, on government, and on woman herself.—CHIEF JUSTICE CHASE.

FOR over forty years I have not hesitated to declare my conviction that justice and fair dealing, and the democratic principles of our government, demand equal rights and privileges of citizenship, irrespective of sex. I have not been able to see any good reason for denying the ballot to woman.—JOHN G. WHITTIER.

If the wants, the passions, the vices, are allowed a full vote through the hands of a half-brutal, intemperate population, I think it but fair that the

virtues, the aspirations, should be allowed a full vote, as an offset, through the purest part of the people.—RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

George F. Hoar.

THE WRONGS AND PERILS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.



HE pending proposal to extend the suffrage to women imposes upon men the duty of deciding whether to retain power where it was lodged by the founders of existing governments, or to make women eligible to vote and hold office upon the same terms as men.

DISFRANCHISED CLASSES.

WITH inconsiderable exceptions, the common sense of the human race, as expressed in civil government, has confined its prerogatives to men. When necessary to preserve an unbroken line in hereditary monarchies, women have been invested with sovereignty. In some communities, where property qualifications exist, they possess a limited right to vote, and to hold minor executive offices.

To portray an idiot, a criminal in prison garb, an Indian in barbaric finery, a lunatic staring in frenzy, and a woman whose features indicate intelligence and refinement, and to entitle the representation, "American Woman and her Political Peers," may beguile the unwary, but others will ask, Does the picture include all disfranchised classes? and, Is their exclusion from the suffrage for similar reasons?

It does not include all. To complete the picture, might be added a portrait of Alexander Hamilton, who, at the appearance of trouble between Great Britain and the Colonies, when he was still a school-boy barely eighteen years of age, wrote a series of papers in defense of the rights of the Colonies which were at first taken for the production of John Jay; and who, when only twenty,—and consequently not allowed to vote,—was aide-de-camp to Washington.

There would also be needed a portrait of one of the distinguished foreigners who, after a study of the Constitution of this country, have adopted it as their own, and yet, after arriving, are disfranchised for a term of years.

Foreigners are disfranchised for a period of time assumed to be long enough for men of average ability to comprehend the institutions and interests, and to identify themselves therewith sufficiently to "have a stake in the country"; criminals are not allowed to vote because, being foes to society and to the government, they have forfeited all claim to personal and

political liberty; insane persons and idiots are debarred, being incompetent to understand; Indians, on account of their tribal claims to an independent sovereignty, and other causes peculiar to themselves; Chinamen, because forbidden naturalization. Young men under twenty-one years of age are not permitted to vote because it is assumed that the average male has not the knowledge and stability of character wisely to exercise the franchise until he has had twenty-one years of life in the land of his birth.

Woman is not refused admission to the suffrage on any of these grounds. The picture is not true to life, and the ideas which it is designed to suggest confuse rather than elucidate the question whether women should be eligible to vote, and hold office, upon the same terms as men.

Whether the suffrage shall be conferred upon any class of men or women cannot be decided exclusively upon the question of natural rights. These do, indeed, require the protection of all in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, so long as the same are exercised in a manner compatible with the rights of others. The arrival of a second man upon a desert island would necessitate a whole series of compromises which, if not accepted, would result in the abject submission of the weaker, his flight, or war to the death.

In this country it is agreed that the majority of voters shall rule. What fundamental principle gives to two millions the absolute right to rule over two millions less one? As at the age of seventeen some are better qualified for the suffrage than many at forty, what absolute natural right decrees that none shall exercise the franchise until twenty-one years old? These, and many other provisions, are compromises to which the people submit for the sake of the results. Should a citizen change his residence from one State to another, he must remain there a specified time before he can vote; nor could he, one day after legally changing his residence, return and cast a ballot where he had lived all his life. If born in Canada, though brought over the line when an infant, he could never become President. Also, every citizen must vote at such times and places as the law prescribes. Nor can one unavoidably detained from his legal residence, even in the service of

the country, as in the army and navy, or in the Federal Congress, demand a subsequent opportunity, or be permitted to deposit a sealed ballot in advance of the time, forward the same, or vote by proxy.

FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIETY.

AN advocate of woman suffrage declares that its opponents "must show that it is incompatible either with the best conception of the State, or with the nature of womanhood." While the burden of proof should rest upon those who would change the universal practice, I hold, and will present the grounds for the belief, that to impose direct responsibility in this particular upon women is incompatible with the nature of womanhood, and with the best conception of the State.

There is a feminine, as well as a masculine, soul; a spiritual sex, as well as a corporeal.

Frederic Harrison, in contrasting men and women, justly says, "Not one man in ten can compare with the average woman in tact, subtlety of observation, in refinement of mental habit, in rapidity, agility, and sympathetic touch; in sudden movement, in perseverance, in passive endurance, in dealing with the minutest surroundings of comfort, grace, and convenience." He predicates of man, as distinguished from woman, "a greater capacity for prolonged attention, intense abstraction, wide range, extraordinary complication, immense endurance, intensity, variety, and majesty of will."

From the same difference arise the virtues and vices, respectively, of the sexes, modified by different degrees of physical strength.

If there be no such feminine nature as distinguished from the masculine; if the abstraction of the mental and spiritual elements peculiar to woman, and their being replaced by those characteristic of man, would make no radical and harmful difference in the constitution of society, there is no reason for exempting women from the responsibilities of government.

On closely considering the State, it appears that the fundamental fact is not most frequently the subject of discussion. The political economist occasionally refers to it, the statesman and legislator deal with a few of its phases, it is seen more frequently in the courts, and asserts itself in various details in a thousand forms, but it is seldom comprehended as a whole. That fact is that the individuals who form the State are constantly changing, are proceeding, in fact, across the earth, finally disappearing, rather than permanently domiciled upon it. Nevertheless, the State endures because there are constantly fresh arrivals through the fami-

lies into which society is divided. The State directly takes no cognizance of these immature beings, who, though human, are without strength or understanding. Their parents are their rulers, responsible for their support, and exercising the prerogatives of government, issuing mandates, requiring submission; permitted to chastise, imprison, and to direct their actions in numberless ways. It depends upon the parents to train them in such a manner as to qualify them for the duties of citizenship, according to the statutes and laws of the land. Only when parents are incapable or unwilling to discharge their responsibilities does the State take cognizance of the situation. In proportion as this State within a State is maintained in its integrity is the nation strong, happy, and prosperous. It is the fountain of private, and the source of public, morality.

Whatever may be said of a few minds of a peculiar structure, lifelong partnerships for better or worse could not be maintained by two natures of the same kind, debating all questions in the same plane, with no natural predominating tendency. The coherence and permanence of the family depend upon the difference in the mental and emotional constitution of men and women. The family is a union of two manifestations of a common human nature, masculine and feminine of soul as well as body; molding, governing, and guiding the children, each after its own manner, and diffusing through society the blended influence of wife, mother, daughter, sister, and husband, father, son, and brother.

The bearing of these principles upon the relations of wives and mothers to the suffrage is that to govern in the State would unfit woman for her position in the family.

It is mere sophism to say that the simple dropping of a piece of paper into a ballot-box could not produce such a result. Unless women are to be treated like children, and furnished with the ballot by men, it is not the mere dropping of a piece of paper, for it implies the whole mode of thinking, feeling, and acting, of which a vote is the concentrated expression. "The vote is the expression of government; voting is governing." To vote intelligently is to think and act in the imperative mood; and to be qualified as voters, girls must be trained to think, feel, and act in the spirit of boys.

To avoid the force of this, it would be necessary to show that women will not be affected in this way, or that, should they be, no harm will result. John Stuart Mill admits that it will produce this effect, and asserts that women are held "in subjection" in the family, and should be emancipated. Wendell Phillips said, "No one can foresee the effect; therefore the only way

is to plunge in." Others affirm that "under all possible circumstances feminine instincts will preserve woman." "Plunging in" without a high probability that the effect will be good is never wise, except when destruction impends over the existing situation.

To assume that either men or women will remain unchanged in their intellectual, moral, and emotional susceptibilities, whatever their situation, is contrary to the facts of evolution, environment, and culture. In countless individual cases, and even in nations, woman has shown a capacity to rise or fall, a susceptibility to moral and intellectual modifications not surpassed, if equaled, by men.

Not only would the governing spirit become a part of her character, greatly obstructing the discharge of the duties of home, but it would make her position there an insupportable restraint. Man is naturally self-reliant; woman may, in an emergency, develop self-reliance and complete independence; but is naturally disposed either to coalesce in the determining tendency of her husband, or to control it by persuasion. Imbued with the governing spirit, she will become as restive in her position as would he if similarly placed. This is avowed by many advocates of woman suffrage, and held up as a result to be desired. The more consistent go fearlessly to the end, and define marriage as a civil contract to be terminated at the will of either party, and society as a collection of independent units instead of an assemblage of families.

That there are exceptions to the ideal family, here assumed as the nucleus of society, is true. Some women rule their husbands; a larger number through the misfortune, weakness, or wickedness of the husband are obliged to support the family, and there are many single women and widows. These exceptions to the general law often have much to bear; but not so much as to justify the overthrow of the whole structure with a view to rebuild upon exceptions. Every female child must be presumed eligible to wifehood and motherhood; therefore the whole sex should be left to the exercise of that kind of influence for which their nature and relation to the family qualify them, and which is required in the interest of society.

An argument drawn from exceptions may be very plausibly affirmed. Suppose a movement to enact a law requiring the training of all children in public institutions. In its support it might be maintained that there are numerous orphans, that many children have lost one parent, and that many parents are cruel, intemperate, incompetent, or unfaithful; that relatively few feel, and conscientiously and intelligently discharge, their responsibilities. These propositions are indisputable: how then shall the

scheme to require all children to be educated by the State be shown to be untenable? Only by affirming that the general law of nature is that parents must be responsible for their offspring. To remove the children of those willing and able to train them, because of these exceptions, would be cruel and unjust; and such a wholesale destruction of home life is not necessary, because the general rule is that parents, with all their imperfections, do train their children in a manner better adapted to promote the public weal than is any institutional training. Individual exceptions must be cared for by private philanthropy, or by special statutes which are compatible with the effectual working of the general law.

The same method of reasoning vindicates the conclusion that the general law necessary for the preservation of the family should not be overthrown in order that unmarried women and widows might be introduced into political life.

Nor would a specific statute admitting single women to the suffrage, and excluding married women therefrom, be expedient or right; for then another evil of stupendous proportions would result, namely: the putting of a premium upon the unmarried or childless condition, since such women would have much more time and strength for the political arena than wives and mothers, and could gain many more personal, pecuniary, and political advantages.

NOTABLE REVERSALS OF OPINION.

It was a deep and serious consideration of these things which led some of the greatest of men to reverse their opinions after having been strongly in favor of woman suffrage, or inclined to espouse it.

Horace Bushnell, when assured that the principles of progress which he had adopted required him to support woman suffrage, reopened the question. After protracted thought he was forced to the conclusion that it would be "a reform against nature."

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

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

To this he adds personal testimony :

In my experience I have observed evil results to many women who have entered hotly into political conflict and discussion. I would save them from it. I am, respectfully yours,

JOHN BRIGHT.

Goldwin Smith is also one of those who voted with Mr. Mill. He was led to change his opinion by considerations similar to those adduced by Mr. Bright, and adds that another important reason was that he found "that those women whom he had always regarded as the best representatives of their sex among his acquaintances were by no means in favor of the change."

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

Mr. Gladstone, who had sometimes spoken as though he thought the change might have more to be said in its favor than against it, was appealed to two years ago in the most desperate crisis of his life by those women in England who demand the suffrage offering their support if he would avow himself in favor of the principle. He sat down to investigate it in the light of the bill then proposed in parliament, "Extending Parliamentary Suffrage to Women," but confined to unmarried women, and after pointing out the impropriety of that proposal says :

I speak of the change as being a fundamental change in the whole social function of woman, because I am bound in considering this bill to take into view not only what it enacts, but what it involves. . . . It proposes to place the individual

¹When about thirty years of age I accepted for a time the doctrine of woman suffrage, and publicly defended it. Years of wide and careful observation have convinced me that the demand for woman suffrage in America is without foundation in equity, and, if successful, must prove harmful to American society. I

woman on the same footing in regard to Parliamentary elections as the individual man. She is to vote, she is to propose or nominate, she is to be designated by the law as competent to use and to direct, with advantage not only to the community but to herself, all those public agencies which belong to our system of parliamentary representation. She—not the individual woman marked by special tastes, possessed of special gifts, but the woman as such—is by these changes to be plenary launched into the whirlpool of public life, such as it is in the nineteenth century, and such as it is to be in the twentieth century. . . .

A permanent and vast difference of type has been impressed upon woman and man respectively by the Maker of both. Their differences of social office rest mainly upon causes not flexible and elastic like most mental qualities, but physical and in their nature unchangeable. I, for one, am not prepared to say which of the two classes has the higher, and which the other, province, but I recognize the subtle and profound character of the difference between them. . . . I am not without fear lest, beginning with the state, we should eventually have been found to have intruded into what is yet more fundamental and sacred, the precinct of the family, and should dislocate or injuriously modify the relations of domestic life. . . . As this is not a party question, or a class question, so neither is it a sex question. I have no fear lest the woman should encroach upon the power of the man; the fear I have is lest we should invite her unwittingly to trespass upon the delicacy, the purity, the refinement, the elevation of her own nature, which are the present sources of its power.

I admit that in the universities, in the professions, in the secondary circles of public action, we have already gone so far as to give a shadow of plausibility to the present proposals to go farther; but it is a shadow only, for we have done nothing that plunges the woman as such into the turmoil of masculine life.

Upon Bishop John H. Vincent, the founder of Chautauqua, the consideration of this subject has naturally been forced, and to it he has given years of reflection, closely following the influence of modern general and higher education upon society, and in particular upon the home. In former years he was an advocate of woman suffrage; but though enthusiastically devoted to the spread of knowledge, and having distributed diplomas to thousands of women who have pursued the extended course of reading of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, he has been compelled to reverse his attitude. In response to a request for a concise statement of the grounds which led to the change of his views, I received the letter which appears as a foot-note.¹

find some worthy women defending it, but the majority of our best women, especially our most intelligent, domestic, and godly mothers, neither ask for nor desire it. The instinct of motherhood is against it. The basal conviction of our best manhood is against it. The movement is at root a protest against the representa-

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENTS WEIGHED.

THE previous considerations, if well founded, will be sufficient to deter every thoughtful citizen who believes the family to be the foundation and safeguard of all that is valuable in civilization from attempting an experiment so dangerous; yet an examination of the popular phrases relied upon to prepare the way for the plunge seems necessary.

It is alleged that "it is obviously fair and right that those who obey the laws should have a voice in making them; that all who pay the taxes should have a voice in levying them; and that men cannot represent women until women shall have legally consented to it, and this they have never done."

But if it is better to exempt them from the responsibilities of government, that the influence which they are naturally qualified to exert, and which is essential to the well-being of society, may not be diminished, it would not be "fair and right" to give women the same kind of voice in making laws that men have. Woman's influence in forming the characters and principles of the law-makers insures care for her.

"No taxation without representation" as an abstract principle is just, but it does not follow that the representation must be identical. The authors of the Declaration of Independence, the framers of the Massachusetts Bill of Rights, did not perceive any incongruity between declaring that "all men are born free and equal," that there should be "no taxation without representation," that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and at the same time relieving women from the responsibility and burdens of government. Taxation is not levied upon the property of men and women respectively upon different principles, but upon property as such by whomsoever held.

The property rights of woman are better protected now than they could be if she were actively engaged in politics. Not long since,

tive relations and functions by virtue of which each sex depends upon and is exalted by the other. This theory and policy, tending to the subversion of the natural and divine order, must make man less a man, and woman less a woman. A distinguished woman advocate of this suffrage movement says, "We need the ballot to protect us against men." When one sex is compelled thus to protect itself against the other the foundations of society are already crumbling. Woman now makes man what he is. She controls him as babe, boy, manly son, brother, lover, husband, father. Her influence is enormous. If she use it wisely, she needs no additional power. If she abuse her opportunity, she deserves no additional responsibility. Her womanly weight, now without measure, will be limited to the value of a single ballot, and her control over from two to five additional votes forfeited.

a lady of rare intelligence, arguing in favor of the suffrage, stated that it was proposed to pave a street in which she lived, contrary to the judgment and wishes of the property-holders, most of whom were widows and single women. She attributed the scheme to "recklessness on the part of men, most of whom paid no taxes. Had she and her friends been able to vote, such a thing would not have been attempted." When asked concerning the outcome, the response was that she and a few other interested women "went to the leaders of both parties, and easily persuaded them to defeat the proposition." She did not appear to perceive that if she had been a voter her influence would have been confined to members of her own party.

Should it be said that this principle, if admitted, would justify slavery, it may be fairly replied that the motive of slavery was self-aggrandizement by individuals, its method the violent restraint of personal liberty. But the motive which relieves woman from government is the belief that the exercise of the suffrage by her will work an injury to herself and to the family, and thereby to the State.

The proposition that men cannot represent women until they have legally consented to it is specious, but not sound. Who has ever been asked whether he consents to the government that exists here? That government was established before the present inhabitants were born. Under it the supreme power inheres in adult male citizens. The consent of the governed is and must be taken for granted, except as changes are made by constitutional methods, until a revolution arises. Then all questions sink out of sight save this, "Shall the government stand?" and that question must be decided by the arbitrament of war.

It is affirmed that "capacity indicates sphere; woman has a capacity to vote intelligently, therefore she should be empowered to do so," and that "the dignity and authority of the ballot would increase her influence as it does that of man." There are various acts for which

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

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

JOHN H. VINCENT.

TOPEKA, Kansas, April 18, 1894.

woman has the ability that she should not be asked or compelled by the law to perform. If it be said, Why not leave the question to her judgment and instincts? it is because the qualifications of voters must be prescribed by law. If the population of the globe consisted exclusively of men *or* women, to confer the ballot upon any who had been without it would increase their dignity and authority. But since it is composed of both, and woman's influence is not derived from authority, or her true dignity symbolized by the ballot, the clenched fist, or the drawn sword, it would add nothing to her power.

The claim is made that "woman suffrage has worked beneficially wherever tried." It was tried in New Jersey. On July 2, 1776, the provincial assembly conferred the suffrage upon women; in 1797 seventy-five women voted, and in the Presidential election of 1800 a large number availed themselves of the privilege. At first the law was construed to admit single women only, but afterward it was made to include females eighteen years old, married or single, without distinction of race. In the spring of 1807 a special election was held in Essex County to decide on the location of the courthouse and jail. Newark and vicinity struggled to retain the county buildings, Elizabethtown to remove them. The contest waxed warm, and, according to a paper on "The Origin, Practice, and Prohibition of Female Suffrage in New Jersey," read by the Hon. William A. Whitehead, Corresponding Secretary of the New Jersey Historical Society,

It was soon found, though only women of full age, possessing the required property qualification, were permitted by judges of election to vote, that every married woman in the country was not only of "full age," but also "worth fifty pounds proclamation money clear estate," and as such entitled to vote if they chose. And not only once, but as often as, by change of dress or complicity of the inspectors, they might be able to repeat the process.

In Acquackanonk township, thought to contain about three hundred voters, over eighteen hundred votes were polled, all but seven in the interest of Newark.

One woman voted three times. Her name was Mary Johnson, and she cast her first vote under that name. Afterward, as a somewhat stouter-looking woman, she voted as Mary Still, and later in the day as a corpulent person whose name was Mary Yet. The legislature set aside the election as fraudulent, and the whole State was so disgusted that an act was passed restricting the suffrage to white male citizens twenty-one years of age.

It was tried in Utah. Introduced by the Mormons, who designed by it to maintain their

ascendancy over the Gentiles, the women supported not only polygamy wherever they had an opportunity, but anything else suggested by the Mormon hierarchy. On March 22, 1882, the Federal Congress passed an act deciding that no polygamist, or any woman cohabiting with such, could take part in any election. This left the wives of monogamists, and unmarried women, in possession of their vote; but the Edmunds-Tucker bill, designed to destroy polygamy, by a Federal law, February 9, 1887, withdrew the suffrage from all women in Utah.

"It has been tried in the great State of Wyoming, where it has worked so beneficially that the legislature has unanimously adopted a resolution of commendation."

The entire population of the State of Wyoming, according to the census of 1890, is only 60,705, of which 39,343 are males and 21,362 females. The largest city is Cheyenne, with a population of 11,690, and the next, Laramie, which has 6388. Besides these there was only one town with a population of more than 3000, and only one with more than two and less than three, and only four with more than 1000 and less than two. Of the population of the State, 16,291 are between five and twenty years of age, and there are only 27,044 males of voting age in the State; and this sparse population is scattered over an area twice that of the State of New York. According to Judge Cary of Wyoming the women consist of less than twenty per cent. of the voting population. "Usually about half of them go to the polls."

The complacency with which the legislature unanimously praises itself and its constituents has often been paralleled, but in the absence of details can hardly be regarded as the best testimony of which the case admits. None of the questions comprehended in the government of dense populations and vast cities is brought to the test. Citizens so generally isolated are practically a law to themselves. Pauperism would not be likely to exist under such conditions; vice in many sections could be practised without attracting attention; crowds at elections, in the absence of people enough to make a crowd, would be difficult to assemble. Unless the State has been grossly slandered, various troubles have occurred within a few years approximating the gravity of civil war. There is no unusual restraint upon the sale of liquor, and little attention is paid to enforcing such laws as women might be supposed to be specially interested to maintain. Without intending to reflect in a wholesale way upon the officers elected in that State, such inquiries as I have made, with some observation, show that, as a whole, they do not merit any unusual eulogium. But the population is too small, and

the conditions are too peculiar, to make the experiment of any value; nor is the legislative testimony of importance when it is considered that any class, male or female, the commendation of whose influence might be under consideration, contains a sufficient number who would execute vengeance at the polls upon those who would venture to take a negative position.

"Women are better than men, and therefore would make better laws, and would reform politics."

To show that women are better than men it is customary to present statistics of the number of the sexes respectively in prisons and in churches. Undoubtedly more than two thirds of the imprisoned criminals of the country are men, and probably more than two thirds of the communicants of the churches are women. But that this indicates that women are naturally better than men it is easier to assert than to prove. The majority of women are shielded and protected, while most men lead adventurous lives, away from home. Men have excessive physical energy, which frequently involves them in fierce conflicts. When they commit crimes they are more likely, under the present régime, to be convicted; for juries dislike to convict women, especially of crimes punished by long terms of imprisonment or death. Men's crimes are generally of violence, the result of excess, or distortion of those natural characteristics which in normal degree and legitimate use give them the power of defense and aggression. Women's abstention from crimes of violence is due to those characteristics which fit them for the persuasive influence which in their normal condition they exert.¹

The same differences affect their attendance at church. The majority of church-going women spend their lives during the week at home, so that to attend religious meetings is a pleasant variety. Most men spend their lives away from home in laborious exercises, for which they find little relief in attending church, except when sustained by high religious motives. That under ordinary circumstances the instincts of women would be in favor of good laws, there is no doubt; but how far their temperaments would affect the character of special enactments, and how far their personal prejudices and prepossessions would affect their political action, are practical questions of moment.

"Women will always vote against war, and thus put an end to it in the world. They will not send their husbands, brothers, fathers, and friends to the slaughter."

Does history support this statement? Where-

ever there has been a war, women have been as much interested as men. They have even encouraged their husbands, fathers, brothers, and lovers to enlist, and would have despised them if they had not. In the last war in this country, the women on both sides were more intense and irreconcilable than the men.

It is alleged that "the demand for the suffrage is the inevitable consequence of the higher education."

This follows only when the normal dissimilarity in the constitution of the sexes—"a difference but not a scale of inferiority or superiority"—is ignored or underestimated. The proper characterization of such culture is the lower education.

IV.

INSURMOUNTABLE OBJECTIONS.

THE practical objections to woman suffrage can be most clearly stated in detail.

Universal suffrage exists in the United States, with the exception of the classes hereinbefore specified. It is an unreasonable expectation that this policy will be changed. If women are to be admitted to the suffrage, all of sound mind, of legal age, not disfranchised by the effect of crime or other special causes applying equally to men, will be entitled to vote. This will add the more than three millions of negro women, all naturalized women of foreign birth, all domestic servants—in a word, all women without respect to intelligence, character, or race, except the Chinese and Indians. In the whole country it will nearly double the vote, and in several States much more than double it. Similar considerations apply to jury duty, which is a concomitant of the ballot.

That the nation has gone so far in a dangerous path does not make it necessary to proceed farther.

The physiological and pathological reasons for the abstention of women from political work and excitement are not diminished but increased by the complexity of modern civilization. Exceptional cases of voluntary endurance of physical and mental strain, exhibited by the triumph of certain women in the contests of scholastic life, or in bearing unusual burdens in business, should not divert attention from the usual facts of personal or domestic life, or from the fact that a large proportion of the best women in youth, middle life, and age will be unable to respond to demands upon them at set times, in storm or calm, for the different forms of service involved in voting and holding of-

¹ With these general views of men and women in respect to crime, etc., Frances E. Willard seems to agree; for in an article entitled "The Woman's Cause is Man's Cause," in the "Arena" for May, 1892, she

says: "We do not claim that this is because woman is inherently better than man (although his voice has ten thousand times declared it); we are inclined to think it is her more favorable environment."

fice, or in securing the qualifications for the one or the other.

Here and there a physician may evoke smiles and compliments from advocates of the suffrage for women by declaring that he knows of no anatomical or physiological impediment to the assumption by women of the duties of political life. But the medical faculty as a whole have no sympathy with his sycophancy, and the common sense of the race, and the observation and experience of most women, concur with them rather than with those who would render legal and necessary the participation of the whole sex in the agitations and exposures of campaigns and elections.

Woman suffrage cannot achieve what its advocates expect. They think that it will reform public morals, close the saloons and other places of evil resort, and realize absolute prudence, honesty, and economy in management.

Laws that do not carry the votes of a majority of the men of a community cannot be executed. Law-abiding citizens require no force to induce obedience; but those disposed to break the law can be compelled to keep it only by force. There is a natural instinct in man which leads him to submit to persuasion by women, and to resist force applied by them. It cannot be eradicated by philosophy, refinement, or religion, and in every generation reappears with undiminished vigor. If women were admitted to political life, the tendency would be for both parties to pass all kinds of laws to please women, which would be dead letters unless they carried the judgment of a majority of the male citizens. In the absence of this, to enforce them would involve a change in the character of the government in the direction of despotism.

Religious feuds would affect political life much more than under present circumstances. It is of immense importance to the welfare of this country that the separation of Church and State be complete. The feelings of women upon the subject of religion are so intense that the franchise, in a large majority of instances, would be exercised under the power of religious prejudice. John Bright, in one of his most important speeches on this subject, exclaimed, "Of one thing there is no doubt: the influence of priest, parson, and minister will be greatly increased if this measure is passed."

Chivalry, with its refining influence over men, must pass away when women become politicians. It is not a favorable portent that of late it has become customary for the advocates of woman suffrage to disparage that chivalrous feeling which causes normal men, wherever modern civilization exists, to treat women with deference, and to be ready to extend them needful aid. At present one of the chief refining ele-

ments of society is the respect felt for women as such by men. Even those who voluntarily form evil associations still esteem the ideal woman. The passing or decline of this sentiment is equally unfavorable to both; for it will accustom men to resist the influence of women.

That it will be undiminished when the fierce conflicts of party politics are involved is an unwarranted hope. All special courtesy to women grows out of the recognition of a kind of influence peculiar to them, and a dependence on their part which must be swept away when they contend on the same plane with men in the political arena. There are many indications that it lessens in proportion as women come forward to compete with men in public life and in business. In the latter case it is an incidental result of a necessity; but it will be the natural consequence of a condition when women appear in politics.

In England, when women first appeared upon the hustings, they were received with the old chivalry, but in recent elections, the contest being fierce, all respect has disappeared. Noted women were treated most disrespectfully in the very heart of London, and people of all parties agree that England has never seen so much participation of women, or such rude treatment of them, as in the last election. In Wales Mrs. Cornwallis West tried to quell a disturbance among the electors who refused to hear Colonel West speak. She obtained a momentary hearing, but the disorder revived, and she exclaimed with much heat, "I am an Irish woman, but it was not until I came to Wales that I found men capable of refusing to hear a woman who was pleading a cause." She was silenced by yells and hisses, and was finally compelled to retire from the platform.

The introduction of women into political life will increase its bitterness. That politics create violent feuds is too evident to be questioned. At present they are modified by the undisturbed relations between the wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters of the combatants. When the struggle has been decided at the polls, these social relations serve to bring about a calm, and the resumption of personal harmony. This was admirably stated by Horace Bushnell:

Hitherto it has been an advantage to be going into our suffrages with a full half, and that (when left to its normal environment and habits) the better half morally, as a corps of reserve left behind, so that we may fall back on this quiet element, or base, several times a day, and always at night, to recompense our courage, and settle again our mental and moral equilibrium. Now it is proposed that we have no reserve any longer, that we go into our conflicts taking our women with us, all to be kept heating in the same fire for weeks or months together, without interspersings of rest,

or quieting times of composure. We are to be as much more excited of course, as we can be, and the women are of course to be as much more excited than we as they are more excitable. Let no man imagine that our women are going into these encounters to be just as quiet or as little nerved as now, when they sit in the rear, unexcited, letting us come back to them often to recover our reason. They are to be no more mitigators now, but instigators rather, sweltering in the same fierce heats and commotions, only more fiercely stirred than we.

It is the very distinctive qualities culminating in an exquisite sensibility, the source of woman's charm in private and family and social life, which, exposed to the attrition and agitations of party conflicts, will most fan the flame.

In this country these liabilities have been illustrated where women have come into anything analogous to political life. The feud that existed for years between two wings of the Woman Suffrage Association in the United States is ancient but still instructive history.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, organized for the promotion of an end in which all were agreed, managed by leaders to whom all are accustomed to defer, would not be expected to have any serious difficulty. But when a feud arose which ostensibly began because of a divergence of opinion with respect to the relation which the Union should sustain to political parties, it speedily became intense, and a distinguished woman, the leader of the minority, more than intimates concerning the national president, that,

in all her great work she has been but seeking a background for her personal exploits, and a theater for the exercise of her wonderful powers and accomplishments.

To this, by order of the executive committee, a reply was prepared by a sub-committee of four women of national recognition, which, after making various charges, culminates in a passage unsurpassed in sting of innuendo:

Whatever values — has won as chairman of the Women's Republican National League, as one of the famous "spell-binders," and wife of a Republican official, she has lost the faith of her old comrades in her sincerity, the chaplet of their admiring love, and the crown of leadership in the grandest body of women known in the world.

The closest approximation to political life on a national scale ever made in this country was the National Board of Lady Managers of the World's Fair. These were women of high character and social influence, most of them accustomed to various forms of public life, selected because of their standing in the States whence they came. A large proportion of them at all times spoke and acted in such a manner

as to command universal respect, and their work as a whole secured the approbation of the country.

But the Board had honors to confer, awards to make, and patronage to distribute. Discord arose between the secretary and the president, the former being a lawyer and a noted advocate of woman suffrage. This controversy lasted for months, threatening to embroil the country. Jealousy of the president's failure to introduce some of her colleagues to the Duchess de Veragua caused a stormy scene. Later, another charged a woman in higher office with instructing the presidents of the various meetings to exclude her from participation in the speaking. Owing to various bitter quarrels among the members, and factional opposition, the president intimated her intention to resign. It must be remembered that the president was a woman of tact and rare ability as a presiding officer. On one day, after a long altercation, accompanied by many personal contradictions, the Board stopped business, and the members left the hall in confusion without adjourning. A sectional war broke out, when a lady exclaimed with reference to the nomination of jurors: "New York has eight representatives and North Dakota none. I want to know the reason why. There is something crooked going on here, and I am going to find it out."

Subsequently several women commissioners appealed to the National Commission against alleged injustice. And later, in open debate, one delegate charged another with being "an arrogant, malicious, injurious, and vindictive woman," which caused intense general excitement accompanied by ejaculations and tears. For several days the disturbance was renewed; but peace was finally made, and the account of the controversy was expunged from the records. Such was the effect of these scenes that some of the members of the Board reversed their opinion on the desirableness of woman's entering political life.

Further illustrations appeared during the recent canvass in the State of New York for petitions to strike out the word male from the Constitution, when a counter-movement was begun by women. The protestants were characterized by educated ladies in public assemblies as "traitors to their sex," "copperheads," "betrayers of the cause of woman," and such was the intensity of the feeling that these terms and phrases evoked general applause. The women who presumed to resist the innovation were characterized by one of their sisters, in a contribution to an important periodical, as "parasites who have mentally retrograded."

It will place a new and terrible strain upon the family relation. The ratio of marriages relatively to the number of the population is

diminishing; the number of divorces has been increasing alarmingly for the past thirty years. They are most numerous in sections of the country where there has been a persistent and almost fierce demand for the ballot.

The introduction of political disputes and party work into family life will develop and increase incompatibility, a prolific cause of separations, infidelity to the marriage contract, and divorce. To this it has been responded: "There has always been more contention over religion than over politics, yet often the wife is a member of one church, and the husband of another or of none; and yet the family is not disrupted, and it is evident from the seeming concord of the household that the two have agreed to disagree." That the family can bear existing strains does not prove that it could endure all that it has and a greater than any of them. Even the worst of men generally wish their wives, unless they become fanatics, to be religious, or do not seriously object to it. But there is a radical difference between political excitement and any other. A political difference means that the most intense feelings shall be excited and kept at fever heat for several weeks or months, liable to culminate in a direct act of opposition, the wife going to the polls against her husband, and he against her, exchanging glances of sympathy with life-long political opponents, perhaps cooperating in active opposition. The wife may be working and voting against her husband's most intimate business or personal friends, and endeavoring to secure the passage of laws especially obnoxious to him. In cases of disagreement, where there are children, each parent would endeavor to surpass the other in capturing recruits at the family altar, the table, and the fireside. At the end of the conflict the defeated would be left without the sympathy of the other; and not only without the sympathy, but in many cases with the taunt and sneer.

These possibilities should not be considered merely or chiefly with respect to established families, united "by the reciprocal ties of friendly intercourse," through many years down to the time of the introduction of woman suffrage. The strain will be most felt whenever and wherever the tie is weakest, whether the cause be the inexperience and impulsiveness of early married life, or the accumulated incompatibilities which test the self-control of many. To resort to the assumption that "women will generally vote as their husbands do" is to renounce most of the considerations advanced in favor of the movement.

To invest her with the responsibility of voting will diminish the real power of woman in speech. At present she may say what she will; men hear, and, without subjecting her words

to too close a scrutiny, are influenced by her spirit. Require her to vote, identify her with a party, and in some instances she will grow timid; where she refuses to restrain herself, she will become an impediment to party success, and will be ignored. When women oppose women, their party conflicts will deprive them of that power by which they now leaven public sentiment.

In an argument in favor of giving the suffrage to woman, a senator of Massachusetts brought forward as an example of intellectual and moral fitness for the franchise Mrs. Clara Leonard, whom he justly characterized as the highest living authority on private and public charities. Mrs. Leonard has recently thus expressed her estimate of the value of the ballot to woman:

It is the opinion of many of us that woman's power is greater without the ballot, or possibility of office-holding for gain, when, standing outside of politics, she discusses great questions on their merits. Much has been achieved by women for the anti-slavery cause, temperance, the improvement of public and private charities, the reformation of criminals, and by intelligent discussion and influence upon men. Our legislators have been ready to listen to women and carry out their plans when well formed.

It may reasonably be expected to deteriorate the moral tone of most of the women who become political leaders, and affect unfavorably all who take an active part in politics; and it will introduce dangerous forms of corruption. The principal causes of political immorality are the desire for power, for "spoils" in money and office, bribery, craft, party and personal prejudice. Is it reasonable to believe that women who become political leaders, and intensely excited in political campaigns, will escape the influence of these demoralizing elements? Certainly it will not be maintained that women are destitute of ambition, that they are above the influence of prejudice or prepossession, that personal favoritism can never warp their judgment, that money, or what it procures, has no charm for them. While some—in the aggregate, many—would resist every temptation, preserve their womanliness, and illustrate in high places all the virtues, is certain. But to subject the entire sex to such influences would inevitably lower its moral tone.

When women vote generally,—and if they are not to vote generally the agitation is useless,—all classes will need to be instructed and led to the polls. There must be women leaders for different classes, as there are among men. Women who aspire to be leaders, or are made such by their constituents, will be compelled to associate for political purposes with other wo-

men similarly related to the party. At present the morals of society are largely preserved by the fact that a woman of doubtful character is not admitted to the society of women of unspotted reputation. It is easy to maintain such an attitude now; it would be impossible in a general participation of women in politics. Also that leading political women will be brought into confidential relations with men occupying similar relations in the same party is a consequence of the proposed revolution which would not long be delayed. Its effect upon domestic peace, and public and private morality, could not be salutary.

A RATIONAL FORECAST.

SHOULD the suffrage be extended to women the grant can never be recalled. Experiments in legislating upon economic questions, even if unwise, need not be permanently harmful, for they may be repealed; but in dealing with the suffrage, or with moral questions, new laws, if bad, are exceedingly dangerous. They will develop a class lowered in tone, or deriving personal, pecuniary, or political advantages from the new environment, who will vehemently declare that the effect of the innovation is beneficial, and resist all efforts to return to the former state.

Should the duty of governing in the State be imposed upon women, all the members of society will suffer; children, by diminished care from their mothers; husbands, from the in-

crease of the contentions, and the decline of the attractions of home; young men and maidens, from the diminution or destruction of the idealism which invests the family with such charms as to make the hope of a home of one's own, where in the contrasts of the sexes life may be ever a delight, an impulse to economy and virtue—but the greatest sufferer will be woman. Often those who recollect her genuine freedom of speech, "the might of her gentleness," the almost resistless potency of her look and touch and voice, will long for the former proud dependence of woman on manliness, reciprocated by man's reverence for womanliness; while "the new generation, to whom such sweet recollections will be unknown, will blindly rave against their fate or despondently sink under it, as women have never done (from similar causes) under the old régime." Meanwhile the office-holding, intriguing, campaigning, lobbying, mannish woman will celebrate the day of emancipation,— which, alas, will be the day of degradation,— when, grasping at sovereignty, she lost her empire.

The true woman needs no governing authority conferred upon her by law. In the present situation the highest evidence of respect that man can exhibit toward woman, and the noblest service he can perform for her, are to vote *NAY* to the proposition that would take from her the diadem of pearls, the talisman of faith, hope, and love, by which all other requests are won from men, and substitute for it the iron crown of authority.

J. M. Buckley.

[In accordance with the conditions of this debate, the foregoing articles were written independently, and have not been changed since they were sent to the authors in order to enable them to prepare the postscripts which follow—which are also written independently of each other.—EDITOR C. M.]

POSTSCRIPT BY SENATOR HOAR.

I HAVE read Dr. Buckley's paper entitled "The Wrongs and Perils of Woman Suffrage." It does not seem to me to make it necessary that I should restate my own argument. The reading of the paper has given me great pleasure. It is, in my judgment, the strongest argument ever made on that side. All patriotic persons, whatever their present opinion, must desire that this great step should not be taken without seriously weighing everything that can be said against it. Dr. Buckley has discussed powerfully and clearly what seem to me the true points of the controversy:

"Will it be a bad thing for woman that woman should help govern the State?"

"Will it be a bad thing for the State that woman should help govern it?"

I do not suppose Dr. Buckley himself ascribes much importance to the portion of his paper headed "Disfranchised Classes." He says that the common sense of the human race, with inconsiderable exceptions, has confined the prerogatives of civil government to man. But in general the common sense of the human race has confined the prerogatives of government to a very few men—to monarchs, noblemen, aristocracies, oligarchies. We are at present addressing an audience who are agreed that what is largely the common sense of the human race is entirely mistaken in its opinion, as expressed in existing civil governments, or the civil governments of the past. So we surely need not occupy time or space in debating whether we should exclude women from a share in the gov-

ernment of the republic in which manhood suffrage is the law, because the common sense of the human race has agreed that nearly all mankind, whether masculine or feminine, should be excluded from a share in the government. Our question is, whether women should help in self-government, not whether, if it be true that most of mankind are born to obey, and a few are born to rule, it is better that the ruler should be of one sex or the other.

Dr. Buckley denies that voting is a birth-right. This denial he extends to all persons; not merely to idiots, lunatics, persons under the age of discretion, and foreigners not attached to the government, or not familiar with its principles. His readers will easily see that this claim is essential to his argument. So, we are fairly entitled to insist that all persons who think a share in the government to be a birth-right shall, if no reasons but Dr. Buckley's stand in the way, come to our conclusion. It can hardly be worth while to take much space in making an argument to persons who accept the American Constitution, State and National, as founded on sound principle, or in debating over again what our grandfathers settled.

I do not, also, care to take much more time than I have already taken in dealing with the authority of Mrs. Leonard and other ladies who, while active in affairs of government, disapprove conferring the ballot on women. I have endeavored to show already that Mrs. Leonard's practice is against her theory, and that she is mistaken only as she misunderstands what is proposed. Dr. Buckley quotes a sentence from her to the effect that woman's power is greater when, standing outside of politics, she discusses great questions on their merits. I do not think she is standing outside of politics when she discusses great political questions on their merits. I do not think she is standing outside of politics when she manages a government hospital or a normal school. I do not see how, when it is proposed to the people that some important change shall be made in these political instrumentalities, that after saying "yes" in a report, or a magazine, or a letter in a newspaper, and giving her powerful and cogent reasons, she or anybody is to be harmed if, when the vote is counted, her vote shall not be excluded. Mrs. Leonard votes when she is a member of the Massachusetts State Board of Lunacy and Charity. Mrs. Hale votes when she is a member of the Board of Trustees of the great hospital for the insane at Worcester. Other ladies vote in the Board of Education. They exercise their power by direct vote when they manage these great political instrumentalities. Will it harm either of these ladies any more to do the same thing in the town or ward where they live under the quiet security of the Australian ballot?

So we come to what I am glad to see Dr. Buckley considers the chief question, which he has dealt with so admirably and powerfully.

"Do we propose anything likely to injure womanhood, or anything likely to injure the Republic?"

I am afraid I shall do Dr. Buckley's argument injustice if I attempt to sum it up in a few lines. But of course that is all I can do here.

The argument is, if I understand it, that if women take a share in governing the State they are so far to control other wills by an authority which is submitted to because the persons submitting are subjected, governed, constrained, and obey because they are subjugated and not because they are persuaded. Women now, Dr. Buckley says in substance, exercise their control in the family as wives, mothers, or daughters, by reason of an influence which the person who submits to it is perfectly free to disregard. But the ruler of a State governed by reason of a power which the person controlled by it is not at liberty to disregard or disobey. Now he says that for women to substitute the habit of government by authority for the habit of influence by persuasion will destroy the sweet nature of womanhood itself. Dr. Buckley says a great deal more than this, which I have not time to deal with. But I select only the point which has made the most impression upon me.

It seems to me we shall find the answer to this proposition by inquiring whether the function of voting bears such a proportion to the other influences that form and affect the character, that it will tinge and color the whole character and life, or whether it will take its own color and tinge from the general character of the person who exercises it. If Lucy Stone had voted, would her character have become arrogant, quarrelsome, dishonest, ambitious, intriguing, because there is danger that political activity will create a temptation to indulge in these vices, or would the function of voting, as discharged by Lucy Stone, have been characterized by sincerity, patriotism, calmness, wisdom, sweetness, and unselfishness? Now I affirm that in mankind, in general, the function of voting takes its hue and tincture from the general character of the person who exercises it, and that the general character of the person who exercises it is not changed by the temptations which attend the struggle for political power. Voting and politics, to most men, are but a small and insignificant portion of life. They do not change opinions, or control the character of the citizen; but they take their character from the character that he brings to them. The German who has lived under the iron rule of the Cæ-

sars, the Irishman who has lived as a peasant under the heel of the Englishman, the Englishman who has lived under the hooped republicanism by which the Englishman governs himself, and with that arrogant disregard for human right with which the Englishman deals with other nations — each, when he comes here, brings to his American citizenship the quality which he gained at home, and does not change it when he takes his share in our republicanism. It may be added, also, that the function of motherhood is a function of absolute authority, perhaps the most absolute that one human being exercises over another.

Dr. Buckley narrates the story of the old New Jersey election frolic. He gives also some amusing narrations of some more recent, and rather undignified scuffles in which ladies have engaged. But these can be matched a thousand times by like scenes in deliberative bodies

controlled by men. I am afraid even ecclesiastical assemblies are not free from them. I suppose Dr. Buckley does not seriously contend, because of the example he has cited, that the great Woman's Temperance Union should disband, or that woman should not manage it any longer.

No person desires to change the essential character of American womanhood. It is a character whose beauty, dignity, grace, sweetness, and power come from causes with which the giving or denying to women of a share in the government of the State has nothing to do. It will not, in my judgment, be affected in the slightest degree for the worse if her vote shall be counted. On the other hand, when she shall be admitted to complete citizenship, these qualities of American womanhood will become more and more the qualities of American citizenship itself.

George F. Hoar.

POSTSCRIPT BY DR. BUCKLEY.

THE courteous admission of Senator Hoar that opponents of woman suffrage among men are not influenced by "the tyrant's desire to keep the rule of the State to themselves," but "chiefly an honest desire for the good of the State, and an honest desire for the welfare of woman," deserves recognition. Not less noteworthy is his acknowledgment of the changes already made in the laws concerning a married woman's relation to property and other subjects, by the "law-making sex." He might have added that where women are concerned law-makers are more than willing to rectify every real injustice and grant any reasonable request.

Woman suffrage, in his opinion, is "the change of a relation which has existed from the foundation of the earth"; yet upon this, the greatest political and social revolution, he generalizes without critically estimating the question of the value and elements of the influence of the sexes respectively under the existing order of things.

The typical man and the typical woman are contrasted by the senator in this passage: "Man values the objects of his affection for the comfort and dignity and benefit that comes to him from them. Woman values herself only for the comfort which she can be to the objects of her affection." Were this description of woman true to nature, no other argument against woman suffrage would be needed, for it would imply absolute incapacity for impartial legislation; but the characterization gives an unequal view of both sexes.

That the majority of the women of the coun-

try do not desire the suffrage is by no means "the chief reason" for withholding it. But the fact that it is so contrary to their instincts, intuitions, and sense of need that they do not wish it is a weighty reason for not imposing it upon them. The reference to Turkish ladies is not relevant, since they are deprived of the information accessible to American women.

The framers of the constitution of Massachusetts were not ignorant of the logical results of their principles. But they knew that every principle has its limits, and, when forced beyond them, mutilates or smothers some other truth. The Essex Convention, meeting at Ipswich in 1778 to consider the proposed new constitution and form of government, was particular to say that women were left unfranchised "not from a deficiency in their mental powers, but from the natural tenderness and delicacy of their minds, their retired mode of life, and various domestic duties. These concurring prevent that promiscuous intercourse with the world which is necessary to qualify them for electors."

Rufus Choate's tribute to the discrimination of character "by the collective womanhood of a people like our own" is just. But should she be compelled to "talk and think of measures, of creeds in politics, of availability, of strength to carry the vote," what reason is there to believe that her vision will not be dimmed or distorted by the medium through which she looks?

It is a suggestive phenomenon that General Butler was the particular admiration of a large number of women, conspicuous aspirants to

political life, who often commended him from the platform and in the press.

The senator concedes that there are large domains of legislation and administration from which "it would be better to exclude women as a whole than to admit them as a whole, because the great mass will be so little fitted for them," but affirms that this is true of the great majority of men. This, however, is an argument drawn from a vast evil which should be overcome, not increased by the addition of an immense number of voters whom he grants are destined to remain in the same condition.

To say that the same arguments which the advocates of woman suffrage have to meet have been used against every extension of suffrage merely acts as an opiate to thought, unless it be clearly proved that they do not now apply. Every important change, good or bad, has been opposed. The proposed extension is radically unlike any that has preceded it.

My eminent colleague in this comparison of views asks his opponents to "find four masculine figures whom they will like to select as leaders or companions rather than" those he names. Emerson and Whittier were idealists, neither qualified for leadership in politics or statesmanship, though a multitude rejoiced to come within the influence of their inspiration and elevating impulses. The deliverance of Mr. Lincoln was made at the very outset of his career, and so far as is known, though paying many a beautiful tribute to woman, he never referred to the subject again.¹ His later experience led to a profound conviction that the temperament of women was such as to make it more difficult to compose public feuds among them than

¹ In response to an inquiry, Mr. John G. Nicolay, private secretary, and one of the authorized biographers of Mr. Lincoln, writes: "I know of no allusion or reference by Mr. Lincoln to the question of female suffrage, except that made in the card printed in the *Sangamon Journal* under date of June 13, 1836 (and

among men. When the possibility of carrying out his conciliatory methods of reconstruction was under consideration, he remarked to the President of the Sanitary Commission that he expected more trouble from the women than from the men, and closed the conversation with these words, "Bellows, you take care of the women, and I will take care of the men."

It is not necessary to journey outside the senator's own paper to find two women worthy to be compared with Mrs. Lucy Stone Blackwell and Mrs. Howe. These are Mrs. John Ware, whom he declares to be "one of the wisest and most accomplished persons in this country of either sex," and Clara Leonard, "another of the women who are the pride and ornament of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts." Both these ladies strongly and conscientiously disapprove of woman suffrage.

To these I add the name of "the most useful and distinguished woman that America has produced," whose influence is felt throughout the world upon every sphere of philanthropy, and is preserved in the laws of every civilized nation, Dorothea L. Dix. She saw the rise of the American woman-suffrage movement, studied it in its advocates, arguments, sentiments, and tendencies, and rejected it. The "divine discontent" which its leaders were and are endeavoring to kindle in the hearts of women she deemed merely one of the ever-changing forms of human unrest. Her biographer states that she believed in "woman's keeping herself apart from anything savoring of ordinary political action. She must be the incarnation of a purely disinterested idea, appealing to universal humanity, irrespective of party or sect."

which is reprinted in Lincoln's Complete Works, Vol. I, p. 7). [This is the passage quoted by Senator Hoar.]

So far as I know, the topic is nowhere else mentioned in his writings, speeches, or letters, nor did I ever hear him refer to it in conversation either directly or indirectly."

J. M. Buckley.

CONVERSATION IN FRANCE.



MUCH has been written, here in THE CENTURY MAGAZINE and elsewhere, about the French salons; but often it seems to be taken for granted that these exist no more. In fact, there are still several of them, which certainly have not all the importance they had before the advent of newspapers and free political discussion, but in which artists and men of letters still love to meet in companionship with intelligent people of the world. Conver-

sation is, and will long continue to be, one of the greatest pleasures of the Gallic race, in which, as every one knows, the social spirit exists from the lowest to the highest rank. Wealth has never been necessary in order to have a salon. Mme. du Deffand lived very simply in the convent of St. Joseph; Mlle. de Lespinasse was so poor that her friends had to support her; and each of these two women had a real court in the 18th century. She who became later almost a queen, Mme. de Maintenon, then Mme. Scarron, gave celebrated dinners; yet it was during one of them that an

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The New Woman-Suffrage Movement.

THE recent active agitation in the State of New York of the question of Woman Suffrage was the result of an opportunity, namely, the Constitutional Convention. Those who so earnestly protested against a condition of wrong did not, we believe, claim that the "wrong" was an increasing one. In fact, it is generally admitted that the condition of woman, as such, before the laws, and as to her education and her general opportunities in the community, is, on the whole, becoming more favorable. Women are not declared to be getting fewer and fewer "rights" and advantages, but rather more and more, with advancing civilization. It was, then, not a new condition so much as a new opportunity that occasioned this special movement.

The difference of the new movement from similar agitations was in the character and social position of many of the women and men who were among the leaders. Men and women of ability and character have not been absent from the previous "crusades," but no previous one, in this part of the country, has had so much leadership or so much following of a supposedly conservative sort. To be sure, some of the old champions sounded again a certain familiar note,—the note which a generation ago met with the ridicule of the wise and the approval of the light-headed,—and this note was not so rare as some adherents must have wished in the new discussion—the old voice and proclamation of feminine revolt! The new crusaders, however, mainly based their claim on natural rights and absolute justice, on their new application of the principle of no taxation without representation, on the probable betterment of the position of women as wage-earners, on the good that would accrue to women and to the community by their enforced education in political duties, and on the improvement of laws and their administration to be caused by the admission of women to the suffrage.

While the entire movement was deeply deprecated by many thoughtful persons as having tendencies, and as being sure of effects, of an unfortunate character, yet so much study of, and thinking on, the fundamental principles of government, and on the relation of the sexes to each other, to society, and to the State, had not been done in this neighborhood for generations. It is not, then, a matter of surprise that a counter-movement should have sprung up among women, and that the earnest protest of women and men against the proposed change should have gone forth. Owing to this, and to the arguments presented on both sides, and to the intense attention attracted to the subject, many have been able to take a stronger hold upon the principles underlying all government, and upon some of the greatest problems of life.

The argument has at times been hot; it may have seemed at times not in all respects entirely frank. The most inescapable condition of humanity is sex; it is the element most carefully to be considered in the ques-

tion at issue, yet it has appeared at times that this aspect of the question was evaded by some of the most eloquent champions of a scheme which would plunge all womanhood into the welter of universal suffrage and partizan politics. The question involved is not only the right to vote, but also "the right not to vote"; for, at heart, the question is this: Shall men, at the request of some women, load upon all women, equally with men and in addition to their present burdens, the duties and obligations of civil government?

Other allied questions of a fundamental character also arise: Is complete Woman Suffrage the next logical step in the advance of civilization, or would it be an unfortunate *non sequitur*? Would the proper function, and use, and power of woman in the State be increased or impaired by so-called "equal rights," *i. e.*, equal suffrage? Will the suffrage be equal if extended to a sex that cannot physically endure the strain of duties implied in the suffrage? Could suffrage be called "equal" suffrage when mothers of families—upon whom the State depends in a peculiar sense for its very existence—would be under special disabilities as compared with single or childless women? Would it elevate or degrade the ideal of the suffrage to attempt to extend it to a class that could not, as a class, fulfil all of its duties and obligations, military, constabulary, juridical, and political? Should the system of government tend to build up or to impair the family and the home, and what effect upon the institution of the family would follow the extension of the suffrage to women? How can it be absolutely predicted that women's wages will be affected by this revolutionary device more than by economical conditions? And even if they should be affected favorably, would this device, under all the circumstances, still be desirable?

There are other questions more immediately "practical," perhaps; such as the effect upon the general suffrage,—and upon the present affliction of spoils and of bosses,—of the enormous increase of the suffrage along exactly the same lines as now; but we do not care to go into the subject at present with more detail, especially as in the August number of THE CENTURY many of the arguments *pro* and *con* will be given at length—by Senator Hoar in the affirmative and by the Rev. Dr. Buckley in the negative.

To-day women are not compelled as a class by our laws and our political system to the assumption of duties for which there is any suspicion of their unfitness. It is our own profound belief that women's work should continue to expand naturally along the lines of education, philanthropy, and the housekeeping interests of our local communities, and along the line of their general influence in the arts and sciences, and in society at large; and that her energies should not be compelled into a domain of untried and physiologically impossible civil obligations.

Some things are sure: if there is anywhere "oppression" other than through the laws of nature, and if this oppression can be lifted by human device, it

must, and will, be in some way ; but above all, it is sure that there can be no conflict of interests between men and women. The development of one is the elevation of the other ; the good of one is the good of both. But let no one be deceived by false analogies and evasions of the deepest facts of humanity, because the compulsion of all womanhood into the political arena (what the law allows to all at once becoming the *duty* of all) would be a revolution of greater magnitude and effect than any the world has yet witnessed.

A Martyr of To-day.

THE recent murder of Robert Ross by political roughs during a municipal election in the city of Troy occurred under peculiar circumstances of more than local significance. For years the government of that city has been a byword of national reproach for the audacity with which the criminal element has dared to defy the simplest and most fundamental principles of justice. So absolute was the control of the local boss,—now the junior Senator from the great State of New York,—that he is said to have boasted that he could elect a Chinaman as mayor of the city if he should so desire. The efforts of law-abiding citizens to punish frauds upon the ballot have been in vain—not for lack of conclusive evidence, but because of it. Grand juries have been unfairly chosen for the purpose of defeating indictments, and even the police have refused to serve warrants. In the face of all obstacles, the patriotic citizens of Troy did not relinquish their fight for the vital principle of honest elections, but knowing well the brutal element with which they had to deal they courageously faced the issue. The death of Ross in the discharge of the highest duty of citizenship has revealed to the American people an example of civic devotion and of self-sacrifice which should inspire decent citizens everywhere, while it should startle the indifferent into a realization of the desperate and dangerous character of the new generation of political spoilsmen.

Robert Ross was in an eminent sense a martyr to liberty. No man that fell at Lexington or Sumter gave his life to his country with more willingness or for a better principle. He knew the type of political rough he would have to deal with in undertaking his duty as a guardian of the election, for he and his brothers had been warned that their lives were threatened. That duty he undertook solemnly and without bravado. He was not inspired by partizanship, for he was a Republican advocating the election of a Democrat ; nor by race prejudice, for he was a Scotchman advocating the election of an Irishman ; nor by religious bigotry, for he was a Protestant advocating the election of a Roman Catholic. He was simply inspired by the most patriotic desire for good government, and it was in defense of this cause—the cause of every American citizen—that he was brutally murdered. Nothing is clearer than that he was the victim of the accursed Spoils System, which is daily bringing disgrace upon the American nation, and is spreading a blight of misgovernment upon every community over which it holds sway. The responsibility for this murder lies at the doors of those who have fostered or consented to the conditions which by an inevitable logic lead to such deeds. In these days of lawlessness it will not do to hold one's peace when a Senator of the United States permits, as it is well

known he might prevent, those encroachments upon the rights of citizens which make justice a mockery and representative government a jest. It is not a question of partizanship, but one of national self-preservation.

In what way is Ross's sacrifice to be given its proper accent and honor? His townsmen have already provided for a suitable memorial for his grave, and it is to be hoped that the spot upon which he died may also be marked in a way appropriate to its significance. But his service was to the nation, and it deserves another sort of recognition. What more appropriate and useful than to perpetuate his name in organizations to defend the purity of the ballot? The danger of the ascendancy of the criminal element in politics is a danger to men of all parties, and there is hardly a city of the United States where there is not need of a non-partizan body of picked men whose duty it shall be to exalt the sanctity of the now degraded suffrage: to agitate for the most perfect election laws, and for more severe penalties for their violation ; to bring the force of public opinion to bear on the selection of registry and election boards ; to scan and purify the lists of voters ; to study the rights of citizens at elections, and to defend them at the polls ; to become familiar with the personnel of the districts in which they are to serve as watchers, and to exert the whole power of the law on election day to insure the free casting and faithful counting of the vote. An appropriate name for such a body would be "The Robert Ross Association." In the *JUNE CENTURY* was recounted what has been accomplished by a few determined citizens in the redemption from ring-rule of the city of Montreal. The overthrow of the Brooklyn ring, and the conviction of McKane and his associates, were due to volunteer work of a similar character. The imprisonment of twenty-nine offenders against the election law in New York city was accomplished by exactly the sort of work which might be undertaken by these associations. Bearing the name of Robert Ross, they would at once be a challenge to evildoers, and a solemn proclamation of the serious nature of their mission.

For it is undeniable that within the past few years a new depth of political unscrupulousness and violence has been revealed. Wholesale bribery, cheating, and counting out, thefts of legislatures and downright murder, make an alarming record. These very crimes have revealed a sound state of latent public opinion ; but what is needed is that public opinion should be not latent, but vigilant. Beside the question whether representative government shall perish through the perversion of the very machinery by which it operates, all financial and economic questions seem trifling.

For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?

If the standard weights and measures of public opinion be tampered with, how shall we discover the will of the people? The Spoils System is a deadly upas-tree, which the nation has long been nourishing ; its leaves are dropping upon us as never before ; here and there we have broken a twig or lopped off a branch ; but the time has come to root it up entirely. To do this, in nation, State, city, and village, is a purpose to which every good citizen should devote himself. The death of Robert Ross will not have been in vain, if it