

AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONALISM
VOLUME II: RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES
Howard Gillman • Mark A. Graber • Keith E. Whittington

Supplementary Material

Chapter 7: The Republican Era — Foundations/Sources/Constitutions and Amendments/The Nineteenth Amendment

The Debate over the Nineteenth Amendment: Women's Suffrage (1918)¹ (expanded)

Women in the Republican Era campaigned vigorously for the right to vote. As with Prohibition, the campaign began in the states. The state constitution of Wyoming in 1889 was amended to declare that "rights of citizens . . . to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens . . . shall equally enjoy all civil, political and religious rights and privileges." Other western states shortly followed suit. By the turn of the twentieth century, women in slightly more than half the states had a right to cast ballots in at least some elections. The suffrage campaign gained strength during the second decade of the twentieth century. Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party gained national attention when they picketed the White House, demanding that women be granted the right to vote. Woodrow Wilson's claim that World War I was being fought to "make the world safe for democracy" provided rhetorical fuel for those who believed in an expanded suffrage. Wilson's conversion to the suffrage cause proved crucial. Both houses of Congress approved the Nineteenth Amendment in 1918. The amendment was ratified two years later.

The excerpts below are drawn from testimony taken at a congressional hearing on the Nineteenth Amendment just before both Houses of Congress sent the amendment to the states. What are the crucial differences between proponents and opponents of women's suffrage? Do you detect differences between the reasons members of the National Woman's Party and members of the National American Woman's Suffrage Association give for championing female suffrage? To what extent do the debates over women's suffrage in the Republican Era differ from debates over women's rights in previous and subsequent eras?

MRS. MAUD WOOD PARK (National American Woman Suffrage Association)

...

When this amendment was first presented to Congress, at the request of our association, in 1878. There were strong reasons for its passage at that time. Those reasons were based upon the essential principles of democracy. They apply to-day just as strongly as they applied then, and they will always be potent so long as the ideal of government in this country is the ideal of government by the people. But in addition to those fundamental reasons there is a new set of reasons, due in part to the extraordinary gains that suffrage has made during the last year and in part to the tremendous crisis which our Nation is now facing and which demands of women, as well as of men, that their uttermost resources shall be poured forth if the crisis is to be adequately met. . . .

...

DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW (National American Woman Suffrage Association)

...

¹ Excerpted from House Committee on Woman Suffrage, *Extending the Right of Suffrage to Women: Hearings before the Committee on Woman Suffrage on H.J. Res. 200, 65th Cong., 2nd sess.* (1918).

[W]e grant that [women] are in favor of peace; we grant that we have a large sympathy for the sufferings of the human race, but we also claim to be possessed of intelligence and of more or less knowledge, and intelligence and knowledge have convinced us that there could be nothing more disastrous to the human race than an undesirable peace at this time; that such a peace would lead to greater suffering than a continuation of the war. Therefore, because we love peace and because we have large sympathy for the sufferings of humanity, we are opposed to anything which will bring to pass a peace which does not forever and forever make it impossible that such sufferings shall be again inflicted on the world. Also because of that knowledge that we possess, added to our natural love of peace and sympathy, we are not pacifists in the sense of desiring an undesirable peace at this time, and the women of the whole world take that stand with us. . . .

Even before war was declared—and now I am speaking of the suffragists of our own association—the women of the National American Woman Suffrage Association met in convention in this city and were the first organized national body of women who gathered together to formulate a definite plan of action and to present to the President of the United States and the Government of the United States a formulated plan of conduct which would be followed by the more than 2,000,000 women of our association, provided hostilities went so far that war should be declared. The President accepted our services, and not only did he accept them, but the general impression of the devotion of the suffragists of this country to the welfare of the country was so uniformly accepted that when the Government decided upon war and upon the necessity of the organization of the woman power of the Nation they called upon the women who are leaders in the woman suffrage association and appointed them on a committee for coordinating the war work of women throughout the United States. Can we for a moment suppose that the gentlemen in whose charge the great interests of our Nation rested would have called upon women who were not thoroughly endowed with patriotic devotion and loyalty to their country for such a service at such a time?

Every Government at war, except Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria, has introduced a bill for the enfranchisement of women, either for immediate passage or for passage at the conclusion of the war. And even the King of Belgium, or that little fringe of that much-suffering nation, has declared that one of the first acts of Belgium when it is restored to power as a nation will be to enfranchise the Belgian women. Now, with such testimony before us can we American men and women be blinded by the statement that the women of this country will not stand loyally by the men if they have political power; that they will desert their own sons, fathers, and brothers in a time of distress such as this? When such a man as Mr. Asquith, because of the loyalty of women, has been won from his opposition to their enfranchisement: when the man who has saved Great Britain, Mr. Lloyd-George, declares so emphatically in its favor; when Gen. French, that mighty leader of the British Army, has declared that woman suffrage is absolutely essential not only to the salvation of the nation during the war, but to its reconstruction after the war is over, and when Gen. Joffre, the man whom we all love, has declared that woman suffrage is absolutely necessary to the Republic of France—when such men as these make such statements, who among us, save those who are fit to enter immediately—and remain there—in schools for feeble intellects, can be deceived by the cry of proGermanism among those who believe in woman suffrage?

I want to say in closing, gentlemen, that we are not asking for the Federal amendment for women because we are not loyal to our country, because we are not willing to do war work, and because we are not willing to sacrifice and to suffer, but because we want this measure passed for two reasons: One is that to fail to ask for it at this time would be treason to the fundamental cause for which we as a nation have entered the war. President Wilson declared that we are at war because of that which is dearest to our hearts, democracy, that those who submit to authority shall have a voice in their government. If that is the basic reason for entering the war, then those of us who have striven for this amendment and for our freedom and democracy in this country to yield to-day, to withdraw from the battle, would be to desert the men in the trenches and leave them to fight across the sea for not only democracy for the world but for democracy for our own country. We believe in that fundamental principle because we believe in the ideals of democracy. Because we are loyal to the men in the trenches, because we are loyal to ourselves,

because we believe the word of the President of the United States, we are to-day, gentlemen, pleading for democracy, that those who submit to authority shall have a voice in their government. The war is not going to last forever. God pity us, it is lasting too long.

...

MRS. GUILFORD DUDLEY (National American Woman Suffrage Association)

...

Two reasons have been given in the past for withholding our enfranchisement, and these two reasons we have, for a time, accepted. They are the State rights doctrine and the negro problem". But the southern Democrats themselves, gentlemen, have retreated from this stand of State rights and the negro problem. . . So now we are face to face with this bare and ugly alternative, either our men feel that we can not be trusted with the ballot or we must feel that we can not trust their sense of justice. For what has happened to the State rights doctrine. Recently the Federal Constitution has been twice amended, and that under a Democratic administration. While the child-labor bill and eight-hour bill are not amendments to the Constitution, they are really open to the same objections, because they impose upon a State laws to which it has not given consent. These bills were proposed, in one House or both, by southern Democrats; the Federal prohibition bill was proposed in both Houses by southern Democrats and passed by the votes of others. So it appears that the theory of State rights is only invoked when women plead at the bar of justice for that voice in their Government to which all those who submit to authority are entitled.

Now, as to the negro problem. We southern women feel that the time has come to lay, once and for all this old, old ghost that stalks through the Halls of Congress. It is a phantom, as applied to woman suffrage, that has had its day, even for what we call in the South a "hant." Let me tell you that in 15 States south of the Mason and Dixon line there are over a million more white women than there are negro men and women combined. That being true, do you wonder that we think the enfranchisement of the white women of the South is a solution of the race question? . . .

. . . The horrors of those old days [Reconstruction] are gone, never to be revived. The only approach to them that could come would be through the failure to give the white women of the South the power of the ballot now that we are at war. When our husbands and our brothers are going forth to fight for democracy, we must not only assume their tasks at home in addition to our own, but we must bear the more sacred burden of cherishing their ideals of government for which they have offered their lives, in order that their sacrifice may not be in vain. You have just heard of the soldiers' vote being two to one in our favor. Does not that prove what they wish? Does not that show you what they would give to us, if they could? Gentlemen, all minor political considerations should vanish in the face of the simple thing that we ask of you, just to aid in giving us the only effective weapon with which we can protect ourselves and their children now that they have gone overseas and maybe into the great beyond.

MRS. HENRY WARE ALLEN (National American Woman Suffrage Association)

. . . Can you gentlemen think what it means to women to know that their men are so chivalrous and have such a belief in their integrity and their intelligence that they are willing to make them equally their partners politically? Can you not see that under such conditions men and women are firmer friends; that husbands and wives are closer together, and that all of the family relations are better because the adults of all the families are equally interested in city, State, and national affairs?

. . . If it is true that women are on a pedestal, will not their entrance into political life bring politics upon a pedestal too, and will the men not closely follow, for surely all men and all women are looking to the upward tendency of the race.

Because I have lived in a State where we have had the opportunity to prove the benefit of suffrage to all the community, it seems the only fair thing for the women of the enfranchised States to do all in their power to help the women of other States to get the franchise, and you all know that because of

the peculiar constitutions of some of the States this thing can be accomplished only through Federal action.

...

We have a wonderful Nation, and the reason for our light shining beyond that of other countries is that it is the burning truth of a few fundamental principles that has made for our great growth. When our forefathers said "The right of government rests on the consent of the governed," and "Taxation without representation is tyranny," they meant it, and those statements have drawn idealists from many shores who in the course of time have made our best citizenship. Their attention has not been called to the fact that women are governed as well as men, and their consent should be given; that they are taxed and they are not represented.

But times have changed, and these facts are being most urgently brought to your attention, and if our legislators do not give heed we shall become a Nation of hypocrites, saying one thing and doing another. There is a moral law which is inevitable in its action, and I believe you would all agree that we do not wish to come under the condemnation of hypocrisy.

...

Our world is weary and wounded and sick, and if you will listen in the silence of the night you will hear the same cry; the world is crying for the mother voice in its councils, in its activities, and in its initiative. Let us help. Let us work together so this horrible war which has devastated the world through all times may at least be put out. Gentlemen, we have a remedy. We call that remedy democracy. You know what it is, the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in what shall be done with their people. I beg of you let us not be hypocrites, let us hear the woman's voice in the councils of our land, and see if I am not right, see whether in time war may not be done away with. I beg of you vote for this suffrage amendment and help the world on in its race. I thank you.

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT (President, National American Woman Suffrage Association)

...

... I suppose there is no Member of Congress who is so ill-informed about conditions at the present time as not to know that woman suffrage is inevitable, not only coming but coming soon. I presume there is no Member of Congress who has not read, I may say, upon the walls of politics, where at the present moment it is written so that "all who run may read," that if the women of the country are not enfranchised before 1920 no political party can control Congress or occupy the White House that is not pledged to the Federal amendment. If there should be one Member of Congress who does not know that, then I should suggest that you who are members of this committee and favorable to this amendment should pass along the line the facts which you know concerning this amendment.

...

Every opponent of woman suffrage, North, South, East, and West, urges State rights as his chief objection to Federal action on the question. ... The motive is apparent, since State rights is about the only straw left on the mighty onward tide of woman suffrage which a drowning objector can seize.

...

As a matter of fact, our country seems more averse to changing its Constitution than many regarded as more conservative, and State rights is a handy obstacle to action in this direction. ...

...

All the world around the allied nations, the neutrals, and even our enemy nations are considering and are pledging it. The premiers of Great Britain, Canada, and Sweden, and Italy have pledged it; an official commission in France has pledged it; Hungary and Bohemia have the question under consideration; and it has even been discussed in the German Imperial Reichstag. To confine the establishment of woman suffrage in our country to State processes means that our Nation will lag many years behind other nations in this phase of democracy because many State constitutions are practically impossible of amendment. The United States led for half a century in the progress of man suffrage. The State method has already allowed our Nation to be outdistanced by Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Finland, and possibly by Russia that is to be. Unless

Federal action is taken at once, France and Italy are pledged to join the nations now in the lead. A theory which holds a nation in the rear of world progress is certainly unsound. To Congress is given the choice between State rights and justice.

...

The question now under discussion not only represents the changed opinion of our country, but it proposes to remove a distinct and oppressive discrimination against one great class of our citizens. When the fourteenth amendment was adopted, it conferred citizenship upon all persons "born or naturalized in the United States"; the fifteenth amendment forbids discrimination on account of race or color. Thus the Constitution, as it now stands, takes the citizens of every State under Federal protection except women. They can never secure that protection by State action. We bitterly protest against this continued injustice and ask a Federal amendment to right the wrong.

...

No one should go away from this meeting with the idea that the vote in favor of woman suffrage was a pro-German or socialistic vote. No living man will question that the soldier vote—the vote of the men at the front, who are either in France to fight for our country, or are on their way to the front—is a patriotic vote. These men from the city of New York have voted in favor of equal suffrage at a ratio of almost 2 to 1. . . .

As to the charge that woman suffrage represents a vote which can not be trusted in time of war, I want to call your attention to certain facts in connection with our country. We have or had in 1910 2,000,000 more men in the country than we had women. We have had in this country a great increase in naturalization since the war began. There were a great many foreigners who were afraid that they would be conscripted by their home government who made haste to take out their citizenship papers. They are not patriotic. They are not loyal to this country. They are seeking protection for themselves. When an election is to be held, as it will be ere long, it must be remembered that we are taking a step which our allies have not taken. . . .

. . . When the election comes, who is going to do the voting? Every slacker has a vote. Every newly-made citizen will have a vote. Every pro-German who can not be trusted with any kind of military or war service will have a vote. Every peace-at-any-price man, every conscientious objector, and even the alien enemy will have a vote. You will not secure anything more than a majority at best of the soldiers in Europe. It is a test, a risk, which no other country has been asked to take.

The women here who belong to the families of the men on the other side can not be called disloyal. There actually is at least one and probably more than one woman in a family of every man who goes on the other side who is going to use her vote to back every preparation of the war, every condition which is going to make it easier and safer for him, and every condition which is going to bring the war to a successful end, if she has the opportunity to cast a loyal vote. It is a risk, a danger to a country like ours to send 1,000,000 men out of the country who are loyal and not to replace those men by the loyal votes of the women they have left at home.

...

It seems to me the most curious thing in the world how men lose their faith and their confidence in their women whenever there is a test. Women are human beings with the same intelligence, the same comprehension of honor, the same understanding of this war, and the need there is to win it that the men have. They can be trusted as men can be trusted, but the country is not safe without their votes.

In the South we are told that after all it is not State rights so much as it is the negro problem. I want to say, as a western woman who does not know very much about the negro problem from actual knowledge, it seems very strange that the South, which has so effectively found the means to disfranchise the colored man, is so scared of the colored woman. In talking with some of the members of Congress about it, we have learned the most amazing thing. That is, that an idea prevails throughout the South that the colored women are more intelligent, more ambitious, more energetic than the men, and that while it is easy enough to keep the men from exercising too much ambition in the matter of politics it will not be easy to so control the women. When talking with those same men about the white women of the South, I have never known an exception to the rule that they have finally rested their case upon the statement that the women of the South do not want the vote anyway, and if they did they would only vote as their

husbands do. To say that means what? That the women of the South, in the estimate of those men are too weak-minded to have an opinion of their own: it means that they have no independence of character: it means that they have been reduced so far to nonentity that they will only echo their husband's opinion.

The thing that startles me is this great question: Is living in the homes of the white men of the South so degrading to the character of the white women that they really can not be trusted to have an honest conviction of their own, but that living in the South outside of those homes renders women more ambitious and more intelligent than the men? I do not know that these men realize that they are saying almost in the same breath that the colored woman is a more brilliant specimen of human nature than the colored man, but that the white woman is the inferior of the white man or is it possible that the climate of the South produces a stronger "female of the species " than the male and that the men of the South are afraid both of the white and the black women? . . .

. . . So long as this Nation, by cooperation with the States, unites in giving the vote to every newcoming foreigner without any test, or much test, of education or fitness, and without ever raising the question of whether they would like the vote or not, women feel that an indignity is put upon them. . .

DR. LUCTEN HOWE (American Constitutional League)

. . . I speak for perhaps a larger number, or speak with them, and that is for those 4,000,000 of voters—about 4,000,000—who have voted in different parts of the country against women's full suffrage, as contrasted with the 3,000,000 who have voted for it; and the reason they have done so is the same reason why it is the home influence and the home reasons, and that is what I venture to speak upon. . .

. . . Confusion in this whole question arises again and again because we do not separate limited suffrage from full suffrage. And limited suffrage, just as the chairman says, should be granted to them in regard to matters relating to hygiene and sanitation, in regard to matters relating to education and also as regards taxes; that is, surely in regard to local taxation. But when you contrast that and having their judgment in such matters with another group of functions and ask them to judge matters in connection with continental transportation or large questions of commerce or manufactures or strikes, or when we take up the question of the building of fleets, or the fitting of armies, I think that you will agree with me, gentlemen, that that is another question, and that relates to full suffrage; and we must always keep those two things always in mind. . .

. . .
It is proper that it is the duty of the woman to provide, first of all, for the health and education of her children. . .

. . . It is quite necessary to have a starting point, and then the corollary of that proposition, or one statement of it, is this—that as long as defects exist in the health and education of children, especially serious defects which can be easily corrected, women should correct those defects promptly and completely as possible before giving their attention or their energies to politics or anything except the correction of those defects.

MR. EVERETT P. WHEELER (President, American Constitutional League)

. . .
What I specially want to call the attention of the committee to is this question of home rule, which to me is fundamental. It was stated by Mrs. Clark yesterday that the real question was not on the merits of suffrage, but on the merits of dealing with the subject by Federal amendment. . . No democracy since the world began has succeeded as this has in securing the rights of the individual, both in person and in property. Now, on what is that essentially based? Let us say on several things, but as much on the principle of leaving to the State the right to regulate its local matters as on any other. . .

. . . Take in Ohio, where the legislature had undertaken to give suffrage to women and the electors for President. There, by a great majority, under referendum they have rescinded that. Why

should this Congress impose upon the people of Ohio a system which they have just voted to do away with? And we may say the same of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the other States that voted two years ago. Do you not perceive, gentlemen, that what has given us not only freedom but satisfaction and content—which are a very important part of our freedom—is this part that each State has had to regulate this matter according to its judgment of its needs?

This question of the colored women has come up. It is a very important question. The Southern States feel it very sensibly. Why should you insist on imposing upon the Southern States the franchise to the colored women against their will? . . .

. . . It is the duty of the woman, and that is something the suffragists have always overlooked. . . . The duty of the woman—the mother, the sister, the wife—is of the first importance, and for her to go into politics disables her from performing that duty, as a rule; I do not say it does in all cases. We do give now, under the laws of this country, to every woman an equal right, if she is qualified—and people will not listen to her if she is not—to speak, to have a voice. . . . To grant women the ballot is to put upon them a burden of responsibility that they ought not to have to bear, because God has made them, and them alone, capable of bearing children and of bringing up children. . . .

. . . God never gave to any human being the right to govern another. Now, our American democracy in that respect differs from other democracies. . . . Our theory is this: That no government has absolute power; that the people are supreme: that they delegate to their executive and to their representatives and to their judges certain powers. Those powers are limited. . . . A woman has the same rights as a man, and in this question of taxation she is just as much entitled to be heard as a man.

You go before your Committee on Ways and Means of the House or Finance Committee of the Senate, when you are levying taxes, and the woman citizen has just as much right to be heard, and I think she is heard. . . .

But there again it is different. That does not give the right to vote. You may own property, as I pointed out, and I want to remind you of it, you may own property in one State and reside in another. You have the right to be heard in the State where that property is upon an assessment, but you have not the right to vote there, because the vote is not a right, but it is a power that is given by law, on the whole, to those that it seems best in the public interest should be charged with that burden and responsibility. If it were otherwise, children would have the same right to vote as adults have. . . .

. . .
MISS MINNIE BRONSON (General Secretary, National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage)

. . . [A]n obligation rests upon the Representatives from the suffrage States to vote against the Federal amendment. You have had an opportunity to vote on this question and decide it in your States; it came before your electorate and they decided that they wanted woman suffrage. Then above all others you should oppose an effort which means to take away from other States the same opportunity which you have enjoyed. It seems to me it is absolutely contrary to fair play. If you are going to be fair about it let other people have the same opportunity that you have had. It is not right that because you in your States concluded that you wanted woman suffrage that you should compel Ohio to take it if Ohio does not want it. If you have had to absorb sulphur and treacle, that is no reason why you should compel those in other States to take it. Because it might taste like honey in your mouth, that is no reason why you should think it would taste the same way in the mouths of those in other States, because what may be honey to one man may be poison to another. Therefore, I can not see that a man from a suffrage State has any right whatsoever to vote for a Federal amendment, I mean, a Representative from a suffrage State.

MR. J. S. EICHELBERGER (no organization given)

[A]s I understand the question of the Federal amendment, it is not the question of woman suffrage per se; it is the question of how Congress shall submit the woman-suffrage question; it is the question of whether it shall be submitted to the legislatures of the various States or whether it shall be let alone and submitted to the people of the various States. It involves a question of whether Congress is going to give the Legislature of Wyoming more right to say who shall vote in the city of Boston than the people of Massachusetts; it is a question which involves giving the Legislature of Idaho the right to say who shall vote in New Orleans, while we deny the same right to the people of Louisiana, who have denied that right to their own legislature. That is the fundamental question.

...

MRS. RICHARD WAINWRIGHT (National Woman's Party)

...

Gentlemen, I have heard that we women of the United States have been said not to be patriotic because during this war we have asked that we might be enfranchised and have our share in the Government. In speaking for the position of women on that I would say that this idea seems to me simply a revival of an old argument that was used in the early days of suffrage, that women could not vote or spend perhaps two hours in a year at the polls and still take care of their home and their children, and it seems to me that is such an obsolete argument that we need not refer to it again. In our many enfranchised States women have happy husbands and devoted sons in the beautiful family life that we all acknowledge is really a marked characteristic of the United States, and since women have grown and have taken part in civic life and in politics I think their homes have remained as happy. I think the happy husband is as proud of his wife and daughter. I think he is just as pleased as ever with us, now that in many States we can enjoy the franchise.

Therefore I feel, in making this plea for enfranchisement during the war, that women are entitled to be considered as having earned a share of consideration. From the time the war started in Europe, from the beginning of the war, the women all over this country organized themselves in great patriotic societies, unselfishly and devotedly. I am sure you all have taken part and have women in your families who have joined these great organizations that provide hospitals and ambulance corps and supply the friendly care for the poor little children and the orphan children of France. We have reached out and helped everybody in these great organizations largely run by women themselves and without any aid from the outside.

Also, before the war began, women were coming extensively and more constantly into the industries, into science, and into work of all kinds. They have shown themselves capable, efficient, and able to do their work trustworthily and well. Therefore I think it was a distinct shock to all of us when the war began to be told, "No; stand back: be silent; be submissive; wait. We have no time to give to you. We don't want you now; we want you to wait. There is no time in war to consider women, because the war keeps us too busy." So we feel we women who want to bear our share in making and unmaking the laws of this country that we should be heard now, because we have proven we are capable of doing it: that we can stand before you and tell you," ...

MRS. TOWNSEND SCOTT (National Woman's Party)

Gentlemen, I am here to assure that I know what I say is true when I express the sentiments of the southern women, in saying they are not afraid of the colored women's vote. This has been a bugaboo that has been held over the country a great many years. That is the most surprising thing, when you consider that men fought with their lives to free the colored man, giving him the franchise, which we of course know is a mistake. Yet, at the same time, a wonderful thing happened during the Civil War. I found out recently that when the men of the South left their homes and went north to fight they left their mothers, wives, and daughters in the care of the colored men, in the care of the slaves; and I have learned that there is not one instance on record where that trust was misplaced. They took good care of the southern women. I think that the men of the South owe the colored man of the South a great debt of

gratitude. I think it was perfectly marvelous that they could leave those women to the care of the negro men and to feel that it was no misplaced confidence. Can you say the same thing of many generations of civilized white men?

...

I think the colored man in a great many respects has improved. I think if he had the trust placed in him, more confidence, it would be better. The colored man has a large degree of religious faith, simple, childlike faith; and I believe if more confidence were placed in them, instead of having it taken away, that possibly they would have improved more than they have.

As to the colored women, I know that the southern women are not afraid of the vote of the southern colored women. I have had three colored women in the employ of my family for 25 years. They have been absolutely honest and trustworthy in every respect during that time. I know that really is true. "By their works ye shall know them." I know that the colored women are to be trusted.

...

... In the South, if we have this amendment passed, that does not prevent a State protecting itself by qualifications of all sorts, literary tests and any other tests it chooses to put forth. In the South there are 2,000,000 more white women than the colored men and women put together, and in only two Southern States—Mississippi and South Carolina—do the colored outnumber the whites, and in those two States this is something which could be rectified in the event of the passage of the amendment.

...

MISS ERNESTINE EVANS (National Woman's Party)

I think of the Federal amendment as an amendment enfranchising women, giving them not only something they want very much, and that should be, it seems to me, their right—the right to express themselves, in the political economy of their country—but to me a very definite expediency, looking forward to the industrial readjustments after the war.

Take the numbers of women who have gone into industry since 1914. They have assumed in the national scheme an importance, certainly in the consciousness of the Government, they had never assumed before. They are not alone the wives of citizens; they are not alone the mothers of the coming generation, but they are very definite factors in the production process of the country, and they have come into this industrial process as unorganized workers. If they are going, in the demobilizing process at the end of the war, to still be important to the country, they must be kept a very stable industrial body, and the judgment of the women of England and the judgment of the Government officials in France has been that they can only be so kept, provided a great, new responsibility is placed on them—that they be enfranchised; that they have precisely the same status as the men industrial workers, with whom they are going to have to work and to cooperate.

All these women are important to the country now, not so much as women, but as workers, and to me it is intolerable that, comprehending this situation, the authorities of Washington should be willing that they should be unrepresented in Government, unable to express themselves and their needs, unable to insist on their status; that they should be condemned to be a body of unenfranchised workers.

MRS. FRANCIS J. HENEY (National Woman's Party)

We are giving our husbands and our sons and our daughters in this war—because our daughters are over there in the hospitals and munition works. They are doing their all in every place where they are needed. We women at home are helping to conserve the food that our armies may be fed. We are knitting that our soldiers may be warm and comfortable. We are doing our all in the munitions factories here that the war may be carried on in the cause of democracy, and we ask you in democracy's name to give us equal political right and a voice in the continuation of this democracy. We want to have a voice in the conservation of our people and our lands and in the laws that are going to be made after this war is over.

...

I read in a Washington paper a few days ago—I think it was the date of January 4—this article, headed “Vote, but won’t fight.”

The article tells of thousands of naturalized Germans in the West who are entitled to vote yet who claim exemption from war service as “enemy aliens.”

I am going to ask you if these men have been voting for years, as the paper says, and are now returning their questionnaires as enemy aliens, don’t you think we women have served the interests of our country as well as these men who have been voting for years and are now returning their questionnaires as enemy aliens?

In conclusion, I want to say to you that we women from the suffrage States are not free until our sisters from the nonsuffrage States have the same political equality we have and until then we can not feel that we can enjoy the fruits of a victory that is not theirs.

MISS MAUD YOUNGER (Executive Committee, National Woman’s Party)

The new and active movement for national suffrage began some five years ago, with the coming to Washington of Miss Alice Paul and Miss Lucy Burns. I believe it was Mr. Blanton who asked what difference there was between the two organizations, the National Woman’s Party and the National Woman’s Suffrage Association. I would say that at that time the other organization, National American Woman Suffrage Association, was working for State suffrage and had merely a committee here at Washington, more or less perfunctory in its appearance before your committees each year. Miss Paul and Miss Burns realized the importance of the Federal amendment and the necessity of an organization in every State in the Union, whose sole purpose would be the passage of the Federal amendment. It was then that the Congressional Union, now the National Woman’s Party, was formed, with now a branch in every State. In the past four years we have raised and spent over \$300,000 for the Federal amendment work. I think that answers the question, does it not? There is no feeling between the two organizations, except that the others have centered more on State work, and our only work has been the Federal amendment.

...

I would like also to submit a leaflet giving the statistics as to the negro population and showing that the white women outnumber the negro population in every Southern State but two. When the “grandfather” clause was declared unconstitutional, Chief Justice Walter Clark, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, said that the only hope now for maintaining white supremacy in the South was to give women the vote, because the white women so far outnumber the negro population.

...

We found also that the picketing had done more to make people think of suffrage; that it had dramatized as nothing else had done the struggle of women for enfranchisement. People would say, “I never thought much about suffrage until the picketing, but that made me think about it and understand.” While the sufferings of the pickets made men feel that suffrage was not merely something for women to talk of at afternoon teas; that it was something women were willing to suffer for and, if need be die for. . .

...

In closing, I merely wish to speak of what it means in this time in war. People say, “Why do we press for suffrage now, in time of war?”

We feel that in time of war women have the heaviest burdens; that the sufferings of war fall most heavily on them. Men go to war with bands playing and flags flying, with all the excitement of the march to the front, but the woman stays at home sometimes to take the man’s place as breadwinner of the family, but always to wait and watch, to look for the news, to dread to read it, lest the name of one dear to her might be among the dead or missing. It is the woman who suffers most in war, and in this war more than all other wars women are bearing heavy industrial burdens. Day by day we find women taking men’s places—becoming carpenters, machinists, elevator operators. In industry after industry we find women doing men’s work in order that the men may be released for war work.

When the men come back from the war what will they find? Will they find that what was an 8-hour day when they left has become a 10-hour day under the women? Will they find that the wages they had secured through years of struggle, wages by which a man could support a family, that these wages have been decreased to meet the needs of a single woman? I do not think any of us want to find that situation, and the best guaranty we can give that women will maintain the standards of living, of work which the men have left while they are off fighting our battles, is to give the women this protection. There are two sources of protection for the woman in industry—the union and the ballot. The most immediate protection which you can now give them is the ballot. Also, for efficiency in the war, we ask for suffrage now. . . . So also, for the sake of efficiency in the war, as well as for the women and children in the work, we ask now for the protection which the ballot would give them.

MRS. EDWIN FORD (National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage)

...
We are confronted with a deplorable condition, that of a divided womanhood; and, gentlemen, that is something to make us pause and think about—thousands of women, believing their greatest contribution to government to be possible only out of politics, as against a comparatively small number—2,000,000 out of 25,000,000 above 21 years of age—who believe their greatest contribution to be made in politics. This small body of women, well organized, overfinanced with already a split in their own ranks, offers opposition to the verge of persecution to that great normal body of women standing for the nonpartisan power of womanhood and man power in government, believing that democracy must be strong to be safe.

This contest is unequal; and it is time the men who represent the womanhood of their States did some clear thinking and straight acting on this question.

I am going to ask you to consider just a few things. You have, gentlemen, to consider the women opposed to suffrage who, when war was declared, asked to have this worthless, selfish agitation stopped, at least for the duration of the country's peril, to be met with what! Utter disregard of their request and a greater expenditure of money and energy in political work. You have to consider the thousands of consecrated women who have been working since 1914, wholeheartedly, for our soldiers and allies, with no thought of reward. It was left to the suffragists in their belated work to put pay into patriotism. The reward asked for them was participation in the machinery of government.

...
You have also to consider the women who believe that the perpetuity of our Government rests upon a limited democracy and that the great nonpartisan body of pure protest—and that God has given you, gentlemen, in the normal women—free from the limitations of politics, is the force back of the ballot to insure balance of power in government. Just as sure as you live, when we all get on one side of the ship we are going to turn turtle, and it will be the ruination of our Government.

Again, you have to consider the women who feel resentment toward the criminal wing of the suffrage organization called the "picketers," native born and imported for the purpose.

You have to consider the women who feel keenly that no woman leader in the suffrage ranks or in any political office has shown statesmanlike qualities of sound judgment and wise courage, sufficient to meet the extraordinary demands of present conditions in our Government.

You have to consider the women who realize we have a man-made, man-sustained Government, good enough for the ends of the earth to want to come and share with us. To preserve it should be our greatest concern.

Finally, gentlemen, you have to consider what may not seem the most important charge to my impartial jury, that the recent suffrage victory in New York may have been divinely granted to point a moral and adorn a tale for us. It affords the first opportunity in a great eastern State to show the combined forces of evil, pacifism, socialism, pro-Germanism, and woman suffrage in action.

...
MISS LUCY PRICE (National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage)

...

I believe that it is a question for the States to decide, rather than a national question: and I believe it is a travesty on everything that this Nation is doing at the present time to call it a war measure. I believe this Congress is giving its attention particularly to war measures, and that means prowar measures: it does not mean antiwar measures. It means measures to help carry on the war and not measures to help interfere with its carrying on.

The president of the National Woman Suffrage Association said that if this amendment carries there will be an organization in every county in every State in the Union, such as there has never been before, to get it ratified, and that, at this time, when not only our men but our hands are needed for the work of the war. I believe that it would be against the entire spirit of the people for this session of Congress to introduce one more matter for agitation for the people at this time which has no possible theoretical connection with the carrying on of the war.

...

MR. HENRY A. WISE WOOD (President Aero Club of America)

...

If society were stable, if the forms of government were secure, if the nations all were immune from attack, and their martial qualities therefore no longer were needed for their preservation, then, and then only, could the United States with safety to itself, commit the full half of its governing power into the hands of the unmilitary sex.

To do this at the present juncture, to unman the Government of the United States during the hour of the world's greatest need for the most masterful of all masculine qualities—the qualities which promote the deliberate taking of life upon an enormous scale—were a foolhardy jeopardizing of the rights of both sexes, won for them in wars planned and conducted exclusively by men. To deliberately stake, in such a crisis, all of our war-won liberties upon the success of an experiment in idealism dictated by considerations of sentiment, which are blind to the naked essentials of the maintenance of military power, is to be expected of Russia, but assuredly not of the United States.

Merely the advocacy of woman suffrage by the British, its consideration by the French, and its espousal by any man, neither do nor can alter the grim fundamental truths of war-time government which teach that masculine not feminine qualities win wars, that military blows must be planned as well as struck by men, and by such men as are the least feminine, the most masculine.

This is all so elementary that one would wonder at the spectacle of strong masculine personalities urging at such an hour the demasculination of government—the dilution with the qualities of the cow, of the qualities of the bull upon which all herd safety must depend—one would marvel at the voluntary self-emasculation were not history replete with ruin wrought by women, who, in attempting to gird themselves with man's strength, had succeeded only in clothing him with their weakness.

...

This movement is the fruit of a long period of peace, wherein social problems were uppermost and no premium was set upon the warmaking powers of man; wherein on the contrary it was sought to curb his force, to subdue his combative qualities, so to harness society that the man, the woman, and the child, the strong and the weak, should be reduced to a common level of power, the one no stronger than the other. In such a world women's quality with man in exercising the functions of State was not out of place; his innate militancy was useless, her innate pacificity was no disadvantage.

...

Ours is a representative democracy, wherein the majority rule in the selection of its officials. Approximately one-half of the adult population of the United States is composed of women. Having the vote, there then is no legal obstacle in the way of the election of a Congress wherein one-half or more of its membership shall be of women, nor of the selection of a Cabinet similarly apportioned, nor of the election of a woman to the Presidency, nor of the apportionment of women, even in majority, upon the

Supreme Court bench. Give woman the vote, and these become possibilities, probabilities, some of them eventually even certainties.

Let no man deceive himself; woman will insist upon holding office in full proportion to her numbers. To that her politicians may be expected to see.

...

War, indeed, is stern business. With its preparation, its declaration, its prosecution, its incidental and inevitable infliction of deaths innumerable, no mother, no woman, should have aught to do. As well make of a woman a public executioner. To the assertion that has been made, that to withhold these functions from the mothers of the Nation is preposterous, I unhesitatingly reply that it is preposterous that the mothers of the Nation should be permitted to sit in the halls of Congress where they may be required to decree the deaths of their own sons!

The belief that pacifism, the shrinking even from necessary war, is no more prevalent among women than among men is not borne out by the facts. . . .

...

Also I discovered that the very woman-suffrage movement whose cause I had espoused was hopelessly given over to pacifism in its extreme socialistic form, and that its chief officers were to be found among the most active opponents of those who were striving to prepare our people for the very emergency that at last has overtaken them.

For these weighty and fundamental reasons I am unalterably opposed to woman suffrage, although, as I have said, but three years ago I was its hearty advocate. These three years have taught me that a nation's freedom is to be safeguarded not by the display of gentleness, or love, or mercy, but solely by a nation's ability to crush with brute force whoever unjustly assails it. To create, direct, and deliver brute force is a man's, not a woman's, job.

...

EX-SENATOR JOSEPH W. BAILEY (Democrat, Texas)

...

It may, I suppose, be fairly considered a waste of time to argue the question of State rights to a committee representing a House which has already voted by an overwhelming majority for national prohibition; but it can not be out of place for me to remind you that this proposal alters, in a most important particular, the relations which the founders of this Republic established between the States and the General Government. . . . That the pending resolution will introduce such a change is freely admitted by many of the most earnest advocates, who boldly aver their intention to destroy our system of dual sovereignty and convert this Union of States into one vast Commonwealth.

...

If this amendment confined its attempt at Federal regulation to Federal elections, some semblance of an argument might be made in its behalf; but what right has the State of Texas to say that the State of California shall permit Chinamen to vote for officers in that State if California chooses to exclude them? . .

... The fifteenth amendment has thoroughly illustrated the folly of attempting to correct a local condition with a general law. There it stands on your books, and there it has stood for all these years; but it is a dead letter in nearly every Southern State. Neither the fourteenth nor the fifteenth amendments have been "faithfully executed," although for years the party in power could have derived a partisan advantage from their faithful execution. But even under that stimulus the Republican Party did not reduce the representation of the South, nor compel us to admit the negro to the free exercise of the electoral franchise. The South has defied, and is to-day defying, those amendments to our Constitution with the acquiescence, if not with the approval, of the North. . . . I think it simply means that the people of the North have the common sense to know that the law can not eradicate a condition which has its origin in human nature. That is the explanation of it.

Mr. Chairman, suppose the Women are entitled to vote—are you not willing to leave that question to the States? Do you not leave to the States the question of their marriage relations? Do you not

leave to the States the question of their property rights? Do you not leave the States to decide between the disagreeing husband and wife as to the custody of their children? If you leave all that to the States, then why not leave it for them to say who shall exercise the privilege of voting for the officers elected by them and for them? I must, of course, be frank with the committee, and say that I am opposed to women voting anywhere except in their own societies. I would let them vote there, and no place else in this country.

Why should the elective franchise be conferred on women? In answering that question we must, of course, look only to the public welfare. That some women desire to vote is not a sufficient reason for permitting all women to do so; nor is the objection to suffrage on the part of some women a sufficient reason for denying that privilege to all women. The question is not one of individual inclination or disinclination; but it is one which vitally concerns the highest interests of our country. No free Government should deny suffrage to any class entitled to it, and no free Government should extend suffrage to any class not entitled to it, for the ultimate success or failure of every free Government will depend upon the average intelligence and patriotism of its electorate.

...

... My rule is this: That every citizen who can be called upon to defend the country in a time of war and to enforce its laws in a time of peace is entitled to vote, provided he is of such an age and character as to warrant the expectation that he will exercise the privilege intelligently and for the best interests of the country. If I were to state as an abstract proposition, and without applying it to any given question, that no persons are entitled to exercise all the privileges of citizenship unless they are capable of performing all the duties of citizenship, everybody would agree that I had stated a sound maxim of political justice.

...

If it be true that only those who can perform all the duties of citizenship are entitled to exercise all the privileges of citizenship, women have no right to vote, because they are physically incapable of performing two of the most important personal duties of citizenship, and incapable, for other reasons, of performing the third.

The two most important personal duties of citizenship are military service and sheriff service, neither of which is a woman capable of performing. She may be able to perform other and very essential services, but she can not perform military service or sheriff's service.

...

If an outlaw must be arrested, are you going to order a woman to get a gun and come with you on such an errand? If you did, she would sit down and cry: and she ought to keep on crying until her husband hunts you up and makes you apologize for insulting his wife. Or here comes a mob – and mobs, I grieve to say, will be more numerous among us in the days that are to come than they have been in the days that are gone.

...

When the sheriff comes to suppress a mob, on whom does he call? On men; because it is a dangerous undertaking, and no man is willing to expose the life of a woman to the fury of a mob. A woman who is able to perform a sheriff's duty is not fit to be a mother, because no woman who bears arms ought to bear children. There is said to be a race of such women in the world, but we are not trying to cultivate them here. Amazons are not our ideal women.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that all just governments rest on the consent of the governed; but after you have rested the government on the consent of the governed, nothing but force can maintain its authority. If it were not for the power – the man power – that is behind every law on your statute books, none of them would be respected, and few of them would be obeyed. If the officer was clothed only with the right to arrest criminals would not stand in awe of him because they would go in twos or fours or sixes so they could overpower him. But the knowledge that the officer can call every able-bodied man in the community to help him arrest and bring the criminal to the bar of justice restrains all except the most desperate. Force alone can execute our laws, and only those who can supply the force necessary to their execution should have a voice in making those laws.

...

The third personal duty of citizenship is jury service, and while women are physically capable of performing that service, there are reasons, natural, moral, and domestic, which render them wholly unfit for it. The natural reason concerns the administration of justice; the moral reason concerns the women themselves; and the domestic reason, of course, concerns the home.

Women are tender, sympathetic, and emotional, attributes which fit them like a garment, but have no place in the jury box. We go to the courthouse for justice—for stern, unyielding justice—and by just so far as we fall short of justice there, by just that far organized society falls short of keeping its covenant to protect our rights and redress our wrongs. Will women help our courts to better administer justice? They will not. Every lawyer with a fair degree of experience in the trial of cases knows that nobody is qualified to decide any case until they have heard all of the testimony on both sides; but the average woman—and in speaking on this question we must, of course, take into account only the average woman—does not reserve her judgment to the end, and she would make up her mind before the plaintiff had concluded his testimony.

But her service on the criminal side of the docket would be even more pernicious than her service on the civil side. The skillful criminal lawyer would use her to cheat public justice. He would arrange the stage in a way to appeal to her better nature; with the defendant's wife and his children in the court room, he would enlist her sympathy by appealing for the innocent children and their grief-stricken mother. Those are the arts which hard-hearted men can not always resist, and do you suppose a gentle woman could do so? We now hear much, and just, complaint about the mistaken mercy which juries show to criminals, but we will hear much more when women become jurors.

...

What is to become of the homes of this country when our wives are called from them to serve as jurors for trials which may last days, or weeks, or even months? Who is to care for the children during the mother's absence? If you tell me that you will not require married women to serve as jurors, then I answer that she has no right to make the law under which men must serve while she is herself excused from helping to enforce the law she has helped to make. Oh, but they tell me they will require the unmarried women to act as jurors. There will, perhaps, be enough of them to answer that purpose, for marrying will become a lost habit in our country, if we apply ourselves much longer to this business of making menlike women.

Let us now examine the other view of this question. This committee will agree with me in saying that the privilege of voting should be granted only to those who will exercise it intelligently. Will women do that? Can they do it? With her home work, her church work, her charity work, and her social duties, what time will a woman have to prepare herself for these new duties of citizenship? Will she take it from her home and husband, or from her church and children, or from her charities and social pleasures? She must take it from one of them or from all of them; and can she make herself or the world better by doing so?

As I sat here this morning and heard these ladies talk, no shadow of doubt entered my mind that they could intelligently perform the duties of an elector, nor do I doubt that these ladies on the suffrage side could do as well; but they constitute a very small per cent of the women in the United States. And what are we to expect from the uncounted millions who have not had the good fortune to be educated as highly as these ladies here and who have not enjoyed the leisure to improve themselves? I do not hesitate to say that we have too many ignorant voters in this country now [applause], and woman suffrage will enormously increase the number. When I say "ignorant" I do not mean that they can not read and write, but I mean that they do not understand the theory of this Government or the measures upon which they may be called to pass. . . .

...

Are not practically all of these man-made laws most favorable to woman, so far as they touch her at all? In our State, where women have never voted and where I sincerely trust they never will, the law gives to the wife as her separate property everything she owns at the time of her marriage and everything she may afterwards acquire by gift, devise, or descent. Not only so, but our law gives to the wife one-half of all the husband accumulates, except such as comes to him by gift, devise, or descent; and upon her

death half of that community property goes to her children in fee simple. What more could women ask than this? Would they take more even if they had the power to do so?

And public sentiment, so far as it can be controlled by men, is even more favorable to women than the most liberal laws, if a husband sues his wife for a divorce, he dare not ask for alimony; for if he did, every upright man in that community would despise him. It is not so, however, with the woman. In many cases where the fault is hers she asks and she receives provision for her support. . . . We must have two sexes, and if the women insist on becoming men, I suppose the men must refine themselves into women. . . .

. . . I would leave her a woman, an American woman, if you please. A woman to whom I am ready to give my hand to help her over the hard places, or for whom I would lay my coat over the muddy places. That is the kind of a woman I believe in, and I do not think it is necessary to isolate her in order to show how much I respect her.

[T]he same rule can not be applied to women and to men. It will not do in matters which are not immoral in themselves. Suppose that when I step out on the street a man insults me. I am not so civilized that I will not fight; but I would hate to see a woman drawn into a street fight, no matter how grossly she was insulted. It may be entirely praiseworthy in a man to resent an insult, but altogether otherwise for a woman to fight anywhere, and especially in a public place. . . .

But returning from this digression, I ask you, gentlemen of the committee, Do you believe that you can increase the intelligent voters of this land by extending the franchise to women? Many of them will never have time to learn the duty of a citizen; some of them will have no inclination to do so; and some, like their unfortunate brothers, will be incapable of learning. When those three classes are combined it is a moral certainty that where you will add 20 per cent of intelligent electors, you will add 80 per cent who will never understand our institutions, and can not therefore contribute to their perpetuity. I repeat that we want more, not less, intelligence in our electorate; and I apply that rule to men no less than I do to women. I have never been able to reconcile with my sense of justice our requirement that a child born of American parents, and reared under the influence of an American home, shall wait until he is 21 years old before he is permitted to vote, while strangers within our gates, aliens in blood and faith, without knowledge of our institutions, and sometimes with a misconception of them, are allowed to vote after they have resided here only two or three years. I have never believed in that; because I do not believe that any man ought to help govern this country who does not understand the principles of this Government.

I would not let any man—white or black, in the North or South—vote unless he can read and write; because I know that the existence of this Republic depends upon the average intelligence of those who vote. . . .

. . . Our ideal woman is one of gentle speech, and her effort always is to make the world happier, even if she does not make it wiser. She goes about her mission in life with a smile on her lips and joy in her heart, oppressed with no sense of duty unperformed and perplexed by no duty unperformable. She chooses to sit at the bedside of the sick rather than in the seats of the mighty and delights more in training her children than in governing the country; that which she loves most is to point her boy to ambition's dazzling heights and tell him how difficult, but still how glorious, it is to attain them; or to teach her daughter to shun every man who does not believe in women and every woman who does not believe in God. That, sir, is our ideal woman. Such a woman was the wife of Thomas Jefferson; such a woman was the mother of George Washington; and if the God of nations would grant me one prayer above all others, that prayer would be that such a woman shall be the American wife and mother through all the years to come; for with her this Republic can not perish, and without her this Republic can not survive.

MRS. MAUD WOOD PARK

When we talk about the principles and the ideals of this Government, I think we should remember that there are three great statements, three great expressions of the American ideal, that have been written into the literature of our Nation, and those expressions are taken to stand for the American spirit; they are taken to stand for the ideals of our Government.

The first of them was written at the beginning of the war which established this Nation as a nation, and it was that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The second of them was uttered by a Republican President of the United States—Abraham Lincoln—toward the conclusion of the war which threatened to rend asunder this Nation: and he said that "government of the people, for the people, and by the people must not perish from the earth."

The third of those statements has very lately been uttered at the time of our entrance into the greatest war that the world has ever known, and it was uttered by a Democratic President of the United States—Woodrow Wilson—when he said:

We fight for the things that we have carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of the people who submit to authority to have a voice in their government.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to ask you if this Congress will not be safe in taking a course of action with regard to the submission of this amendment; if it will not be constitutional; if it will not be dealing in accordance with the highest ideal, the true American spirit, when it submits to the States a proposition which will make this country truly a democracy, and which, for the first time, will make it a "government of the people, for the people, and by the people"?

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before I reply to the gentleman who was the speaker of the afternoon I would like to present to you this petition [indicating]. It was gotten up in the month of December. Our auxiliaries in the various States were requested to ask men of importance in their States to sign this petition, which was to be limited to a thousand names. I had myself not seen those names until I glanced them over here this afternoon.

Here are petitions from the governors of the enfranchised States. There is another one to come from the governor of Arkansas; and here [indicating] there are as signers or petitioners the governor of Florida and the governor of Tennessee. I will not name the western or the northern governors.

There are other men of importance in politics: State officials from the South; the State chairman of the Corporation Commission of Richmond, Va.; the attorney general at Richmond, Va. There are two and a half pages of mayors, among them the mayors of several cities in Virginia, in Florida, and in Texas. There are two mayors in Georgia. It will pay you to look it over. It contains a thousand names of men. The original signers are in these two volumes [indicating], plus two others which I will deliver to the committee a little later. The printed petition is here, and there will be one provided for each member of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, as I sat here this afternoon I was reminded that the first president of Harvard College wrote a very famous preface to a very famous book, in which he declared that there were many people of this country of ours who were witches without any question, and that it was the duty of all good people to hunt them out, for the welfare of the community. He was an intelligent and a highly educated man, and Harvard was the leader of our educational institutions.

But 25 years later there was no intelligent man in this country who did not know that there never had been such a thing as a witch anywhere. The trouble with the president of Harvard College was that he lacked vision.

You will remember that there was a man who wrote a book, proving in that book that a steamship could never cross the ocean. That book was brought to America by the first steamship that crossed the ocean. That man lacked vision.

I recall a speech by Webster, a great, wonderful, and eloquent speech. It was either upon the admission of Oregon as a State or the organization of Oregon as a Territory, I now forget which. But I do

recall that the chief argument was that Oregon was so far away from Washington that, even if it were organized, its delegates, starting after their election, could not reach Washington until the term of Congress for which they had been elected had come to an end.

And so the gentleman from Texas seems to lack vision. Webster lacked vision. He does not seem to know what has been happening in this great world of ours. And so I take pleasure in informing him, and you, incidentally, gentlemen, that when he wants to bring back the women like the mother of Washington and the wife of Jefferson, who wove their husbands' clothes and who read their Bibles by candlelight; when he dreams of those women who probably did not think, in the simplicity of their lives, that women would ever come to a time when they would want to vote, or when there would be any reason for it—they never dreamed that the spinning wheel would go into the factory, and that their daughters, and their daughters' daughters would have to go into that factory to earn their honest bread. They did not realize that the candle would be superseded by the electric light, and that no longer would the old industries of the home be performed there, but that a great industrial question, in which women would form a very integral part, would come in time, and that because of that question there would be a great awakening among the women of this and other countries to the need of the ballot as a protector of their new interests in the world.

And as a result of that movement it is my great happiness to inform the gentleman from Texas that I myself am that thing which he regrets—a voter.

As a matter of fact, I know I disappoint him, but in this troublous world I would rather have my vote as a protector than the reverence even of the gentleman from Texas.

Indeed, the speech to which we have listened has been very interesting, because it seems to be a chapter from a book that has been written long ago. The very week before the war it was my privilege, sitting in the balcony of the House of Commons, to look down upon the bald head of Mr. Asquith while he made a speech against woman suffrage, and so near was it in philosophy, in word painting, in expression of the terrible fear of what women would do to the country should they vote, and in certainty that the vote carries with it a duty, and that duty military service, that I am inclined to think that both of those speeches were drawn from the same source—and the source was the famous Cato the Elder.

Said Mr. Asquith:

I am unalterably opposed to woman suffrage because Great Britain is a great Empire, and it will always be necessary to defend it by military power; and what do women know about the war?

Three years later Mr. Asquith humbly confessed before the world that when a nation like Great Britain goes to war, and such a war as this one is, which calls for every ounce of power the nation can offer in its defense, men and women make equal sacrifices and therefore it is not a man's job, but it is a man's and a woman's job, and they are doing it together. [Applause.]

And so Mr. Asquith stands for woman suffrage to-day; and more, he has had the privilege of voting for it in the House of Commons. Consequently, when the gentleman from Texas says that, no matter how this movement may change in this country, he will never be for it, I beg to disbelieve that statement. Remembering Mr. Asquith, I think there are hopes for him.

He says that the vote is a privilege; granted. That the privilege carries with it a duty to perform; granted. But when he says that that duty is military service, he shows that he has not read what has been happening on the other side; how the men and the women of the country have made sacrifices in every one of those belligerent lands on the other side; how they have given their all; and that the women have not only, as the minister of munitions said, made it possible to carry on the war by their services in munitions factories, but the minister of railways has said that the railways could not have run without the women; and when, last but seemingly greatest of all, the man who is in charge of the royal dock yards says that they could no longer build the ships of England were it not for the women; and they have sent them up to the forests in the north to fell the trees. And now one of their experts says that he could build a dreadnaught had he no other help than the help of women. And because women can do these things and are doing them Great Britain has been great enough and big enough and frank enough to admit that women are assets in time of war.

Here is a headline in the newspapers: "American women nurse troops under shell fire." So they have been doing, all the way alone. But the gentleman lacks another vision: We are fighting this world war to-day because it is a death grapple between the autocracy which has governed the world in the past and the democracy that is to be. Doubtless every American has a different vision of the meaning of this war; but I am sure the great majority of Americans who do not like the idea of having a republic based upon military rule look to the future, when every military nation, and every king and emperor and kaiser and czar will be dethroned.

I believe that we should look forward to the time when every nation may really live in democracy, and when militarism will be no more. We are standing behind this war, every one of us, because we realize that it is to be the last grapple between those two forces. But we want to back it up with diplomacy afterwards. There are some who say that they can not trust women, because we stand for peace more than men do. We have the same sense of honor that men have. The women of Canada and New Zealand have voted for conscription.

It is not that. But we do want to back up the men of this country—not to go weakly forward in the hope that we may save our own country from war, but that we may honorably put war out of the world—that is the vision that the men and women of this twentieth century ought to have, and I believe that the majority do have it.

It has been said that American women can not carry a gun. Why, that is the kind of talk that we heard 40 years ago, and the speech is just that much behind the times. The gentleman said that he regrets that there should be the introduction into our politics of more ignorance. I regret it, too. I regret that there is not more intelligence in the world. I regret that our public schools have not made scholars and philosophers yet of all our people. But I believe that intelligence in politics is worth a great deal more than intelligence out of politics, and when I recall the great output of our public schools and our colleges, of women who are doing things, of their marvelous capacity to uplift the political institutions of this country, then I know that we are infusing into our electorate a positive source of strength.

In the last election in California there was 1 person in the population to every 4 who voted. In Georgia there was 1, I think, in 13 who voted. Now, what is the difference? You know very well that if you should take those two States to-day, with those differences in them—suppose the States were all equal peoples of equal intelligence and let them travel along for 25 years, you know that the one in which the one person in every four was a voter would be more progressive, more abreast of the times. It would have a larger vision; it would be more truly a State of the times than the one which disfranchised 12 and enfranchised 1.

That is why the vote is truly educational, and we want the vote because it is educational.

Said this gentleman: "Everything is all right as it is; the women are protected." Doubtless, he thinks so. It is not a question of what laws are good or what laws are bad now. There is not a man here who wants to keep his vote because some law against him is offensive; he is not trying to keep his vote just to change a single law. You might look at that in another way; you want to keep your vote and you value your vote because it is a defense of all of your interests in society, and it is a weapon of offense[^] too, with which to get the things which you want in the society of which you are a member.

Just one little illustration: When this war broke out all over the world and in our country, when the war came to us, there was a sudden breaking down, or a threat to break down, the laws governing the labor of women and of children, because even before there was yet time for the men to go, before the draft had come, before there had been many enlistments, they said: "These men will go to the war; let us have the right to put the women in their places "; and they wanted the right to change the hours and to change the wages of woman's labor.

In the State of New York the leading antisuffragist of the legislature introduced a bill to do away with the child-labor law for the time of the war. Now, according to the gentleman from Texas, the women ought to remain at home, oppressed by no sense of bad government. But in New York they are oppressed by the sense of bad government, and especially when that government oppresses the children of the State, and especially when they have to pay the taxes that pay for that government.

And so from all over the State of New York the women went to Albany. They represented the greatest organizations in New York State; they represented hundreds of thousands of women, and they

made their mothers' appeal on behalf of the children; and the legislature voted the man's bill to do away with the child-labor law during the war.

Those women might as well have stayed at home, for any good they did. But, thank God, we had a suffrage governor, and he vetoed the bill. But now let me say to the gentleman from Texas that there will be no introduction of such a bill in the Albany legislature; the women will not have to pay their fares to go to Albany to protest against it, for they have the right of suffrage.

And those are the things that we want the ballot for. We want it in order that it may defend us and our interests as we go along.

Men are very busy persons; they do not have the time to consider all the developments of society. There are a great many things that women can interest themselves in—that they may become intelligent about—and that they may bring about in laws and conditions which would never come without them. In the old days it was, as Mr. Bailey said, that a man's home was a man's castle, and no one dared to enter there. But to-day there is scarcely a law which has not entered into that home; it enters and it puts a tax upon everything in that house. It enters and it presides over the birth of every child, over the funeral of every one who dies, over the marriages, over the social arrangements of that home. It interferes with everything that is done within that castle. And that is the reason why the intelligent woman who lives in that castle is coming out of it to help the men to defend the rights of that castle.

As a matter of fact, I do not think it is necessary to talk about these things. We have passed that stage. I am sorry that any man still lives in this world who has stood still while the world has gone along. Nevertheless, if he has it is not our fault. As a matter of fact, we have won our case with the majority of the people of this country. They know we are right; they know that woman suffrage is coming. They know that no power on earth can do more than postpone its coming. They can not stay it.

But just now there is a different thing that has happened. All over the world, in other nations, they have considered this question; the war has made them think about it. They are not giving votes to women as rewards; the war has only opened the eyes of those men to the rightful place of women in the world as women—to their qualities and their capacities.

And so to-day we, the first great representative Government, are bickering here in this room over the question as to whether a woman should stay inside and let a reactionary man go out and protect her and defend her, while all the world, even the monarchical nations, are granting votes to their women.

There is no longer any necessity to discuss the question of whether the Federal amendment is tweedledum or tweedledee. It is a matter of national honor and pride. Are we as Americans going to stand against democracy, which we introduced into the world, or are we going to stand by our own principles? Are we going to stand up to the standards of our old-time mother country? Are we going to say—are you going to say, Mr. Bailey: "Go-ahead, you women; pay your taxes into the Treasury of the United States and let us men spend it for you, because taxation without representation is tyranny only when men are taxed," while the descendants of George III on the other side are saying, "When women are taxed without representation it is tyranny"?

Why, my blood runs cold when I think of how my ancestors fought in the War of the Revolution for such poor purpose. Little did they think that those who came after them would question that inalienable right of representation for taxes paid. And yet it has been done here to-day. And a man comes all the way from Texas to say that he will never believe in this thing, no matter what anybody else says.

Why, I am almost made to believe in kings. The King of Sweden has recommended woman suffrage to his Parliament, and the premier has pledged it. The premier of Italy has pledged it. The King of Belgium said to the visiting Congressmen, if correctly reported in the press, that when his kingdom is restored to him he will do his best to give votes to women. The King of England is going to sign a full suffrage bill directly. And shall we, who hate kings and hate monarchical institutions, shall we give out to the world from this Congress the statement to all the world, "We will do our best to block democracy in America; our women are unworthy to rank with the women of other countries"? Is that the answer we are going to give?

The Constitution has provided the way of amendment, and when the gentleman says: "Do you mean that three-fourths of the States are going to put the vote over on the other fourth " we say, " No; we

mean that the 48 States ought to ratify this amendment and stand up to the times in which they live; it is a part of their honor and their pride to do the American thing by ratifying it."

But if they do not: if Missouri, for instance; if the men of Missouri refuse to ratify that amendment and say, "No; all the world may have democracy, but we are going to have a little sex oligarchy," why, then, I say that the men and the women of New York ought to put it over Missouri in order to liberate the women of that State to whom liberty is denied by the men of that State. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Texas will think I have not answered him. I have not touched many of the points he raised. Most of them had absolutely nothing to do with the question before the committee—as to whether you should submit the Federal amendment to the Constitution.

And may I add one bit of practical common sense—that the gentleman has the wrong idea about representative government to-day? It is no longer the idea that the home is a place apart and the man over it is defending it. Things have passed on. We may regret it, but that is no way to face the present problem. The man who is really a man realizes that time passes on every year. It is a different world in which we live; and as Lloyd-George said, "The world is a century older than when the war began."

More, the treatment of this question which was applicable when the conventions were held in St. Louis and Chicago is no longer applicable to-day; for other nations all the world over have moved, and they have challenged us to keep pace with them.

The submission of the Federal amendment is simply a question of method. When we have gone to the States by State amendment, and have lost as in Pennsylvania, we must wait five years before we can get another referendum. They can amend only once in seven years in New Hampshire. We women did not make those laws. The men were so afraid that somebody would do something revolutionary that they tied up the constitutions with the most slow-moving, conservative procedure that they could find; and the result is that we have to untie those bits of red tape little by little.

And we find further, that there are no election laws in most of the States of the Union that can protect an amendment. And so we women have gone on strike. We are striking against the man-made election laws that make it impossible to be certain that we have had an honest election.

Therefore we are appealing from a method which is difficult in itself, not because it is undemocratic or not constitutional, but because the election laws and the provisions of the constitutions amount to obstructions chiefly. We appeal from that method to Congress.

It has been said that women are threatening. Not in the least. Is it not true that when you have a vote you use that vote to get what you want? If you have a vote, would you not use it to get what you want?

Now, I have a vote; just as big a vote as Mr. Bailey has. I could go home and vote, and vote, and vote every time there is an election. But I have worked too long for that privilege to be content to use my own while the women of Texas are still living under the influence of such a gentleman as the man who has come to speak to us here this afternoon.

And so I pledge myself to stand by, so long as breath within me there is, until the women of Virginia, and Missouri, and Texas are as free as we are in New York.

And what would you do if you wanted liberty for all women? Would you come before committees and appeal to them, saying that women ought to be trusted? Would you go to them with all that fol-de-rol, when to-day the majority of intelligent men and women know the facts and that while women are different they are equal in intellectual power in their service to their country—a different kind of service, but nevertheless just as important.

Would you fool away your time talking about all those things that have been passed years ago? No. You would come to Congress and say, "Gentlemen, we ask you to submit the Federal amendment. We have honestly tried this method State by State, and it does not work; not because we can not convert the people of the States, but because we have no protection in that election."

Let me show you the difference. My former home was Iowa. It is a prohibition State. Two years ago the German brewing interests of that State defeated woman suffrage. Just now they have defeated prohibition; and yet you will say, "Look at Iowa; they have no suffrage in that State, but it has a prohibitory law."

Why? Because the constitutions permit a prohibition law to be established, but they are so worded that no suffrage law can be made in the same way. That is the reason why we protest. It is not that we can not convert people.

And another thing right here I want to make clear: We women utterly refuse to recognize that the men of this country are the people of this country. Men and women together are people. And when a question is submitted to men alone, it may be constitutionally and legally adopted, but it is not adopted by a democratic process. Consequently, we have the right to appeal to the simpler method. That is all that we are doing.

And now, when we come to Congress and if Congress says "No," what would you do? Suppose Congress does not do it now, you are not going to vote for the man who says "No," but you are going to see to it as best you can that the men are in Congress who will do the thing you want. [Applause.]

That is a fundamental principle of democratic government; it has been the whole theory from the beginning; and every group of people who want things do the same way. So are we.

Now, Mr. Bailey is going to do his best to keep the women from having the vote. I am going to do my best with my vote to see that they get it.

MISS CHARLOTTE E. ROWE (National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to say, first of all, that it has been said frequently at these hearings that the antisuffragists had practically given up all their old arguments and that we were now talking merely about the socialism and the pro-Germanism of the New York State vote.

I want to make it very plain to you, and I want to get it into the record, that the antisuffrage association have by no means given up their principles regarding this question of feminization. Feminization is a much deeper thing than the mere casting of a ballot on election day. The leaders of the other side have recognized that fact. And we are opposing this feminization of government, and we are opposing this deeper thing to which the vote is merely a steppingstone.

Now, so far as this statement goes—may I ask Mrs. Catt a question at this point? The statement was made to-day that the suffragists would welcome the submission of this question to women voters. May I ask Mrs. Catt if she would welcome the resubmission of woman suffrage to the men and women voters of New York State? I am a New York woman, and in behalf of my organization I want to ask Mrs. Catt that question.

The CHAIRMAN. I think there is no objection to that if Mrs. Catt desires to answer the question.

Mrs. CATT. I will say that I would no more welcome the resubmission of a question already established in favor of woman suffrage than I would for a question of man suffrage. Is there a man who would be willing to allow the resubmission of the question of man suffrage? Certainly not. After having gone through one campaign and won suffrage, why should we go through another?

Miss HOWE. That, of course, eliminates the statement, then, made by the other lady on that side—that they would gladly at any time submit this question to a referendum of women.

Mrs. CATT. That is a different thing. That is the only legal method and the only possible method to get a referendum of women. We have stated over and over again that we wanted a referendum of men and women in the whole country, and this is the only method by which we can get it.

Mr. BLANTON. I should like to ask a question in that connection in order that the other lady might not be misunderstood. Mrs. Catt, if to submit this matter to a referendum of women would delay the issue a year, or two or three or five years, no one of your party would be willing to submit it, would you?

Mrs. CATT. That is correct.

Miss ROWE. Thank you for the answer. It has been said here that it is not necessary for any woman to vote if she is enfranchised, just as it is unnecessary for a man to vote if he does not want to. I, who know something of the conditions in the State of New York, know that that argument, used by suffragists, was one of the great encouragements to the Socialists. It is due to the fact that the Socialists recognized that the mass of the women probably will not vote that they were probably so insistent and so determined that this year they should have their grand opportunity to bring in socialism, because they

know that every socialistic woman will come out and vote, and it is because of that double power and with the expectation that the Republicans and the Democrats will have that double voting power that they demand this thing. And the suffragists who claim that they are not Socialists have a great responsibility on their shoulders in having constantly said to the Socialists that if women got the franchise it would not be necessary for the home-loving, motherly women to vote, and if they did not want to vote they could stay at home.

That is exactly what the Socialists are counting upon. Mrs. Catt has said that the work of women has gone out of the home. Suffragists always are talking about the days of the spinning wheel being past and the days of the factory being at hand; they are always referring to the fact that we use electric lights now instead of tallow candles. They say our grandmothers used to make their own soap, whereas they now use Colgate's; and they say, "Let us follow our work out of the home."

But, gentlemen, I say to you that it is insincere to say that the work of women has gone out of the home. The woman at the head of the household, whether it consists of 2 rooms or of 22, a small, cozy apartment or a handsome one, a cottage or a mansion in the suburbs—that woman has her hands full if she is willing to do her share in its maintenance and its beautifying. The luckiest workingman in the world is he whose wife is a good housekeeper; and this country would not be the fine, great Nation that it is unless there had been plenty of those blessed women.

And if working girls and women in colleges would study cooking and sewing and domestic science and hygiene, or simple rules of health and how to care for the sick and the fine and beautiful art of home making, it would be much better for them and better for the country than if they spend their time parading up the avenue of a crowded city and praying that they may some day, somehow, become policemen or boiler makers side by side with men. [Applause.]

The work of women, they say, has gone out of the home. Have you ever attended the trial of an arrested child? Have you ever seen a deserted child? Have you ever seen a lost child? Have you ever attended the trial of a little arrested boy? You can see the pinched, perverted, tragic face of what we term the incipient criminal, his terror-stricken attitude. See his eyes widen, and he sheds tears when a kindly hand is placed upon his shoulder and a soothing voice tells him not to be afraid.

Here is what happens when the work of woman has gone out of the home: when fathers and mothers are free of each other. And I say to you that a thousand, nay, 10,000, balloted women can not do for that child what the one derelict woman might have done without the ballot.

Some women have, indeed, permitted their work to go out of the home, as our foundling asylums, our reformatories, and our prisons testify. They speak of the "home, heaven, and mother crowd." Mrs. Anna Shaw a few years ago characterized the antisuffragists as the "home, heaven, and mother crowd."

We are not ashamed of that characterization.

We have been called the enemies of womanhood; they say we are opposing woman's development. They say, "You are the enemy of woman; you are trying to crush them in the four walls called home." That is the suffragists' definition of home—four walls. But four walls do not constitute a home. There are four walls to this room, but it is not home. Home is where the heart is. Home is the altar of human affection; home is the shrine of man's desire. And in spite of this aspersion; in spite of this contempt; in spite of this everlasting ridicule to which we are subjected, I am not ashamed to say a word in defense of that old-fashioned place called home.

Because, I will tell you this: You can take from your public life, your political life, every woman who is in it—I do not care whether she is in the House of Representatives or the Senate of the United States, or in the Colorado Senate, or mayor in a town in Kansas: I do not care what position she occupies in a political sense. You can take her out of that place, and some other woman or some other man can take her place, and there will not be a ripple on the surface of your civilization.

But if you everlastingly preach this doctrine that home is a small, narrow place; if you say to your women in your homes, "Do not be satisfied with this existence of your grandmother; do not be content to be a woman with four or five children; come on out and be free; come out and be independent; have a pay envelope; come on out and be independent economically, politically, and socially"—and that is what the feminists are demanding—if you do this thing, you will prostitute your civilization, you are a vandal,

and you have stripped from life its most beautiful thing, that which has lifted men and inspired them and clothed them with immortality, the instinct in the heart and soul of civilized men to place their mothers—I mean you, not necessarily all women, but your own individual mothers, squarely apart from the rabble of the street.

Now, the suffragists say that we talk about the chivalry of men. They have called us sentimentalists; they have said, “You depend upon the chivalry of men.” And they have said to me again and again, “There is no such thing as chivalry in the souls of American men; you belong back in the sixteenth century.”

But I am not talking about sixteenth century chivalry; I am talking about twentieth century chivalry; I am talking about the chivalry of my own brothers; I am talking about the flower of this great Nation of ours, who at this very hour are being conscripted to fight—for what? Not only for the safety of democracy but for the safety of democracy’s womanhood.

And I say to you that it has remained for this self-sufficient twentieth century to have produced a womanhood which would stand—even a small proportion of it—in legislative halls and say that they are doing more in this great and terrible war than the men are doing.

No; I do not belong to that type of women. Let me make it very plain to you that the women whom I represent consider that the sacrifice which those boys are making is the greatest sacrifice the world has ever seen, and that we are its beneficiaries.

They say to you, “Why, women also work; women also do these things in the ammunition factories.” But do I have to remind you that the women, many of them, in ammunition factories earn \$30 a week, while the soldier boy gets but \$30 a month, placing the question merely on the dollars and cents basis.

And does anyone imagine that that woman in the ammunition factory, who is doing work far from the field of battle, does anything to be compared with this terrible labor, this drudgery, this tragical and unspeakable and terrible death which that boy upon the battle field of France has to face? No; no. I want you to understand, I want it in this record, that there is at least one body of women in this great country of ours who is appreciative of this great sacrifice of the manhood of America.

You were told something about the National Council of Women, and you were reminded that this National Council of Women wanted this thing. Gentlemen, I think it was this same National Council of Women which sponsored a bill before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization—I think that was the name, of which Mr. Kaker himself was chairman—a bill introduced by a member of this very committee, and at the hearing before that committee such evidence as this was brought in: That the mother is the permanent parent, and that the father is only a casual parent. That statement was brought out at that hearing.

You may think that feminization is only an imaginary thing, but it has come to your very doors, you men from suffrage States, and it has remained for the suffrage States to produce women who would dare to make such a statement as that.

And I want to tell you that the statement that fathers are casual parents is not only dishonoring the men of this country but it is dishonoring its womanhood. There are women in this country—not suffragists, perhaps, but certainly, thank God, there are women in this country who are not willing to say that the fathers of their children are casual parents, and yet such is the logic and ultimate outcome of the doctrine of feminization.

You are also reminded about something about the Federal amendment—Mrs. Catt says that she wants to use the vote to get what she wants. I thought all along that Mrs. Catt wanted to get the vote. I do not know. Perhaps she wants something more than the vote. Does she want office? What more does she want, now that she has the vote?

You were reminded of the red tape that hinges about this question of State rights. I am not going to talk about that question of State rights, because it has been handled by abler speakers than myself.

But I want to read you just one paragraph written by the President of the United States, wherein he explains some of this red tape. Woodrow Wilson said:

The amendment of State constitutions, like the amendment of the Federal Constitution, can be effected only by elaborate, formal, and unusual processes which are meant to hedge the fundamental law about with greater dignity and sanctity than attaches to any other body of legal procedure.

I would commend to every member of this committee a reading of that textbook by Woodrow Wilson. The name of it is *State and Federal Governments of the United States*. It is a textbook upon this great fundamental question.

The suffragists have said that they want to be the comrades of men. It has been said two or three times during this hearing that they want to be the comrades of men. That reminds me of the suffragist in New York who used to say, "Yes; we just want to be comrades of the men." It is very plausible; they say it with great charm of manner; it sounds quite human and interesting.

And sometimes they will say, "We want to be comrades of the men on election day; we want to walk by their sides on election day, and strengthen and sustain them when they go to the polls." And when they are married women, they say, "My husband is a feminist; my husband wants me to walk by his side on election day and sustain him when he goes to the polls."

Gentlemen, if I were a married woman and my husband was a feminist, and on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November he said to me, "Come and walk by me, so as to strengthen and sustain me as I go to the polls," I would say to him, "Look here, Mabel, here is the key of the flat: I am going home to father." [Laughter.]

And I would advise men and women suffragists, and especially those suffragist men who need their wives to strengthen and sustain them on election day—I would advise them to go to the cellar and check over the laundry.

Mr. MEEKER. Excuse me for interrupting; but yesterday I received a letter from a lady in St. Louis, in which she named those kind of men "neuters."

Miss ROWE. Thank you. Mr. Meeker. I think that covers it. Perhaps, better than I possibly can.

....

I do not want to bother you with figures; but it is a fact that if you add up all the men who have voted for woman suffrage and add up all the men who have voted against woman suffrage in all the suffrage States since 1893, and if they should pool all this vote according to the democratic method, you would find more than a million majority against suffrage, and we would not want woman suffrage in any State.

Mr. MAYS. How far back did you say?

Miss ROWE. 1893.

Mr. MAYS. That is going pretty far back, is it not?

Miss ROWE. Yes; but we have totaled the whole thing. I do not see the point in that question. I did that in order to be fair. In fact, the majorities against suffrage have considerably increased.

Mr. MAYS. That was before you were born, is it not?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Can you put into the record all the votes, so that anyone who wants only the recent dates can refer to them?

Miss ROWE. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And a person can also go back as far as he likes in comparing the vote?

Miss ROWE.

... It seems to me that a great deal of the suffrage attitude is very materialistic. I wish you would make a study of the thing called "feminism," or the demand that is being made for what they call the political, economic, and social independence of women. It is a thing that, if followed, will destroy the integrity of the unit called the family. Your family can not endure if you continue to break down these interdependencies. We say that the family relations of the men and the women are interdependent, not independent. We say that their social entity is interdependent also.

... And if I may speak for myself, personally, I believe that this terrible problem of war—all these terrible conditions to which civilization is heir—never will be destroyed until the power of womanhood is aroused. And that power of woman will be destroyed by political participation; because the moment

you enfranchise your womanhood you make them Democrats, Republicans, or Socialists, all wrangling among themselves, duplicating the necessary work of men and also bringing into your electorate this feminine, absolutely incompetent vote, so far as any enforcement of the law goes.

. We say to you that the power of womanhood is the greatest force in the world; but we tell you also that woman's power is always by inspiration. A woman can only win by inspiring men. And when a woman says to you that she has no power without the ballot: when she says to you that she cannot impress her day and her generation without this physical weapon of manhood, I say to you that already she has lost her grip on womanhood, and the ballot can never in the world give it back to her.

. . .



OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS