

THE REMONSTRANCE AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1914

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

Nearly six Branch Committees; 26,000* members in 396 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President.

MRS. MARY S. AMES.

MRS. JOHN BALCH.

MRS. ANNA L. DAWSON.

MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD.

MRS. AGNES IRWIN.

MRS. FRANCES C. LOWWELL.

MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL.

MRS. HENRY M. WHIPPNEY.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
pro tem. Walnut Street, Brookline.

MRS. E. C. POST, Rec. Sec'y.

MRS. CHARLES F. STEVENS, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

—
Vice-
Presidents
—

* Not exact membership of women over 21 years of age eliminating those names which the Association has lost from death, resignation, and removal from the State

SUFFRAGE AND THE BABIES

This call for contributions to the suffrage "melting-pot" contained the following appeal:

"Among your personal possessions there is something you can give, something you can consecrate, perhaps a little silver cup kept for love of some child. Every three minutes, a baby dies in this land of ours from some preventable disease or from improper food. Give the little cup, that the mother wisdom of the country may express itself directly through wise, sane laws for the good of children."

This is touching. But how is "the mother wisdom" of the country expressing itself in suffrage states? How does it happen that there are better child labor laws in male-suf-

frage states than in suffrage states? And, apropos of this matter of improper food for babies, what are we to say of this extract from a letter by Mr. Nathan Straus in the Los Angeles Times of March 24, 1914?

"Other states and countries have adopted wise and judicious laws to prevent the spread of diseased animals and the sale of milk from infected cows. California is one of the few states which still permit the sale of milk from tubercular cows."

Suppose that Dr. Shaw and the other signers of the "melting-pot" appeal, instead of trying to use infant mortality as suffrage campaign material, were to try to secure decent sanitary legislation in California and other suffrage states. Would it not be a good expression of "mother wisdom"? And would it not be a great deal more useful to the community and a great deal more sincere?

WHY WOMEN OPPOSE WOMAN SUFFRAGE

THOUGHTFUL women realize that voting is less a privilege than a responsibility. To vote as good citizens ought to vote requires time and strength which the average woman can ill spare from her normal activities. She cannot take on man's job without slighting her own.

Women are not in the habit of shirking. If they were convinced that their use of the ballot would be a benefit to the state, they would take up the new responsibility courageously. But this is precisely what has never been proved. Suffragists, it is true, go on making reckless promises. But when asked for actual proof, more and more they follow Judge Lindsey in admitting that "women are as free of the power of the Deast as men are,—and no freer," and Professor Max Eastman

in regarding the claim that woman's vote will purify the political arena as pure sentimentality.

When leading suffragists admit that women will divide at the polls pretty much as men do, the argument that women ought to assume the suffrage for the good of society vanishes. The suffragists are actually asking women to add the responsibility of the ballot to those they are already carrying for no better reason than that a small but very noisy minority of women want it. The claims of the woman of the home, the woman of large philanthropic activities, are to be set aside, if the suffragists have their way, at the demand of the woman of cross-country "hikes," of spectacular street parades and of soap-box oratory. To such lengths has this disregard of the interests and wishes of the great majority been carried that it is now boldly affirmed that, if only one woman in any state wants to vote, she should be given the "right."

Women oppose woman suffrage also because, so far from being a movement of "progress," it is a step backward toward the days when little or no discrimination was made in favor of women in the distribution of the burdens of society. It has been well said that, the farther we get from savagery, the more marked is the disposition among men to relieve women of the harder work and to shield them from the rougher experiences of life. The suffrage movement urges women to ignore all differences of function and powers, and to relinquish the privileges and exemptions which an advancing civilization has given them in order that they may engage in a futile struggle for "equality" in alien fields of politics and public life. At a time