

[July 7, 1919]

Mine "Adversary hath written a book." "Yea thine own lips testify against thee."—Job.

Women ARE Taught by Men to Deceive; All are Liars **How Long Halt Ye Between (these) Two Opinions?** **"Greater Love Hath No Man"**

"WOMEN ARE TAUGHT BY MEN TO DECEIVE; ALL ARE LIARS"

(Dr. ANNA H. SHAW)

Notable Suffragist Passes Through Birmingham on Way to Address State Association at Tuscaloosa. Talks Interestingly of Progress of the Work.

"But women are greater liars," was Dr. Anna Howard Shaw's reply to a remark that men were liars, made by a prominent suffragist at the Tutwiler Thursday morning.

"All women are liars. That is the trouble with the suffrage movement today. Women have been taught for so long, by the men, to win what they wanted by deceit, that it is now hard to come forward and ask for it in a straight forward manner."

Dr. Shaw has a charming, almost Scotch, accent and her face is touched with the lines of an habitual humorist. "The most consistent part of men is their inconsistency," she continued. "I have always thought so, but I never had the nerve to say it until recently."

But when she launched into the serious questions that have to do with woman suffrage, one could not imagine her lacking nerve in anything.

She chatted lightly on several subjects, her trip, her recent visit to Raleigh, N. C., and Philadelphia, and the progress of the cause in other sections of the country.

"But," she said, "I believe that undoubtedly the Southern States will be ahead of the East and the Northeast in winning the ballot. Things may look dark at times, but progress during the last two or three years has indicated the advance of the cause."

"The men and their idea of chivalry, which does not now and never did exist, stand most in the way in the South. They are most conservative and fear the entrance of women into politics, which they say is too filthy, and yet they refuse to admit that they are themselves part of the filth. They give reasons, but stick to theory and idea rather than facts."

"It isn't the men who are working and making homes that I fear. It is the shifting, unsettled, mostly unmarried men that are drifting in groups from place to place that will give the most trouble. They are the first to make objections."

"The legislators say that women will not be satisfied with the ballot, they will be wanting to hold office, but the recent law passed in Montgomery allowing women on school boards, shows that they are willing that women should hold office, but want them elected by the men."

—Birmingham News.

WHAT IS PEDESTAL?

By James Callaway.

The press dispatches from London relate a touching story of man's deference to woman—even giving his life to save hers.

Alfred G. Vanderbilt was on the deck of the Lusitania as she went down. He could not swim, and had equipped himself with a life belt. Near him he saw a young woman without a life belt. He gallantly took his off and placed it around this woman—a stranger to him. Before he could secure another the boat sank. This man of great wealth, gave his life to save the woman. This was "pedestal." His duty was to the weaker one. He surrendered to her his only chance of life.

"No man has greater love than this—that he lays down his life for another."

When Southern men say they place their women upon a pedestal, what do they mean? That the woman comes first. He places her above him. He regards her as purer, loftier than himself.

Even when the sea is opening as a yawning gulf, and only one life-preserver, he hands that to the woman. That is what we mean when we say we place our women on a "pedestal." Save her, even if the man goes down. This is the Southerner's ideal of his duty.

And, like Vanderbilt, so did Archibald Butt act in the tragedy of the Titanic. A member of the White House, associated with President Taft, the officials rushed to provide his representative with a seat in the life-boat—a compliment to his official station. Did he avail himself of it?

What did he do?

A woman was near. He seized her, placed her in the seat reserved for him, and as the boat was sinking, waved her adieu, his very countenance lit with a smile. This was manhood. This was "pedestal." He gave his life to save the woman. Greater love hath no man than that.

Love for what? Not for the individual woman whose life was saved, but in obedience to that principle of deference to womankind.

May our Southern women remain on the pedestal, forever preserve that distinctive deference which is theirs so long as they remain as they are—our highest ideals of the true, the beautiful and the good.

Thank God that Archibald Butt and Alfred G. Vanderbilt illustrated in their self-sacrifice the true spirit of American manhood.

On Mother's Day we wore the white flower in token of our affection for our departed mothers. The heart of each bowed in love and reverence at her shrine. This, too, was "pedestal." May our women never desert the pedestal, but remain on it—the objects of perpetual adoration and homage.

Deference to its womankind has always been a distinguished characteristic of the Southern people. Southern men would perpetuate it. But foreign forces have invaded us, established branches over the South of a huge National Woman's Association whose ideals are not our ideals; whose women are not like our Southern women. They are women of a different clay, and are of different mould. Should these foreign crusaders succeed, pervert the tastes of our women, persuade them to abandon their old ideals and descend into the arena of politics, as practiced in Oregon, Washington, California and Colorado, then the Southern mothers of the future will change the song, "Oh, Where Is My Wandering Boy Tonight?" and distressingly and despairingly ask, "Oh, where is my wandering girl?"

Woe is the day for Southern civilization when the "pedestal" is overthrown.

God be praised that heaven's door was wide open to Archibald Butt and Alfred Vanderbilt. They symbolized our "pedestal."

—Macon (Georgia) Telegraph.

Lest Ye Forget. Only Fourteen States Want Suffrage—Thirty-Four Against.

July 7, 1919

SOME FACTS ABOUT SUFFRAGE LEADERS

A CAUSE IS NO STRONGER THAN ITS LEADERS

Why this Hysteria? Only 14 States For Suffrage and 34 Against.

(By J. B. Evans)

THE writer realizes that controversial subjects like Woman Suffrage should be tabooed in a crisis like that our country now faces, but if Northern agitators can come among us and discuss it in our High School building, he feels that a native of the State, who has its best interests at heart, should be excused for saying a few words through the press in opposition to a propaganda which he honestly believes is a worse menace to society and good government than a war with Germany.

In her recent speech at Montgomery, Dr. Shaw accused me of attacking the leaders of the movement instead of the cause itself. She was mistaken or misinformed; but I know of no better way to judge a cause than by its leaders. So I will mention a few facts as to some of them.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton was one of the first and foremost leaders and advocates of Woman Suffrage, and an agitator of the fanatical type. She was one of the authors of the History of Woman Suffrage, and a brilliant woman. But it is hard to understand how a Christian woman can follow such a leader or her teachings. She regarded the Bible as a man-made libel of women, and so dissatisfied was she with it that she wrote one of her own, called "The Woman's Bible," in which she tore the Good Book into shreds from Genesis to Revelations, not even exempting Jesus Christ from criticism on account of His attitude toward women. In the Suffrage History some verses by a Suffragette are quoted with approval, winding up with these lines:

"This doctrine of Jesus, as preached up by Paul,
If embraced in its spirit, will ruin us all."

Susan B. Anthony, the most prominent leader, was a rabid hater of the Southern people to the day of her death, and an absolute worshiper of the negro. Not a great while before her death she expressed keen regret that the statue of "Mr." Fred Douglass, her intimate negro friend, erected at Rochester, New York, faced South instead of North, because "Mr." Douglass had nothing in common with the South.

Dr. Anna Howard Shaw was the bosom friend of Miss Anthony, and is thoroughly imbued with all of her South-hating, negro-loving propensities. In July, 1915, she went directly from Montgomery to Philadelphia and addressing the Suffrage department of the Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, she said, "I hate to speak of colored people or white people, to speak to colored people or white people, I do like to speak to women." She deprecated the fact that some negro men were opposing woman suffrage, and said that in so doing he was hurting his own people. "He then shows he is not better than the white man and he ought to be better than the white."

Dr. Shaw is a woman of engaging manners and magnetic personality, but her intellectual development, as evidenced by her writings, is decidedly mediocre. I do not, however, entirely agree with a very prominent neurologist, Chas. L. Dana, who said it is comparable to that of an eleven year old child.

Another is Mrs. Norman D. R. Whitehouse, State President of the New York E. S. A. In the January, 1916, issue of the Masses, edited by Max Eastman, a radical Socialist, Feminist and Woman Suffragist, appeared a

"Ballad" setting forth in gross language that Jesus Christ was the illegitimate offspring of Mary, a fallen woman, and praising her husband, Joseph, for taking her to the Manger to protect her from the gossip and insults of their neighbors. In the following issue of the same magazine, February, 1916, appeared a long advertisement appealing to Woman Suffragists for donations to help the magazine in financial difficulties. Among much other gush it said: "In cartoon, in verse, in editorial, in story, the Masses has stood by us as no other magazine in America has. We propose to surprise the Masses this year by a New Year's present of \$2,500.00 from the women who appreciate its stand for Feminism." This was signed by Vira Boorman Whitehouse (Mrs. Norman DeR.), Alice Carpenter, and other prominent Suffragists. It is needless to mention Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, the woman of divorce fame; everybody knows her. Can any cause be a good one with such leaders?

If you advocate the cause, don't you endorse its leaders and all they stand for? And don't forget that among its most earnest advocates are all Mormons, all Socialists, all Feminists, negro preachers and negro school teachers. A nice bunch for ladies to be associated with even politically.

In conclusion, many prominent substantial business men are asking by what authority the City High School Auditorium is used for their harangues by political agitators, and whether the citizens of Selma are expected to vote another bond issue for the erection of another school to be lent to such purposes. The twelve hundred Selma women who signed a protest against Woman Suffrage, many of whom have children at the school, should protest en masse against its desecration.

Among other things, Dr. Dana says:

"Finally, as to anti-suffrage and intelligence. There is, I find, an acute controversy as to which party is the less intelligent, the suffragists or anti-suffragists. Real intelligence lies in wisdom, in the power to adjust one's acts and functions to the environment and its problems; and women seem, so far, to have taken in large measure the suffrage question, not intelligently, but obsessively. It is adopted as a kind of religion, a holy cult of self and sex, expressed by a passion to get what they want. There is no program, no promise; only ecstatic assertions that they ought to have it and must have it, and of the wonders that will follow its possession. The minds which lead a cause may be great and broad, inspired and unselfish; but they are so only when the cause has the same qualities. There are many quiet, sensible women who honestly believe in this cause, but often the active and aggressive workers and writers who think themselves so clever are definitely defective mentally. Measured by fair rules of intelligence testing, I should say that the average zealot in the cause has about the mental age of 11. They look through a cranny and see a dazzling illumination beyond, which is to them the light of a new heaven when it is really only the sublimation of an unoccupied "elan vital." Yet they consider every one who does not believe with them to be unintelligent, so I suppose that they will class as such.

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) Chas. L. Dana, M. D.

"Lest Ye Forget." Write Your Representative in Congress and Your Senators
not to Vote for Woman Suffrage.

[July 7, 1919]

"MOTHERING THE COMMUNITY"

(From The Remonstrance, October, 1914)

IT is a favorite argument with suffragists that women, by keener insight, higher standards, steadier devotion to duty, and superior practical ability, would effect civic reforms which have been neglected by men. We hear over and over again that "woman is an adept at house-cleaning" and that "city government is nothing but municipal house-cleaning;" that "the community is only a larger home," and that "it needs mothering."

It would be pleasant to share this confidence in the present achievement of our sex, and to feel that it was ready for more worlds to conquer. But the facts do not point that way. One after another, social experts, the country over, are voicing the conviction that the individual home is not being "mothered" as it should be, and that faults there are responsible for much of the evil of the community.

Speaking of wife-desertion—one of the evils which suffragists hope to check by Women's votes—Mrs. Catherine Van Wyck, President of the Wisconsin State Conference on Charities and Corrections—said, last fall: "Some of the homes I have seen almost justify the husband in running away from them. The wife who does not know her job must take her share of the blame for many cases of wife-desertion." Upon this same point, Miss Lucy Wheelock, the well-known educator, has said: "No business is so poorly and inefficiently conducted as that of house-keeping. To the luxury and inefficiency of the modern household, many economists charge the high cost of living. They are not far wrong. At least they are right enough to make it imperative that we give our girls good and thorough training in all the craft of home-making and house-keeping."

Juvenile courts, the suffragists claim, would be reenforced in their work if women could vote. But Mrs. Fred T. Dubois, President of the Big Brother and Sister movement, though in close sympathy with these courts, writes to the Washington Times of June 12, to emphasize the need of urgent measures of prevention, before boys and girls reach the stage of juvenile crime. "Can you make human nature good through law?" asks Mrs. Dubois. "Is the old-fashioned home disappearing? I tremble at the thought. But when we watch the crowds upon the streets, day and night, the crowded cafes and restaurants, the dance-halls, moving-picture shows and theatres, this thought is uppermost: To

what are we trending? The social centre is gradually going to take the place of the home, if we are not watchful. For we are trending toward the community life in this country. Can we become as strong a nation built of large units as of small ones well modelled? The community must grow out of the home."

The public teaching of sex-hygiene is another subject in which the suffragists believe women voters would take keen interest. But here, again, experts are pronouncing women unequal to the opportunities they already have. Mr. Graves Moore of the Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago, reporting last March on the work of the association in classifying causes in the cases of 500 unmarried mothers, said: "We find that more than half of them come from homes where there is no financial pressure, but that they never had presented to them the essential facts of life." Dr. Charles H. Keene, of Minneapolis, a supervisor of hygiene and physical training, said at the recent meeting of the National Educational Association: "We should have but the strongest contempt for the wealthy, club-going woman who has not time to teach her child the fundamental truths of life, and would throw the responsibility upon a teacher or a football coach. Such shiftlessness is outrageous." Dr. E. P. Colby, professor of nervous diseases in Boston University, said before a Ford Hall audience, last winter: "The proper place for such teaching is the home. But how many mothers are capable of instructing their daughters in such matters? Probably not one-half."

Speaking of the abnormal nervous conditions which, in his opinion, lead many girls to go wrong, Dr. Colby said: "The remedy lies in the early education a good mother can give." Looking at the same pitiful question from another standpoint, Miss Mary Bartelme, head of Chicago's Court for Delinquent Girls, told a reporter from the Boston Herald, last year, that the majority of the girls who were brought before her were between fourteen and sixteen. "Almost invariably," said Miss Bartelme, "I find that the home environment of these children had been bad. When the home is bad, it must be a girl of sterling principle who remains good. There has been a great hue and cry raised recently that most girls go wrong because of inadequate wages. I do not believe this is true. Low wages, I think, drive comparatively few girls to the street."

It is startling to realize that the heedlessness, vanity, and social ambition of women are actually pandering to vice. But no thoughtful observer can doubt the fact. Speaking on "Commercialized Prostitution" in Brooklyn, last March, Mr. George J. Kneeland, of the Department of Investigation of the American Social Hygiene Association, enumerating the causes which swell the number of women in the profession each year, laid special emphasis on "the increasing tendency toward immoral and suggestive amusements as a serious problem in American life." For this tendency, surely, the mothers rather than the fathers of the community are to blame. At the theatre, too, and at the fiction-counter, the lack of delicacy shown by women patrons is notorious.

That woman's vote would break up the "white-slave traffic," and go far toward curing the social evil, has been the strongest argument of the suffragists. And yet, at that very Tremont Temple meeting, last year, when their leader, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, exploited the unsavory subject so sensationally, Mr. Frederic H. Whitin, of the New York Committee of Fourteen, declared that "a happy home is the greatest preventive of the white slave traffic," and added, "The great problem, however, is to educate young women not to arouse men."

Last spring, before a fashionably attired New York audience of nearly one thousand, with an admission price of \$2, the same subject was again discussed by experts. "The attitude of women toward libertines, rakes and dissipated," says the reporter, "was handled without gloves by the speakers, and it was the opinion of those dealing with the subject that women themselves are largely to blame for the present situation. Clifford G. Roe, President of the American Bureau of Moral Education of Chicago, unhesitatingly told his audience (mostly women) that this was so."

Plain speaking, this is. The fact that many of the sociologists whose opinions have been quoted are themselves suffragists only makes their admissions more striking. The need of the day seems to be, not more "mothering" of the community, but better "mothering" of the individual child. This conclusion will be a welcome one to the multitudes of mothers who believe that they can serve the community better through the home than through the ballot-box.

July 7, 1919

Virginia Warns Her People Against Woman Suffrage

TWENTY-NINE COUNTIES WILL GO UNDER NEGRO RULE OVER SIXTY COUNTIES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA THE ENTIRE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

WHAT OF YOUR STATE, YOUR COUNTY? ISN'T IT ABOUT TIME FOR REFLECTING
MEN AND WOMEN TO THINK—AND ACT?

THE THREATENED COUNTIES

From The Richmond Evening Journal May 4, 1915—Republished by Request.

Several times The Richmond Evening Journal has been asked to say which counties of Virginia have more colored than white female inhabitants. The question, of course, is in connection with the somewhat noisy demands we read of in the newspapers for "votes for women." Here is the list, from the United States census of 1910:

	Colored Females.	White Females.
Amelia	2,658	1,578
Brunswick	5,549	3,843
Buckingham	3,881	3,738
Caroline	4,314	3,934
Charles City	1,817	645
Charlotte	4,267	3,599
Cumberland	2,966	1,604
Dinwiddie	4,619	2,866
Essex	2,618	1,868
Goochland	2,585	1,914
Greensville	3,720	2,177
Halifax	10,330	9,815
Isle of Wight	3,720	3,633
King and Queen	2,635	2,069
King William	2,409	1,698
Lancaster	2,531	2,279
Lunenburg	3,338	2,856
Mecklenburg	8,280	6,160
Middlesex	2,148	2,053
Nansemond	7,847	5,602
New Kent	1,317	802
Norfolk	15,936	10,039
Northampton	4,587	3,536
Nottoway	3,715	3,016
Powhatan	1,818	1,168
Prince Edward	4,367	2,905
Prince George	2,257	1,601
Princess Anne	2,883	2,683
Southampton	8,005	5,001
Surry	2,804	1,763
Sussex	4,458	2,270
Warwick	2,053	819
Westmoreland	2,279	2,193

We may assume that the proportions of females twenty-one years of age, or over, or who have come of age since the census was taken is the same in the two races.

Assuming that the women of the two races would qualify to vote in the same proportions and that the white and colored male vote would remain as they were shown to be by the returns of the last presidential election, the colored people would have absolute and immediate control of the counties of Amelia, Brunswick, Caroline, Charles City, Charlotte, Cumberland, Dinwiddie, Essex, Goochland, Greensville, King and Queen, King William, Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Nansemond, New Kent, Norfolk, Northampton, Nottoway, Powhatan, Prince Edward, Southampton, Surry, Sussex, Warwick and Westmoreland.

In Buckingham, Halifax, Lancaster and Princess Anne the whites would have a fighting chance if their women vote and present white male vote combined solidly against the colored woman and present colored male vote.

It is to be remembered that the literacy test would not work in choking off the colored woman vote. The colored people are decreasing their percentage of illiteracy very fast, especially among their women and girls. The ladies of the suffrage league will hardly come forward with a property test. No safeguard would be left but the poll tax; and if colored women knew they could get votes and rule some very rich and important counties by paying \$1.50 apiece, we are inclined to think most of them would be willing to go hungry, if necessary to do it.

Probably the ladies engaged in this suffrage movement are not very practical or very logical or very well informed or disposed to bother their heads with the actual facts of politics. Most of them, we surmise, hold the somewhat vague, but firmly established feminine line of reasoning that when they want something, or think they want it, they ought to have it by all principles of wisdom and justice; and are prepared always to fall back on the traditional conclusive feminine argument "because."

No other argument, however profound, is quite so convincing or fascinating as that word "because," accompanied by some pouting of alluring and scarlet lips—especially if there be dimples by way of re-enforcement. But men are compelled and accustomed to face and deal with hard facts when considering important affairs in business or in politics. It is a hard fact that twenty-nine counties of Virginia would be condemned by woman suffrage to colored rule and five others would be in serious peril of it with woman suffrage.

We do not suppose, or imagine, that the suffrage ladies would suggest resort to counting out the colored people of their own sex or to stuffing ballot boxes or padding registration lists. We wicked and inefficient and tyrannical men who are supposed to have made such a sad mess of government in Virginia, became ashamed of such methods and alarmed by them and contrived to remove the necessity for them. Surely, we are not to be incited to return to the slime-pit from which we dug ourselves.

The population and the votes are in these counties as stated. We can't get away from the figures and facts, ladies. Take twenty-nine counties and make them Republican and add them to the counties already Republican, or close, and the Democratic party and white rule in Virginia will be swinging on a mighty thin line.

July 7, 1917

Anna Howard Shaw Said:

“What is the American Flag But a Piece of Bunting”

America does not need Military and Industrial Preparedness if it is Prepared to Live Within its Own Borders.”

Speech Made at the Last Session of the Forty-Eighth Annual Convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

So much Indignation was Aroused Over this Statement, Throughout the North, that she Laboriously Composed a Very Eulogistic Peroration to this Flag Trying to Deny the First, but the Records were Against her.

POLITICS AND PATRIOTISM WAR AND WOMEN

(By J. B. Evans)

The action of the powers that be in placing the management and control of women's war service in the hands of suffragist leaders and particularly the registration of Alabama women was, from a patriotic point of view, distinctly unfortunate. The inevitable disappointing result might have easily been foreseen. After weeks of publicity and explanation through the newspapers of the object of the registration, and a formal proclamation by the Governor fixing the day and calling on all women to show their patriotism by registering on that day, very few, comparatively speaking, responded. No enthusiasm was shown except by the suffragettes, practically all of whom registered.

Was this enthusiasm aroused by pure and undiluted patriotism or was it zeal for their peculiar propaganda and the political advantage they expected to gain by having all of the women come to them to register? Is it possible that the very small per cent of Alabama women who compose the Alabama Woman's Suffrage Association are more patriotic than the great mass of our women outside of the A. E. S. A.? If so, it is gratifying to know that in this respect at least they are radically different from their Northern leaders from whom they get their Suffrage Education and from whom they take their orders.

When it became evident that war could not be averted unless this country was willing to lay down in the dirt and crawl, and the Administration was urging preparedness, the Catts, the Shaws, the Addamses and practically all the lesser lights among the suffrage leaders by their attitude and utterances, did everything and said everything possible to hinder and delay the President in his efforts. Some of their utterances were worse than unpatriotic, they were seditious and savored of treason. They were all pacifists of the aggressive and defiant type. Rev. Anna Shaw referred to the flag contemptuously as “only a piece of bunting.” Mrs. Carry Catt frankly declared that she was “rebellious” and that this country had no right to wage war for democracy until it made itself democratic. On May 11, after she had been put on the Woman's Committee of the Board of Defense, (as unfortunate a blunder as putting the Suffragists in control of the registration), she made a speech at Toronto, her announced subject being National defense. The Toronto Daily News in reporting it said among other things “Mrs. Catts never reached National defense nor anything else but Votes for Women.” “She was distinctly unpatriotic. The United States was attacked rather than defended by the lecturer. The position of the women of Yucatan was compared with that of the women of the United States to the disadvantage of the latter,—an insult to the intelligence of her audience and a defamation of her country.” “Surely even the most ordinary ideas of decency would be sufficient to suggest that her diatribe be confined to the borders of her own country.”

Miss Jane Addams, the queen bee of the pacifist-suffragists closing her philanthropic eyes and ears to the horrors of Belgium and France, to the shrieks of agony of tortured and outraged women and apparently forgetful or unmindful of the thousands of murdered and starving children ground under the heels of fiends incarnate who

were only obeying the direct orders of the spawn of hell who rules them, begged the President “to consider the feelings of our German-American citizens” before declaring war on their dear fatherland.

When, despite the wails and protests of these pacifist-suffragists, Congress declared war and the Administration began to prepare for it, the Catts and the Shaws from the depths of their own fertile brains or inspired by the advice of some shifty politician, suddenly conceived the idea of changing their tactics, and presto, the word was sent to the faithful: “We, the women of America,” not as women merely, but as suffragists, do hereby assume the burden of organizing all the women of America for war service, and we shall claim all the credit as suffragists for all the patriotic services of all the women and we hope and expect the reward which we will surely demand, viz.: the passage of the Anthony Amendment. Belated and newly hatched patriotism in one hand and political propaganda in the other,—patriotism with a string to it.

In condemning the unpatriotic words and actions of the suffrage leaders, the writer does not for a moment mean to charge that any Alabama woman is unpatriotic. It has been proved in the wars of the past that there are no women on earth more patriotic than the women of the South. Unfortunately some of them have allowed themselves to be misled by bold women who are the product of the peculiar social conditions of our Northern cities into advocating a political innovation the realization of which would be the undoing of the South, and the surrender of the vital principle of home rule for which their fathers bled and died. Most of the members of the Alabama Suffrage Association, are daughters and granddaughters of Confederate Veterans. In working hand in hand, as they are doing, with these Northern women for the passage of the Anthony Amendment, these misguided daughters of the South are endorsing the principles for which Thad Stevens, Fred Douglass, Susan B. Anthony and other bitter enemies of the South contended, and if they succeed then indeed was the blood of their fathers shed in vain.

The failure of Alabama women to come forward and register was not due to apathy nor to a lack of patriotism. It was silent resentment of the fact that they were expected to submit themselves for registration under the auspices of a political organization, an aggressive organization with aims and purposes that are distasteful if not offensive to the vast majority of our women. They feel and resent what they believe to be an attempt on the part of the suffrage organization to capitalize the patriotism of Alabama women to further their propaganda.

Whoever was responsible for turning this work over to the suffragists made a serious mistake, and however unwittingly, did a grave injustice to the women of Alabama.

If this registration had been placed in the hands of capable women, even though some of them were suffragists, to be controlled and managed by them as women and not as members of some controversial faction, the result would doubtless have been very different.

Selma, Ala., Aug. 17, 1917.

[July 7, 1919]

THAT DEADLY PARALLEL

No. 1.

The FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT to the Constitution of the United States as adopted in 1870:

ARTICLE XV.

- Sec. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
- Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

No. 2.

The PROPOSED—"SUSAN B. ANTHONY" Amendment to the United States Constitution:

- Sec. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of SEX.
- Sec. 2. Congress shall have the power by appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of this article.

Can Southern Men and Women Forget so Soon?

The Official History of Woman Suffrage, by Susan B. Anthony, names the following persons as instrumental in securing the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution: Susan B. Anthony, Anna Dickinson, Frederic Douglass (negro) and Theodore Tilton. This amendment was adopted in 1870, Susan B. Anthony advising "that now is the opportune time." She reckoned well, for the South was in the shameful throes of Reconstruction and, STRANGE AS IT MAY SEEM, the Congressional Records show that SEVEN SOUTHERN STATES RATIFIED this INIQUITOUS Article. Those Southern States were helpless, under THEN existing conditions, with negroes in the majority in their Legislatures, and Susan B. Anthony well knew the methods necessary—FRAUD AND FORCE. PRESENT indications seem to establish, beyond any question of doubt, that the supporters today of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment under existing abnormal conditions, have again decided "THAT NOW IS THE OPPORTUNE TIME."

NOW as to the PROPOSED "SUSAN B. ANTHONY" amendment, a careful analysis will show the MASTER

thought and hand that prompted the FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT, in fact the two Amendments were drafted and proposed by the same parties and at the same period, the REPUBLICAN PARTY at that time adopting the Fifteenth, but would not accept the other.

Many times has Congress been asked to right the injustice done the South, but without avail. (CIRCUMSTANCES forced it to recognize this menace when it affected Washington and in order to procure relief, Congress passed a law taking away the right of suffrage to EVERY citizen of the District of Columbia)—; Congress has, however, been kind to the South, in that it HAS NOT EXERCISED the authority vested in it under Section two of the Fifteenth Amendment. HAD WE NOT BEST LET WELL ENOUGH ALONE?

The granting of suffrage to WOMEN would prove a serious problem, especially to the South and the CONTROL of suffrage is undeniably a RIGHT which belongs to the respective STATES and which they should not surrender to the Federal Government.

NOTE:—It will be observed, the proposed "Susan B. Anthony" amendment does not state, "race, color or previous condition of servitude." There is no need, as this feature is provided for in the Fifteenth Amendment.

Brown Printing Co., Montgomery, Ala.

[July 7, 1919]

A SOUTHERN WOMAN SPEAKS HER MIND

“OUR MEN, GOD BLESS THEM!”

**Superbly Brave Enough to Die for Us in France, Yet
Not Good Enough to Vote for Us at Home!
Oh, the Base Ingratitude of Some Women!**

WERE YOU REPRESENTED, SUFFRAGETTE, ON FLANDERS FIELD?

MR. JAMES CALLAWAY, in a column conducted by him in the *Macon (Georgia) Daily Telegraph*, prints the following letter, on November 30, from a distinguished Southern woman who sent it to him with the request that it be published.

“Has woman suffrage, with, comparatively speaking, a little band of willful women, ‘made cowards of us all?’

“Men, who were once real men, are almost perjuring their souls to curry favor with this small band of dissatisfied, hysterical females, who in no way are representative of the women of the nation, or of anything else, for that matter.

“Mr. McAdoo fairly spills over with ‘what the women are doing for their country,’ as if the loyalty of the American woman was a discovery of the present administration!

“To what ‘women of the United States’ does he allude when he wishes to offer the most dastardly insult written in the annals of history, that ‘votes for women,’ choked down the throats of 90 per cent of the women of the nation, is the price of their loyalty, in the opinion of these self-appointed judges of a fitting ‘reward?’ Surely one may say ‘thou treadest on holy ground with most unholy feet!’

“The ‘solid South’ elected Mr. Wilson. This eternal prating of ‘women’s votes’ is mere stupidity, and every well-informed man and woman knows it. Today it is this same South that rises in all her outraged dignity to say, and in no uncertain tones, to any man or woman, be he or she of high or low degree, that the loyalty of her womanhood is without and beyond price!

“THE WOMEN of the South know what war is. They have tasted its deadly fruits of hunger, cold and privations. Drunk to its bitter depths and dregs its fiery cup of gall! Standing upon the ashes of all save hope, we passed through our Gethsemane over fifty years ago.

“But we come today as one to face again, for the second time, war and all its horrors, and when hearts and souls are quivering with emotion, tears for the cruel sufferings of the past, dried but yesteryear, men dare offer this affront to us of added burdens, loathsome responsibilities, and would, with flattering, nauseous words, weigh our hearts’ blood in political scale and prate of ‘vote!’ Are we clean gone mad? It is past belief that American manhood could fall so low!

“For every woman who stands and shrieks for the ballot there are hundreds, aye thousands, telling you *they do not wish it. Do not force their patience too far!*

“The Western States are thinly settled; if the rest of the country does not please the *dissatisfied suffragettes let them ‘go West and grow up with the country!’*

“The women of the South do not come to plead, gentlemen; they demand that the sovereignty of their States be not disturbed at this most critical hour!

“Yet the Southern press sits and sucks its thumb while our very birthright is being sold for a mess of petticoats! Have our men become spineless cacti? Will they submit, as dumb, driven cattle?

“‘New York went for suffrage’ we are told with bated breath. With over 400 per cent increase in Socialism, more than 70 per cent foreign-born, is that surprising?

“But what is that to the South? The purest American blood in the nation flows in her veins and people. Instead of following, as sheep led astray, let us take warning from the experience of New York and stand firm in the faith of our fathers, and that ever safe rock of ages, the sovereignty of our States!

“Barter your own souls and your manhood if you must; play your cheap political games; weaken your government when its united strength is most needed, but *spare your women!*

“The Fifteenth Amendment and the force bill! How proudly they boast of these two dastardly achievements in their Official History of Suffrage! To ‘dear Anna Dickinson, Frederick Douglass and Susan B. Anthony we owe them!’ Suffragettes all!

“The wound is scarce healed, and some way we feel that our statesmen, no matter how great the pressure, be it under the thinly buttered sop of ‘war measure,’ that unspeakable insult of ‘reward’ or any other trumped-up vaporings of political expediency, will indeed hesitate, ere they loose these upon the Southern women for the second time, and add to them that pestiferous old maid and her legacy of hell, the Susan B. Anthony amendment!

“To the naked eye it is not visible, but a careful examination of the ‘inside of the suffrage cup’ shows these startling words: ‘Made in Germany.’

“Beware, indeed, oh woman of the South, of these Greeks who would bear to you this gift.

A SOUTHERN WOMAN.”

**Men of the South, the 15th Amendment but Sleeps.
No State Law can Control It. Let well enough alone.**

[July 7, 1919]

Will the States Consent to Blot the Stars from Old Glory, Leaving Only a Meaningless Square of Blue?

Then Beware of Federal Amendments Passed in "War Times" when the Public Mind is Demoralized.

A Message from the Old South to an United Nation of To-Day.

(By James Callaway.)

Macon, Georgia, Telegraph, January 8th, 1918.

IN TUESDAY'S column attention was called to Senator Bailey's warning against submitting constitutional amendments in war times when the public mind is out of joint and not in a normal condition.

Senator Bailey's position is illustrated in the passage of the fifteenth amendment. As it takes nothing short of revolution to get rid of an amendment, howsoever odious it proves, so amendments should be carefully weighed before making them Federal laws.

To show that it is unwise to pass amendments in times of war when the public mind is demoralized, it is well to recall the circumstances under which the fifteenth amendment became a national law, and for the nation to learn from the blunder then made, to avoid such unwise legislation in the future, at a time when passion and prejudice sway the thoughts of men.

That blunder of the fifteenth amendment put upon the country amid the excitement of war times produced the Ku Klux Plan. Of this Klan Collier's Weekly says:

"The Ku Klux Klan was a gigantic conspiracy of night riders who saved the civilization of the South and bequeathed it a priceless heritage to the nation. The conditions which gave it birth have no parallel in the story of the human race. The bloodiest and most destructive war in history had just closed. The conquered South lay helpless in her rags and ashes, with the flower of her manhood buried in nameless graves.

"Four million negroes had been suddenly freed and the economic world torn from the foundations of centuries. Five billion dollars' worth of property had been destroyed in the South; every bank had been closed, every dollar of money had become worthless paper, and the whole South—the eleven States—had been plundered by invading armies.

"The task of reorganizing this wretched society and controlling the millions of ignorant and superstitious negroes was one to appal the stoutest hearts.

"Such a blow on a disarmed foe, who accepted the surrender at Appomattox in good faith, could never have been struck had Lincoln lived, but upon his death, the shrewdest and meanest man who ever dominated over our national life became dictator of our republic.

"This man was beyond doubt the most adroit parliamentary leader in our history. A fanatic, a misanthrope, embittered by physical deformity, a born revolutionist endowed with the audacity of the devil, he became in a moment the bold and unscrupulous master of a crazed nation.

"Twenty-eight years before this, when he lived in Lancaster, Pa., he had become infat-

uated with a mulatto woman (Lydia Smith) of extraordinary animal beauty, whom he had separated from her husband. This yellow vampire fattened on him during his public career, amassed a fortune in real estate in Washington, wrecked his great ambition to be President, and made him a social pariah.

"But the muffled crack of a pistol in Ford's theater in the hands of a madman suddenly snatched this man from the grave and lifted him to the seat of empire with his negro wench by his side. Over him she had complete control and became the 'First Lady' of the land.

"Thad Stevens as master of the situation, being leader of the House, determined to blot the South from the map, confiscate the property of its citizens, give it to the negroes, deprive the whites of the ballot, while conferring it upon the former slaves, send their leaders into beggared exile, enfranchise the negro and make him master of every State from the James to the Rio Grande."

In this scheme he had the hearty support of Cady Stanton, Anna Dickinson, Fred Douglass, Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, Theodore Tilton and Lucy Stone, who set up shop in Washington, and beseeched Congressmen to stand up to Thad Stevens and his policies. This same Susan B. Anthony amendment was offered and insisted upon, but Congress refused to accept it. However, these women did not desert Stevens. To quote again from Collier's:

"If the statement about Thad Stevens seems extravagant, turn to the Congressional Record (Globe) for 1867, page 203, and read Thad Stevens' confiscation act, House bill No. 29, and his speech in its defense—a speech which lights with the glare of infamy his whole character and career. He lost the confiscation and miscegenation scheme by ONLY FIVE VOTES, but was sustained in the balance of his Reconstruction plan and measures.

"He disarmed all the whites, armed the negroes, placed the ballot in the hand of every negro, and a bayonet at the breast of every white man, though no armed foe existed anywhere. He organized the negroes through the Freedmen's Bureau into oath-bound secret societies, known as 'Union Leagues,' in which they were drilled in insulence and crime and taught to hate their former owners, over whom they were promised unlimited dominion. Every device was resorted to in order to detach the negroes from the whites. Stevens had his military sastraps to nail to the door of every court house his proclamation of EQUALITY and promised bayonets to enforce the intermarriage of whites and blacks. Negroes were supplied with arms taken from the whites and drilled every night at the league rendezvous.

"The women of the South being thus in danger, a 'reign of terror' immediately followed. The men who represented the Aryan civilization had to take their choice between rebellion against these conditions permitted

by the government or annihilation. A great crisis was upon the men of the South.

"At this very time in South Carolina, 80,000 armed negroes, answering to no authority, terrorized the State, and not a single white man was allowed to bear arms. He was jerked up by the Freedmen's Bureau even if he kept an old shotgun in his home. Hordes of former slaves, well armed, paraded daily before the homes of their former masters. The children of the breed of Burns and Shakespeare, of Drake and Raleigh, had been made subject of the spawn of the African jungle." This from Collier's Weekly, and taken from Harper's. But it shows how unwise and unstatesmanlike to enact legislation and put amendments to the Constitution when the public mind is out of balance—for the public mind sustained the Reconstruction measures, now regarded a foul blot on the escutcheon of the nation. Had it not been war times these measures would not have been passed and Lincoln's plan of "restoration" would have been adopted.

Hence it is Senator Bailey warns against submitting amendments during a period of war, when the public mind is distracted and out of balance. But the disciples and followers of Cady Stanton, Susan Anthony, Anna Dickinson and Fred Douglass are now in Washington to rush through the amendment as a companion of that fifteenth amendment which they aided Stevens to fasten upon the South.

No wonder the Ku Klux Klan arose as in a night to save the South. But the "leagues" had done their work of alienating the negroes from the whites.

The same organization that aided and abetted Thad Stevens had its headquarters in Washington. They are now making a "drive" on Congress, hoping in the unsettled state of affairs, Congressmen will yield to their entreaties and devices. These organizations care nothing for States and State self-government. At a suffrage convention in Washington City Mrs. Chapman Catt said: "If the Constitution stands in our way we will tear it up and make another to suit us." And so felt Thad Stevens. He said the "Constitution was a worthless old parchment, for which he had no regard."

Yet these anti-South and anti-Constitution suffragists catch the weaklings. Even Southern Senators (names omitted) are attracted by the "swish" of the petticoat. They walk right into the web spread for such as they, and like the unwary fly of old, listen to the spider's siren song as she sings:

"Won't you walk into my parlor?"
Said the spider to the fly;
'Tis the prettiest little parlor
That ever you did spy."

STATES' RIGHTS ARE BEING WEIGH-ED IN THE BALANCE. LET "JUSTICE" GAUGE THE SCALE.

July 7, 1919

CHARACTER OF ROBERT E. LEE DEFAMED

By **SUSAN B. ANTHONY, Author**

of the Anthony Suffrage Amendment, Cady Stanton and others, in their
Book, the Official History of Woman Suffrage.

(By James Callaway)

MUCH curious information such as shocks Southern ideals has been produced in this column from the "official history of suffrage," compiled under supervision of Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. The last article on the historic line was from "Thirty Years and More," the autobiography of Cady Stanton, wherein was a graphic account she wrote of her visit, along with members of the revising committee of her "Woman's Bible" to Peterboro, the home of Gerrit Smith, the great advocate of John Brown and admirer of Fred Douglass. And the reader will recall with what feelings of intense pleasure it gave Mrs. Stanton and her party to parade her grounds with Fred Douglass, each esteeming it a special honor and privilege to "walk arm in arm" with him.

But this article is not from the "Woman's Bible," which cast aside our Scriptures as cunningly devised fables, nor from the "autobiography," but from the "Official History of Suffrage," largely edited by Mrs. Stanton. Its animus toward Robert E. Lee is not surprising. The authors of the "Woman's Bible" who prefer Fred Douglass to the Apostle Paul could hardly be expected to respect the name and fame of Gen. Lee.

THE HISTORY

Vol. II, page 23:

"Many women showed their love of country by sacrificing still greater than by enlistment into the army. Among these, especially noted for her surroundings and family, was Annie Carter Lee, daughter of Gen. Robert E. Lee, commander-in-chief of the rebel army. Her father and three brothers fought against the Union which she loved, and to which she adhered. A young girl scarcely beyond her teens when the war broke out, she remained firm in her devotion to the national cause, though for this adherence she was banished by her father as an outcast from that elegant home once graced by her presence. She did not live to see the triumph of the cause she loved so well, dying the third year of the war aged 23, at Jones Springs, N. C., homeless because of her love for the Union, with no relatives near her, dependent for care and consolation in her last hours upon the kindly services of an old colored woman. In her veins ran pure the blood of "Light-horse Harry" and that of her great aunt, Hannah Lee Corbin, who at the time of the Revolution protested against the denial of representation to taxpaying women, and whose name does much to REDEEM that of Lee from the INFAMY of late, so justly adhering to it."

UNMITIGATED FALSEHOOD

Reader, there is not a word of truth in this story about Annie Carter Lee. They first declare Gen. Lee banished her a mere girl from his elegant home, Arlington. Why, the Federal government seized Arlington, the first thing they did, and in years afterward refused to pay for it, and the heirs of Gen. Lee won it by a long lawsuit, the supreme court finally allowing a small amount for the property.

As to the fabrication about Annie Carter Lee, none but those who adopted the "Womans Bible," and repudiated Moses and the prophets and mocked the divinity of Christ, would have had the unblushing impudence and audacity to put in book as a truth such a bold falsehood.

ANNIE CARTER LEE

The very name of Annie Carter Lee is embalmed in pathos. Her death was one of the heart sorrows that came to Gen. Lee while bearing the burden of the Confederacy.

General Lee's daughters were refugees at the White Sulphur Springs, N. C., during a part of the war. While there Annie Carter Lee died. She was buried in the family burying ground of Joseph Speed Jones, of Henderson, N. C., a family which was friendly to General Lee, and who cared for his daughters during the last two years of the war, Henderson, N. C., being regarded as a safer place than Richmond. After the struggle was over, Gen. Lee visited the spot where his daughter was buried and let

the body remain there as a tribute to the family who had cared for his daughters when refugees. Just a year after the war the women of Warren county erected a beautiful white shaft over the grave.

This was the first monument erected by the Daughters of the Confederacy. The first deed was to pay homage to Annie Carter Lee, the one bearing her grandmother's name. It was the first expression of sympathy by the women of the Confederacy. The grave is well taken care of by the local chapter of the U. D. C. Besides a committee appointed by the North Carolina division, one from Louisburg, one from Warrenton visit the grave once a year as a memorial to Annie Carter Lee. They go on the 10th of May each year, as this is the date on which the graves of other members of the Lee family are decorated at Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

That glorious woman, Mrs. I. P. Faison of Charleston, N. C., an enthusiastic member of the U. D. C., takes great interest in this caring for the grave of Annie Carter Lee. For all the years to come Annie Carter Lee's grave will be honored for her sake, for her name.

So we see calumny and falsehood was the weapon of Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony and Fred Douglass with which to stab the name and fame of General Lee. Did malicious slander and hatred ever go further? Could hatred of the South stoop to lower depths? General Lee, Christianity's highest achievement in manhood slandered by a set of women who declare General Lee's Bible is an evil and a myth, and put their slander in book form.

LEE AT ARLINGTON

But these South haters and Biblemockers do not stop at desecrating the memory of Annie Carter Lee, but they heartlessly pursue General Lee further and say in the same story:

"When Annie Carter Lee's father, after the war, visited his two ancestral homes then turned into a vast national cemetery, it would seem as though the spirit of his Union-loving daughter must have flashed over him, whispering of his wrecked hopes, and piercing his heart with a thousand daggers of remorse, as he recalled his blind infatuation, and his banishment, of his daughter, Annie Lee, from home that bright young life."

"NOTE LEE AT ARLINGTON"

"Visitors to this noted place are so frequent that his appearance attracted no attention. He walked through the dreary hall, and looked in on the wide vacant rooms, and passing to the front, stood for some time gazing out over the beautiful panorama, with its one great feature—the new dome of the old Capitol, surmounted by a bronze Statue of Liberty armed with her back to him, gazing seaward.

"From this he passed to the garden and looked over the line of the officers' graves that bound its sides, saw the dying flowers and wilted borders and leafstrewn walks; and continuing after a field where sixteen thousand Union soldiers lie buried in lines as though they had laid down after a service to be interred in other places.

"Some negroes were at work here, raking up the fallen leaves and an old man stopped suddenly and stared at the visitor as if struck mute with astonishment. As the stranger regained his horse, the old negro dropped his rake and said: 'Shore as the Lord, men dat was Massa Lee.'"

Now this whole story of General Lee visiting Arlington in 1866 is a fabrication, based on the imagination with no foundation as absolutely false and wicked as the wretched story about Annie Carter Lee. Yes these women put it in their history to perpetuate a slander.

The ugly feature of it all is that these slanders have a large following in the South and have succeeded in committing so many Southern women to their creed—a creed that means wreck and ruin of our Southern ideals.

[July 7, 1919]

ELIHU ROOT WARNS THE SOUTH

PROTECT YOUR STATE CONTROL OF SUFFRAGE

Reject the Susan B. Anthony Amendment

Protect the Black Belt, and Remember the Lonely Farmers' Wives. Many have Given their only Protector for Service in France. The Eleven Southern States Hold the Balance of Power. The Susan B. Anthony Amendment Means Negro Rule. Any Southern State Giving Woman Suffrage an Entering Wedge Against the Wishes of this Vast Majority of the Women, and at this time, is a Traitor to Womanhood.

By James Callaway.

PROTECT THE BLACK BELT.

THESE be war times and things are abnormal, and that repose of thought, like the calm of a summer day, is no longer with us. Because of this our statesmen are likely to catch the spirit of restlessness pervading the country and do unwise things.

But let us remember the great Constitution of the United States remains with us and is our Ark of the Covenant for us to guard and keep sacred from the profaning touch of the unthinking.

Then we have our States, each one a pillar on which rests the Constitution. Our Constitution was made by men familiar with war and it holds good for all exigencies in war or in peace. Of course extraordinary things must be done in times of war, but no use for the people or our statesmen to lose their balance or their bearings.

One of the great intellects of the country is Senator Borah. In his conception of our system of government he reminds us of Ben Hill and his wonderful speech in the Senate setting forth the nature and character of the American system of government—its Constitution, wherein it is executive, wherein national and wherein federative.

But let us hear from Senator Borah:

"At the time of the organization of this government and during the first years of its existence there lived two of the most remarkable men in the history of politics—Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson.

But the strength of the republic arises not out of the policies of Hamilton and not out of the policies of Jefferson, but out of that combination of policies which are everywhere interwoven into our system.

"The maintenance of these principles of government are essential.

"Any serious departure," declared the late Justice Harlan, "from that principle would bring disaster upon the American system."

"We forget in this day both as Hamiltonians and Jeffersonians, that the government was not framed by Hamilton and Jefferson. It represents neither the full view of Hamilton nor the full view of Jefferson. It is the result—the combination, the composite work—of two of the most powerful and puissant minds that have ever lived in the tide of time. It is the government as Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton made it—one of them believing in a government strong enough to guarantee all the blessings to the individual which it promises to give stable and powerful enough to protect them, and the other believing in the principle of local self-government in the initiative upon the part of the individual citizen, and in reserving to the States everything of a local nature. It is to such a government I give my allegiance."

Continuing, Senator Borah further said: "We are not a homogeneous people yet by any means. The interests of States are diverse. What suits Idaho may not suit Georgia. We have the Oriental question on the Pacific Slope; we have the negro question in the South; and we have the countless thousands of immigrants crowding into the country from Southern Europe, who are yet to be acquainted with our theory of government and the duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

"And it is necessary to preserve certain principles—a representative republic and local government for the States. The cornerstone of the very fabric of our system is the right of local self-government as to who shall vote in the State, or who shall own property and lands or attend schools in a State. These are prerogatives of the State, not of the Federal government. What I am contending for is this—that which is local in its nature as I conceive this suffrage matter to be, should be permitted to remain local.

"The right to vote can never, in the nature of things, under our system be other than a local question, for upon it rests the very integrity and the sovereignty of the State. Under no circumstances and for no purposes should we nationalize the States."

And Senator Borah further said: "I would count myself a derelict to those great Pacific States and to the framework of our government if I were to set a precedent for Federal control in matters pertaining to State jurisdiction. It is for the State to say who shall vote and who shall hold property in a State."

Yet Congress is asked to take from the State the chief pillar upon which rests the Constitution which Senator Borah so reveres—the right to regulate the franchise.

In this debate on suffrage in which Senator Borah of Idaho expressed his views, John Sharp Williams, the able and erudite Senator from Mississippi, in answer to Senator McCumber, who favored the enforcement of the fifteenth amendment, saying: "You Southern people should know by now how to influence the negro vote, you have no carpetbaggers there now," made this reply: "But they will come, and if suffrage is granted to negro women and the fifteenth amendment still a law, and the government should enforce the law, then every white farmer in the black belt of Mississippi would have to pull up and leave the State."

And Senator Root, who is so opposed to the Susan B. Anthony amendment, declaring suffrage is a State matter, is for enforcement if the amendment becomes the law. In the debate on the Sutherland and Bristow amendments the following colloquy occurred between Senator Bacon and Senator Root:

Mr. Bacon: "Does the Senator mean that IF THE LAWS upon the statutes of the States

with reference to the regulations and limitations of suffrage in the Southern States were conceived by Congress to be unconstitutional, Congress would have the power to annul those provisions and make Federal laws to control those matters?"

Mr. Root: "WITHOUT THE SLIGHTEST DOUBT. I PUT YOU ON NOTICE AND I PUT THE WHOLE COUNTRY ON NOTICE that the government shall no longer surrender the power necessary to ENFORCE THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT." And of course, by parity of reasoning, enforce the Susan B. Anthony amendment if it becomes a Federal law."

Since this debate and only a few years since, the supreme court in the Oklahoma and Maryland cases decided our disfranchisement acts were no good. So we enter upon perilous conditions for the South if the Susan B. Anthony amendment is forced upon us. It will bring on unpleasant complications with the Federal government. The suffrage associations all stand for enforcement and turned down the proposition to repeal the fifteenth amendment and give the ballot to white women only.

We have had peace and tranquillity in the rural districts of the negro belt since the white primary, a voluntary device and now tottering was established, but under the Susan B. Anthony amendment the old conditions will revive and the farmers' wives will again live in dread and suspense. Up to some eighteen years ago they dared not travel the highways without escort. They were prisoners within their own homes. The white primary enfranchised them—gave them freedom. But it is proposed to make them prisoners again, and the agencies at work for the return of such a calamity are the disciples and followers of Cady Stanton, whose mantle fell on Susan B. Anthony, to whom she dedicated her autobiography, "Thirty Years and More," as her closest friend embracing her creed and her "Woman's Bible."

Will not Congress protect the women of the South? Suffrage is not a party question. Our President, who is burdened with perplexities, tell us, "We are fighting this war for humanity's sake." If so, then why not protect the white women of the black belt of the South? Georgia alone has over sixty-six counties with large negro majorities. Is it not the highest humanity not to again make the white women living on the farms in the black belt prisoners within their own homes? Talk about emancipation of women—of freedom and a war for humanity—when the Susan B. Anthony amendment will close the public highways to our women of the rural districts, and again make them the victims of the "terrorism," that frightfulness which superinduced nervous debility.

[July 7, 1919]

ELIHU ROOT WARNS THE SOUTH

Still 34 States Against Woman Suffrage, only 14 For NO CAUSE FOR EXCITEMENT OR HASTY ACTION

Protect the Black Belt, and Remember the Lonely Farmers' Wives. Many have Given their only Protector for Service in France. The Eleven Southern States Hold the Balance of Power. The Susan B. Anthony Amendment Means Negro Rule. Any Southern State Giving Woman Suffrage an Entering Wedge Against the Wishes of this Vast Majority of the Women, and at this time, is a Traitor to Womanhood.

By James Callaway.

PROTECT THE BLACK BELT.

THESE be war times and things are abnormal, and that repose of thought, like the calm of a summer day, is no longer with us. Because of this our statesmen are likely to catch the spirit of restlessness pervading the country and do unwise things.

But let us remember the great Constitution of the United States remains with us and is our Ark of the Covenant for us to guard and keep sacred from the profaning touch of the unthinking.

Then we have our States, each one a pillar on which rests the Constitution. Our Constitution was made by men familiar with war and it holds good for all exigencies in war or in peace. Of course extraordinary things must be done in times of war, but no use for the people or our statesmen to lose their balance or their bearings.

One of the great intellects of the country is Senator Borah. In his conception of our system of government he reminds us of Ben Hill and his wonderful speech in the Senate setting forth the nature and character of the American system of government—its Constitution, wherein it is executive, wherein national and wherein federative.

But let us hear from Senator Borah:

"At the time of the organization of this government and during the first years of its existence there lived two of the most remarkable men in the history of politics—Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. . . . But the strength of the republic arises not out of the policies of Hamilton and not out of the policies of Jefferson, but out of that combination of policies which are everywhere interwoven into our system.

"The maintenance of these principles of government are essential.

"Any serious departure," declared the late Justice Harlan, "from that principle would bring disaster upon the American system."

"We forget in this day both as Hamiltonians and Jeffersonians, that the government was not framed by Hamilton and Jefferson. It represents neither the full view of Hamilton nor the full view of Jefferson. It is the result—the combination, the composite work—of two of the most powerful and puissant minds that have ever lived in the tide of time. It is the government as Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton made it—one of them believing in a government strong enough to guarantee all the blessings to the individual which it promises to give stable and powerful enough to protect them, and the other believing in the principle of local self-government in the initiative upon the part of the individual citizen, and in reserving to the States everything of a local nature. It is to such a government I give my allegiance."

Continuing, Senator Borah further said: "We are not a homogeneous people yet by any means. The interests of States are diverse. What suits Idaho may not suit Georgia. We have the Oriental question on the Pacific Slope; we have the negro question in the South; and we have the countless thousands of immigrants crowding into the country from Southern Europe, who are yet to be acquainted with our theory of government and the duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

"And it is necessary to preserve certain principles—a representative republic and local government for the States. The cornerstone of the very fabric of our system is the right of local self-government as to who shall vote in the State, or who shall own property and lands or attend schools in a State. These are prerogatives of the State, not of the Federal government. What I am contending for is this—that which is local in its nature as I conceive this suffrage matter to be, should be permitted to remain local.

"The right to vote can never, in the nature of things, under our system be other than a local question, for upon it rests the very integrity and the sovereignty of the State. Under no circumstances and for no purposes should we nationalize the States."

And Senator Borah further said: "I would count myself a derelict to those great Pacific States and to the framework of our government if I were to set a precedent for Federal control in matters pertaining to State jurisdiction. It is for the State to say who shall vote and who shall hold property in a State."

Yet Congress is asked to take from the State the chief pillar upon which rests the Constitution which Senator Borah so reveres—the right to regulate the franchise.

In this debate on suffrage in which Senator Borah of Idaho expressed his views, John Sharp Williams, the able and erudite Senator from Mississippi, in answer to Senator McCumber, who favored the enforcement of the fifteenth amendment, saying: "You Southern people should know by now how to influence the negro vote, you have no carpetbaggers there now," made this reply: "But they will come, and if suffrage is granted to negro women and the fifteenth amendment still a law, and the government should enforce the law, then every white farmer in the black belt of Mississippi would have to pull up and leave the State."

And Senator Root, who is so opposed to the Susan B. Anthony amendment, declaring suffrage is a State matter, is for enforcement if the amendment becomes the law. In the debate on the Sutherland and Bristow amendments the following colloquy occurred between Senator Bacon and Senator Root:

Mr. Bacon: "Does the Senator mean that IF THE LAWS upon the statutes of the States

with reference to the regulations and limitations of suffrage in the Southern States were conceived by Congress to be unconstitutional, Congress would have the power to annul those provisions and make Federal laws to control those matters?"

Mr. Root: "WITHOUT THE SLIGHTEST DOUBT. I PUT YOU ON NOTICE AND I PUT THE WHOLE COUNTRY ON NOTICE that the government shall no longer surrender the power necessary to ENFORCE THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT." And of course, by parity of reasoning, enforce the Susan B. Anthony amendment if it becomes a Federal law."

Since this debate and only a few years since, the supreme court in the Oklahoma and Maryland cases decided our disfranchisement acts were no good. So we enter upon perilous conditions for the South if the Susan B. Anthony amendment is forced upon us. It will bring on unpleasant complications with the Federal government. The suffrage associations all stand for enforcement and turned down the proposition to repeal the fifteenth amendment and give the ballot to white women only.

We have had peace and tranquillity in the rural districts of the negro belt since the white primary, a voluntary device and now tottering was established, but under the Susan B. Anthony amendment the old conditions will revive and the farmers' wives will again live in dread and suspense. Up to some eighteen years ago they dared not travel the highways without escort. They were prisoners within their own homes. The white primary enfranchised them—gave them freedom. But it is proposed to make them prisoners again, and the agencies at work for the return of such a calamity are the disciples and followers of Cady Stanton, whose mantle fell on Susan B. Anthony, to whom she dedicated her autobiography, "Thirty Years and More," as her closest friend embracing her creed and her "Woman's Bible."

Will not Congress protect the women of the South? Suffrage is not a party question. Our President, who is burdened with perplexities, tell us, "We are fighting this war for humanity's sake." If so, then why not protect the white women of the black belt of the South? Georgia alone has over sixty-six counties with large negro majorities. Is it not the highest humanity not to again make the white women living on the farms in the black belt prisoners within their own homes? Talk about emancipation of women—of freedom and a war for humanity—when the Susan B. Anthony amendment will close the public highways to our women of the rural districts, and again make them the victims of the "terrorism," that frightfulness which superinduced nervous debility.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY AMENDMENT

DEFEATED IN ALABAMA JULY 18th, 1919

In Spite of the Powerful Pressure Brought to Bear by President Wilson, Mr. Cummings, Chairman of the National Democratic Committee, and Many Others High in Authority in Both National and State Politics, who Sought to Interfere with Alabama's Sovereign Right to Make Her Own Laws.

Declining to enter the political arena and engage in distasteful debate and asserting confidence in their cause which seeks to preserve to the State of Alabama the right to make her own laws and enforce them, the Woman's Anti-Ratification League threw a small bomb into the ranks of the suffrage supporters before the joint session of the Legislature Wednesday morning when announcement was made that no one would speak against ratification of the amendment and a memorial to the Legislature was filed setting forth reasons for such action.

The document was offered in lieu of an oratorical drive on the legislators respecting their action on the amendment when it comes before them in the Senate Thursday and the House on Friday. Judge R. B. Evins, of Hale county, read the message Wednesday, which was as follows:

MEMORIAL

Gentlemen of the Legislature of Alabama:

Permit us, if you please, as the representatives of the wishes and views of more than eighty per cent of the white women of Alabama to express to you our thanks for the opportunity which you have so courteously offered to us to appear before you in this Joint Session in opposition to the ratification by you of the proposed Woman Suffrage Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

We do not avail ourselves of the opportunity thus offered because, in the first place we feel that when that unhappy time has come when the women of Alabama have to plead with the men of Alabama not to thrust them against their wills into the conflicts, the dissensions and the coarsening atmosphere of politics, the men of Alabama will have become so changed from the splendid race to whom we have so long looked to stand between us and the rough things of life, that our wishes and our welfare will have become things to which they are indifferent; and, in the second place, to appear before you to argue a political question in which the discussion may become acrimonious, would be to do the very thing which, in opposing this amendment, we seek to avoid having thrust upon us. Moreover, it would be personally embarrassing to us, in a high degree, to assume the unfamiliar and distasteful role of political gladiators.

We are not politicians nor political debaters, and we seek no laurels upon the hustings nor upon the floor of this House. We are home keepers and the mothers of children, and we seek to discharge our duty to our country and to the cause of civilization and right living, not by voting and holding office, but by making homes in which Love and Peace and Happiness dwell, and by instilling into our children love of their country and devotion to high ideals. We seek to remain such and we look with confidence to you, in whom the high traditions of the South still live, to protect us from this device of Northern Abolitionists, which, if adopted, will, it seems to us, be not only debasing in its effect upon the woman character, not only productive of discord in the sweet harmony of the family circles but will also inevitably result in striking down those barriers which you and your fathers have raised between Anglo-

Saxon civilization and those who would mongrelize and corrupt it. We oppose the adoption of this amendment because the vast majority of the white women of Alabama do not want it; we oppose it because we believe that women can exercise a better and greater influence upon the race, and contribute more fully to its development and its progress by remaining supreme in their own peculiar sphere than they can by invading yours; because we believe that to adopt it will nullify the work of those wise and patriotic men who have purified the ballot box from the contamination of negro votes, or from the fraud necessary to keep them out; because we believe in you and trust you and know that in the laws which you make, and in your administration of the public affairs, we will find a solicitude for our rights and our happiness which we ourselves could not exceed.

We revere the traditions of the South and of the Democratic party, and the fundamental principle of both has been, and still is, local self-government. To that principle both have been true through many weary years of discouragement and defeat. The unterrified Democracy came again to power because it stood, in the face of all discouragements, for the principles in which it believed. How strange then it is that some of those who are high in its councils, who are in honor bound by its platform which still declares against this amendment, presume to urge upon you to abandon principle for expediency. When they do so, they ask you to cease to be Democrats because the existing pronouncement of the supreme authority of the party condemns this amendment. We, your countrywomen, bone of your bone and blood of your blood, say to you that such an appeal is discreditable to him who makes it, and seeks to dishonor him to whom it is made. We who know you would feel ashamed to ask you to stand immovable for principle. We know you will do that, but we do ask you to make such a reply by your vote to that appeal which assumes you to be time-serving weaklings, that no other man or high officials will assume again to hold you in such contempt.

Gentlemen, our welfare is in your hands. You may, if you will, thrust us from the quietude of our homes into the contaminating atmosphere of political struggle, but we feel the strong assurance that in your protecting care we, our institutions and our sheltering laws are safe; and that you, on our behalf as well as your own, will decline to surrender our great State's control of her own electorate into hands that may be regardless of our welfare, our happiness, our safety and our great traditions.

Respectfully,

WOMAN'S ANTI-RATIFICATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE; Mrs. James S. Pinckard, Chairman; Mrs. Charles Henderson, Vice-Chairman, Mrs. W. T. Sheehan, Secretary; Mrs. Marie Bankhead Owen; Mrs. Chas. A. Thigpen, Mrs. Hails Janney; Mrs. Jack Thorington; Mrs. J. G. Winter; Mrs. Ormond Somerville; Mrs. W. J. Hannah; Mrs. Clayton T. Tullis; Miss Mae Harris; Mrs. J. Winter Thorington; Mrs. E. Perry Thomas; Mrs. Wm. E. Ellsberry; Mrs. J. H. Naftel; Mrs. W. B. Kelly.

[July 7, 1919]

THE WOMAN'S BIBLE

By ELIZABETH CADY STANTON

Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National Suffrage Association, one of the Revising Committee, Denies the Divinity of Christ, or that the Bible is the Inspired Word of God.

LET REFLECTING WOMEN THINK

James Callaway—Macon Telegraph.

"THE WOMAN'S BIBLE" ONCE MORE.



HAVE a great many inquiries as to where Mrs. Cady Stanton's "Woman's Bible" can be bought. The book is out of print, and of recent years the copies have been bought up and the book suppressed.

Mrs. Stanton gave her Bible the name it bears. In the preface to Book II Mrs. Stanton says: "Rider Haggard's 'She' was denounced so universally that every one read it to see who 'She' was. Thus the title in both cases calls attention to the book."

Volume I was devoted to the Pentateuch and Volume II to comments on the Old and New Testament from Joshua to Revelation.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The following is the preface to the New Testament signed by Mrs. Stanton: "Does the New Testament bring promises of new dignity and of larger liberties for woman? When thinking women make any criticisms on their degraded positions in the Bible, Christians point to her exaltation in the New Testament, as if, under their religion woman really does occupy a higher position than under the Jewish dispensation. While there are grand types of women presented under both religions, there is no difference in the general estimate of the sex. In fact her inferior position is more clearly and emphatically set forth by the Apostles than by the Prophets and the Patriarchs. There is no such specific directions for woman's subordination in the Pentateuch as in the epistles.

"We are told the whole sex was highly honored in Mary being the mother of Jesus. Surely a wise and virtuous son is more indebted to his mother than she is to him and is honored only by reflecting her superior characteristics. Why the founders of the Christian religion did not improvise an earthly father as well as an earthly mother does not clearly appear. The questionable position of Joseph is unsatisfactory. As Mary belonged to the Jewish aristocracy she should have had a husband of the same rank. If a Heavenly Father was necessary, why not a Heavenly Mother? If an earthly mother was admirable, why not an earthly father?"

"The Jewish idea that Jesus was born according to natural law is more rational than is the Christian record of the Immaculate Conception by the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Trinity. These Biblical mysteries and inconsistencies are a great strain on the credulity of the ordinary mind."

So we see where Max Eastman's "ballad," making mockery of the birth of Christ, had its origin.

The reader observes that Mrs. Stanton discards the "immaculate conception" of Jesus. In her introduction to Volume I she treats Moses and the Prophets as Jewish myths, and on page 12 of the introduction says: "I do not believe that God inspired the Mosaic code, or told the historians what they say he did about woman. I do not believe that any man ever saw or talked with God."

Sarah A. Underwood, a member of the revising committee, on page 191 in the appendix says: "But when millions have for centuries been brought up to believe that the Bible is the inspired revelation from God, its influence has been mischievous in a thousand ways."

Matilda Joslyn Gage, also of the revising committee, says: "The Christian theory of the sacredness of the Bible has been at the cost of the world's civilization. . . . We are investigating the influence of the Bible upon woman under Judaism and Christianity, and pronounce it evil."

In her closing remarks in Volume II Mrs. Stanton says: "Women have been taught by their religious guardians that the Bible, unlike all other books, was written under the special inspiration of the Great Ruling Intelligence of the Universe. Not conversant with works on science and higher criticism which point out its fabulous pretensions, they cling to it with unreasoning tenacity, like a savage to his fetish. Though it is full of contradictions, absurdities and impossibilities, and bears the strongest evidence in every line of its human origin, they blindly worship it as the Word of God."

Throughout the book Mrs. Stanton impresses the idea that she and her revising committee wrote the "Woman's Bible" to emancipate women from the teachings of the Old and New Testament, and give them a religion based on science and nature. It must be admitted she built up a remarkable following—and her disciples still teach her religious and political creeds.

On page 61, Volume I, Mrs. Stanton says: "Some members of the revising committee write me that the tone of some of my comments should be more reverent in criticism of the 'Word of God.' Does any one at this state of civilization think the Bible was written by the finger of God, that the Old and New Testaments emanated from the highest divine thought in the universe? Do they think the men who wrote those books were specially inspired?"

Mrs. Pankhurst caught the meaning of Cady Stanton's Bible when she declared her "object was to demoralize the world of society, shame the churches, and upset the whole orderly conduct of life." Cady's Bible made a convert of Mrs. Pankhurst.

Mrs. Stanton's most intimate friend was Susan B. Anthony, to whom she dedicated her autobiography, "Eighty Years and More," which is really a history of woman's suffrage and the part she played in "the emancipation of woman," and her experiences with Lucy Stone, Anna Dickinson, Fred Douglass, Gerrit Smith, Lucretia Mott, Rev. Theodore Parker, Robert G. Ingersoll, Margaret Fuller, William Lloyd Garrison and other politicians and reformers. Her mantle is now worn by Mrs. Chapman Catt, who has risen to great influence with the present Democratic Administration, by whose aid she expects "without delay and without conditions or restrictions" to pass the Susan B. Anthony amendment and deprive the States of the right to regulate their franchise, but transfer this power to the Federal government.

While Mrs. Stanton's "Woman's Bible" is out of print, yet it became the textbook of her disciples and followers, and her doctrines have been handed down as the mother of Moses handed down through her son the history of the Jews.

Mrs. Stanton was impatient over the influence of the old family Bible, and on page 8, in preface to Volume I, says:

"We have made a fetish of the Bible long enough, and it has been the great block in the way of civilization." Curious enough, the Germans have this same idea until Germany is now an infidel nation—rejecting Christ and His teachings.

The closest friend of Cady Stanton was Susan B. Anthony. Their amendment strikes at State self-government, and takes from the State its right to regulate its own franchise. One thing is certain—if the States surrender their right to determine the nature of suffrage and the right to fix its status within their own borders, that will mean also the surrender of their status and their true position as political entities. Recognizing the passage of the amendment as, in his opinion, a foregone conclusion, is perhaps why Senator Lewis took position "that this government has reached an end of its yesterdays and that there is now no excuse for a State government," and added a most remarkable sentence, saying: "Those in power in this government have left little reason for continuation of States."

If this be true, what a triumph for Cady Stanton and the Shaws and the Catts and their teacher, Susan B. Anthony! But what a fall for the States!

Queer indeed that those who rejected the Scriptures and discarded Christ and Him Crucified should now dictate the domestic policies of the government.

Cady Stanton from her grave cries out: "I and my 'Woman's Bible' are vindicated."

Could you expect these Leopards to change their spots? July 7, 1919

"Suffrage Democracy Knows no Bias of Race, Color, Creed or Sex."—Carrie Chapman Catt

Look not to Greece or Rome for heroes, nor to Jerusalem or Mecca for saints, but for all the higher virtues of heroism, let us WORSHIP the black man at our feet.—Susan B. Anthony's *Official History of Suffrage*.

"Let us kill the Solid South; break it up and destroy it altogether."—Mrs. Howard Gould, *N. Y. Sun*, Feb. 27th.

"AMEN"

Says Rev. Anna Howard Shaw.—(*Voices from the Tomb*;) Frederick Douglass, Thad Stevens
Susan B. Anthony, John Brown and others.

LETTERS: Carrie Chapman Catt and Anna Shaw announce votes for Negro Women.—*The Crisis*, Nov. issue, 1917. Official Negro Suffrage Magazine, Jane Addams, Director, Oswald Villard, of New York Evening Post, Director and Secretary and Treasurer.

MRS. GOULD SPEAKS TO NEGRO VOTERS

DOMINATES BIG AUDIENCE OF MEN AND WOMEN AT RANSOM MEETING.

(New York Sun, Feb. 27th.)

Mrs. Howard Gould made her New York debut as a political speaker last night before an audience of negroes that tested the capacity of the Mother Zion Church in 136th street near Seventh Avenue. The church held 2,000 men and women at a meeting called to advance the candidacy of the Rev. Beverly C. Ransom, negro candidate for Congress, who is backed by the United Civic League, an independent organization that was formed when the Republicans in the Twenty-first Congressional district refused to accept Rev. Ransom as their nominee.

Mrs. Gould, who as Katherine Clemmons, the actress, had much experience with large audiences, showed no lack of self-possession. She said she was the kind of a suffragist who did not limit her interest to white women. She vigorously denounced white politicians who would attempt to lure the negro voter from the Ransom standard at the special election on March 5; praised President Wilson; denounced "Tammaniacs" and put Col. Roosevelt right on his misinterpretation of a sentence credited to Baron Ishii when the Japanese diplomat was last in this country.

According to Mrs. Gould, Col. Roosevelt misunderstood Baron Ishii because he lacks an Orientalized point of view. When the Baron said "Look for the enemy within your gates" the Colonel began to look for Germans, Mrs. Gould said, whereas, the Baron's advice was purely figurative and meant simply that people should look within their own hearts and tear out the evil that is in them.

Never in her career as an actress did Mrs. Gould win more complete success with an audience. Applause punctuated her speech throughout. When she said, "Let us kill the solid South; break it up and destroy it altogether," the outburst of cheers and cries had something of the intensity of the answer to an emotional religious appeal at a camp meeting.

At the end Mrs. Gould appeared to be running the meeting. She called for a collection "to keep the polls straight," and saw to it that the plate bearers missed nobody. She put a check for \$100 on the plate herself.

Mrs. Gould said after the meeting that she became a suffragist as a protest against the treatment to which the White House pickets were subjected. Her interest in Ransom's candidacy, she said, was purely that of a worker for democracy. She has joined the National party, which will organize in Chicago March 6, and will be active at its meeting.

VOTES FOR ALL.

"Responding to your request for a brief message with regard to the Colored American and Suffrage, I wish to repeat a statement which I have made so many times that I believe the whole world is familiar with it, and that is that I hope the time will come when there will be no such thing as a Colored-American any more than a German-American or an Irish-American or any other kind of American, except a plain American citizen. What I say in regard to the vote of the American citizen I should say in regard to the vote of any citizen who is an American—that I trust we are approaching the time when every loyal-law-abiding citizen of the country shall have an equal right with every other law-abiding citizen of the United States to express, through the ballot box, the will of the citizen, regardless of sex or color, in connection with those problems of the Government which affect the lives of American citizens.

I have never been able, and doubtless never shall be able, to understand why one citizen who contributes to the support of the Government, and who is submissive to its authority, should have any more right than any other citizen, under like conditions, to free access to the ballot box.

I believe in democracy, and there is no such thing as democracy under conditions which deny to any citizen who obeys the law and contributes to the support of the Government the right to a voice in making the law.

ANNA HOWARD SHAW,

Honorary President, National American Woman Suffrage Association; Chairman, Woman's Committee, Council of National Defense.

What is it all about?

What is the idea underneath the horror and the heartache?

What is it for?

"For democracy,—for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government."

In those nobly simple words of the President of the United States is set forth the whole story, the great ideal, the democratic faith that is sustaining alike the men of the Allied Armies on the battlefield of Europe, the women of the world waging their own double struggle to meet the new economic demands upon them while trying to secure a voice in their own government, and the Negro facing the self-same problem and often refusing to see that through the Negro women his race is as vitally involved in the woman suffrage question as race can be.

For just as the world war is no white man's war but every man's war, so is the struggle for woman suffrage no white woman's struggle but every woman's struggle. Once long ago, the Negro man made the white man's mistake of deciding that the suffrage was the prerogative of men only. That was just after the Civil War. He had his chance then to stand by the woman's rights cause that stood by him. He did not do it. Like

the white men around him, he could not and would not recognize that women were present, and that women, as well as men, must have a voice in their own government. Like the white man, he wanted democracy applied for himself, but not for women. That is the crucial error of all men, white or black, in their efforts to apply democracy. It seems to be wholly a matter of sex, not at all of race or color. White man, black man, Mongolian, Malay, and Redskin are wonderfully alike when it comes to counting women out in any scheme for the political salvation of the world.

But however men have seen it, and may continue for a time to see it, women do count. Everybody counts in applying democracy. And there will never be a true democracy until every responsible and law-abiding adult in it, without regard to race, sex, color or creed has his or her own inalienable and unpurchasable voice in the government. That is the democratic goal toward which the world is striving today.

In our own country woman suffrage is but one, if acute, phase of the problem. The Negro question is but another. The enfranchisement of the foreign-born peoples who sweep into this country and forget to leave the hyphen at home is yet another.

All along the line we fail of the right answer and the whole answer. Capital clashes with labor, class clashes with class, man-made laws are imposed on woman who are denied all voice in the law-making, the individual sells his vote and pockets his dollar, race is arrayed against race, even to the perpetration of some such awful crime against common humanity as that against black people in the East St. Louis horror, and in woman's own struggle for democracy we hear some such retrograde outburst as emanated from the picket prisoners at being housed with Negro prisoners—not because they were prisoners, because they were black—a strangely and cruelly undemocratic protest!

With all its failures, its delays, its harsh injustices, we will stick to democracy. We will not give up. We women, at least, will not even falter. We will press straight-forward, knowing that the cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy.

As suffragists we have a profound belief that with the enfranchisement of ALL women will come improvement in our body politic.

As suffragists women stand on but one plank today and that the plan of equal rights, for women as for men, without delay and without conditions. Standing on that plank alone they bespeak for and from America that broad application of democracy that knows no bias on the ground of race, color, creed, or sex. To the end that Americans may stand united, not as Irish-Americans, German-Americans, Negro-Americans, Slav-Americans and "the women," but one and all, as Americans for America.

CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT,

President, National American Woman Suffrage Association.

"Lest Ye Forget"—Only 14 States for Suffrage, and 34 Against. No need for Undue Haste or Excitement.