

The University of Maine

DigitalCommons@UMaine

Archival Materials

Archival Materials

1-1-1917

Letters to the Editor, I Greenwood Papers, Box 540, folder 48

Isabel Greenwood

Maine Woman Suffrage Association

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/maine_women_archival_all



Part of the [Women's History Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Greenwood, Isabel, "Letters to the Editor, I Greenwood Papers, Box 540, folder 48" (1917). *Archival Materials*. 36.

https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/maine_women_archival_all/36

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Archival Materials by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

known by the company they keep. While the antis have among their member many worthy and intelligent men and women they are obliged to work with the liquor dealers, with those who traffic in human flesh, with those who demand long hours of labor from women and children, who delight in unclean politics and oppose all reforms. Behind the suffrage cause is a majority of the brightest and best men and women in the land—men like Teddy Roosevelt and women like Jane Addams—social workers, prohibitionists, those who demand better child labor laws and greatly protection for working women—a might host which will never cease working until all women are enfranchised. Maine has the opportunity of being the first State east of the Mississippi to grant full suffrage to its women. Where will it stand on Sept. 11th. Gentlemen, the case rests with you.

Yours for suffrage,
LILLIAN BUKER KEHEW,
Welds, Me.

Greenwood Collection
(Mrs. Chester - Isabel Whittier)

WOMAN SUFFRAGE NEWS CLIPPINGS

MAINE

Letters to the Editor

To Editors of Lewiston Journal:
A former resident of the good old Pine Tree State, I wish to do my bit in the fight for woman suffrage to be decided at the polls here Sept. 10. Having been thru the recent Massachusetts campaign for equal suffrage, I have had opportunity to learn something of the question. To me, the voter about to decide the question should not ask, "Do the majority of women want suffrage? Will they use it wisely if at all? Will the cost of elections be increased?" Not even "Do we men want them to have it?" but only "Is it right and just that they should have it?" To this there can be but one answer. Almost a century and a half ago the men of our colonies waged war with England because they were taxed without representation and declared that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Are not those great principles equally as true today and of women as well as men? Can we have any just government without the consent of all the people? Women have long been taxed without representation, long obeyed laws made by men and since they began asking for suffrage seventy years ago is it surprising if some have become impatient and boldly stated their case at the very doors of the White House? Yet most of us deeply deplore recent events there and surely the men of Maine are too just to hold us responsible for the activities of these few.

Our anti friends continue to tell us of many disastrous results of woman suffrage despite the fact that men and women of the highest character who have lived in suffrage states for years have testified over and over again to its remarkable benefits and that most of the governments of these states have passed resolutions to that effect. There are excellent proofs of these statements plain enough to convince any but the most prejudiced.

In the West where suffrage has gained such a foothold it has spread from state to state just across the borders where its workings could be carefully watched. This would not have happened had it not been a success. And again, Colorado, which has had suffrage nearly a quarter of a century, has the best laws in the world for the protection of women and children, homes and schools, and Judge Ben Lindsey of Denver declares woman suffrage is responsible — that the women have introduced many of these bills and stood almost solidly behind them.

But why the woman anti? She tells us that if woman are enfranchised she too will feel obliged to vote. Remarkable consciences that let them not only refuse the responsibilities and opportunities of self-government but permit them to work against their sisters who are willing and anxious to shoulder such responsibilities for the sake of their benefits.

We cannot blame the male anti so much if, having always held the reins of government he likes the job too well to share it with a partner. But with the man who says women are unfit for the ballot we have little patience. When in any election has the fitness of men been questioned? But rather even the poorest specimens are gathered in by automobiles to vote on important questions which perhaps concern the most refined and intelligent women. This should not be. Such men should remember that we have been permitted education less than a hundred years. Since the high schools were opened to us we have made wonderful progress until we now stand side by side with men in almost every profession proving that most of us are all qualified to vote and the rest are as capable of learning as men. Causes as well as people are

LEWISTON SATURDAY

CONGRESSMAN WHITE OUT FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

WASHINGTON, D. C., Aug. 31, 1917.

Hon. Robert T. Whitehouse,
178 Middle Street,
Portland, Maine.

Dear Sir:

In answer to your request for an expression of my views on the question of Equal Suffrage, I am glad to make the following brief statement on the subject.

I favor Equal Suffrage. I am led to this conclusion by the belief—that this is but one of the many reasons which have influenced me—that under our political system, all persons of prescribed mental and moral qualifications have an inherent right to participate in the consideration and decision of the social, the civic and the governmental problems which so vitally affect us all. This is a general principle to which I feel all should give assent.

A further reason for my attitude is found in the nature of many of our present day problems. They are not those of yesterday. We have new and perplexing questions intimately connected with the social and moral well-being of our people. They will not be solved by backward lookers. They will never be appreciated by the head alone. They call upon the sentiments, the sympathies, the heart. Their solution demands an infusion of new ideas and higher ideals into our political life. One must concede the intellectual equality of women with men. For myself, I see the needed inspiration and purpose for the working out of their problems, in the active participation of the women of our State in its political affairs.

I earnestly hope Equal Suffrage will prevail in the election of September tenth.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed)

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

(Beginning Missing)

and prosperity of the State the women of Colorado have done their share. The enfranchisement of women is no longer a question here. Equal suffrage was granted by popular vote in 1893 and incorporated into the constitution ten years later by a majority three times the size of that given the original referendum."

Mrs. Katherine Reed Ballentine, who has lived and voted in California, says: "When I went to California I was a suffragist and worked for it simply because I am an American and believe in government by the consent of the governed. I was satisfied to rest my claims on that ground alone, for it is sufficient. When women were enfranchised in 1911, I did not expect any immediate results, good or bad; but I have lived there most of the time for the last six years, and seen California make a wonderful record in progressive legislation which has not merely been passed but enforced. A large proportion of this legislation was initiated by women; and women and the State have both been benefited by the change."

In 1912 laws were passed by California granting equal guardianship of children, providing a detention home for girls, and for the abatement of the "redlight" evil. In 1913 laws were passed establishing compulsory education, authorizing "home teachers", whose duties are to teach the elements of right living in the homes of the poorer classes, requiring birth registration, and raising the age limit for child labor. A law has also been passed making the wholesale destruction of food (for the purpose of keeping prices up) a criminal offence.

Ex-Gov. Hiram W. Johnson says "Women have proved themselves a force for good government. In several particular instances they have waged battles in this State in behalf of decency and good government that challenge the highest regard for them as voting citizens."

All the Governors of the equal suffrage states have personally testified to the benefits of equal suffrage, and several of the Legislatures have passed strong resolutions that it has been a success and recommended it to non-suffrage states.

The meaning of "just woman's work" is not clear. There were women in all but three of 301 trades followed by men, even before the war brought out their abilities to such a remarkable extent in England. Men are also found in nearly all work once considered as belonging exclusively within woman's sphere. There are, in the United States, between eight and ten million women working for wages outside of the home. However, the kind of work which any citizen does has no bearing on the right to expression of opinion in the only way that carries weight—by ballot.

"Letter to the
Editor from
Isabel W. Greenwood"

The "splendid organization" owes its existence and growth largely to the fact that women learned that they could effect the "vital needs of the day" most surely and quickly by the direct influence of votes, and in suffrage states, after gaining the ballot, the same organized womanhood has put its strength into bringing about better conditions, especially for women and children. California gained at once by votes a law giving to parents equal rights in their children; Massachusetts women worked for fifty years before getting this law.

The fine ability shown by anti-suffragists in their public activities makes them able co-workers in these lines, for no anti-suffrage organization exists in a state after the ballot is granted to women.

That "popular information on the subject is daily increasing" is shown by the fact that so many states are adopting equal suffrage, or nearly full suffrage as in the cases of Illinois, North Dakota, Ohio, Indiana and Arkansas, and that in ten states where the question has been submitted more than once a much more favorable vote was cast the second time with but two exceptions, Ohio and Michigan. Ohio on Feb. 14, 1917, gave her women presidential suffrage; they had already been granted school suffrage in 1894. The case of Michigan will perhaps affect the belief of the anti-friend as to the cause of defeats of suffrage. To quote Michigan papers: The Kalamazoo Gazette said: "Last year (1912) liquor dealers vigorously denied any connection with the fight against women. This Spring they openly boasted of it. There is no doubt thousands of dollars were sent into the State by outside liquor organizations." The Bay City Tribune said: "The liquor interests of the State were solidly against the women. Unquestionably their influence more than anything else caused the defeat of the amendment."

All vicious interests are actively against the cause, while the anti-suffrage organization is the only body of women who are working against the cause.

The plea "these campaigns are killing women" was never quoted from any suffragist's words; their plea is: Give us the ballot immediately, so that we may concentrate our increased powers on other issues.

If anyone really wants "conservation of women's forces" let them join forces with the suffragists. The suffragists stand for laws that benefit women and children, and for the ballot as the most direct means of obtaining these laws.

Greenwood Collection (Mrs. Chester - Isabel Whittier) WOMAN SUFFRAGE NEWSCHIPPINGS: MARY



WOMEN AND THE BALLOT

Meditations of One Maine Woman
On Equal Citizenship Problems—
"Superiority vs. Equality."

To Editors of Lewiston Journal:

There is an old saying that "figures will not lie." They cannot even make mistakes if we set down the right figures, but the trouble is we do not always get the right ones. There is no child in the fourth and fifth grades in school who is not aware of the bother it makes in an example in long division if just one figure is copied down wrong or one figure is omitted.

Perhaps some of us busy mothers have to help our children over this trying period in their experience of learning mathematics. It brings to mind the experience of our own youthful days, and we find that even tho we have a real liking for mathematics, it is still quite easy to make mistakes. But we enjoy working with the children. It takes our mind, for the time, away from the tasks of washing dishes, scrubbing, dusting, sewing, etc., and then we almost unconsciously carry this mathematical reasoning into our problems that come from outside our regular work. And we can think as we work. Tho it is rather unsafe to think very deeply when we are cooking, or sewing, for we may omit the soda or the cream of tartar, or make two sleeves to fit one arm. But we can think when we are washing clothes, or ironing, we do not have to give much thought to that kind of work but just keep pegging away. If only some sort of a fairy could come and record the thoughts of busy women while they are at work the world would be greatly enriched, I am sure. The thoughts come with the work and go with the work, the inspiration is gone with the new task, but they help to make the life of the very busy woman happier in her work. If we have to keep our mind on our sewing when we are sewing we can think about it afterward, and we ask ourselves "what is the difference between the right sleeve and the left sleeve?" They are different, very different. They must

be different or they would be useless, yet the process of making seems the same. I have often thought that it would be well to make the right sleeve a little stronger, as most people are right handed, and usually the right sleeve comes to a little harder wear. Of course we cannot think of the sleeve without thinking of the arms.

What is the difference between the right arm and the left arm? The right arm is just as different from the left arm as the right sleeve is from the left sleeve. As the majority of people are right handed we speak of the "good right arm," as tho it were of much greater importance than the left arm, and it would certainly be a greater misfortune to lose the right arm because it has really become stronger thru exercise. But the left arm will become stronger and the left hand can be trained to do all that the right hand had been able to do before.

How do we use our arms? Do we allow ourselves to do a certain part of our work with one hand and a certain part with the other hand, using only one hand at a time. No, we use both hands working together. Sometimes one hand is doing the principal part, and sometimes the other, but the work goes on and the task is completed. If the spool of thread with which we are sewing happens to be in a position that it is easier to be picked up with the right hand we pick it up with that hand. It is just as easy to use the left hand in the same way. Thus it may be with men and women picking up the thread of life and working out the problems together. Elbert Hubbard said that nothing was ever an entire success when men and women were not working together. Men and women are different but not so different as many people suppose. One man is very different from another man, not only is he different from men of another nationality but different from men of his own nationality. Customs and environment will change a man a great deal, at least in outward appearance. It is also the same with a woman. How different the free and independent American woman is from the women of less favored lands! But I have come to think, in the words of Kipling, that "the colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady are sisters under their skins."

That good old Irish name reminds me of the problem I have been trying to solve. Irishmen have always been noted for saying bright and witty things, and one of our anti-

suffragists complimented the Irishman who was compelled to make a toast to a party of ladies who had just acquired the ballot, when he said "My superiors of yesterday, but my equals of today." I presume he was an American Irishman, but I wonder if he thinks that his countrymen are superior without the ballot to what they would be with it.

A friend of mine has an acquaintance who says that he has great respect for women, but if they get the ballot and become his equals, he will have no respect at all for them. An other anti said that she did not believe in suffrage because it was not logical. Different people see things in a different way so it would be unfair to judge from statements made by a number of people, but the problem that is confronting me is how to make the statements of one person who is an anti, seem logical to me. Now here is my problem to find just what effect the ballot will have on the women of our land or state according to the statements of this anti: "There are just as many bad women as bad men." "The bad women are just as bad as the bad men." "The women are physically weaker than men." "Women are mentally weaker than men." "Women are the superiors of men, but if they receive the ballot they will become the equals of men."

The first part of this problem seems very simple. The bad men and bad women being equal in numbers and quality of badness cancels them out of the equation. Then the fact that the remainder of the women being the superiors of the men, while at the same time being weaker, physically and mentally, proves that their superiority must lie in the fact of their weakness. We do not see any mistakes in our work so far, but the next step in solving this problem is much difficult. If the superiority of women lies in their weakness, would a greater weakness, both physical and mental, make them still more superior? Even the school children can see there is something wrong here, so we will have to begin all over again as the children do. The statement is that the bad women are equal in numbers to the bad men while they are just as bad as the bad men; that is they have the same moral weaknesses. Are they so much stronger physically and mentally that when they receive the ballot along with the superior morally it will bring the whole mass of women down from the plane of "superiority" to that of simple equality with the men. (We have hardly been in the habit of thinking of the bad women in that light.)

If, on the other hand, they are weaker physically and mentally, while at the same time they are on the same plane of moral weakness with the bad men, then the good women would have to be stronger morally than the good men to bring about this state of equality. So we do not think the anti's need to have any great fears, unless there is something more than has already been stated in the problem. Yet the anti's have great fear of the ballot, so there must still be something wrong. I have not time to go over the problem again but I do feel that the problem cannot be solved just as it stands, because we do not know the exact proportion of good men and good women. And, while we know that the bad men equal the bad women, we do not know the percentage of the bad in comparison with the good.

But while I am waiting for someone to help me bring the problem of the anti's into a more workable equation (since it must be that anti-suffrage is logical, if suffrage is illogical), I will indulge in a few thoughts

of my own. I am glad that we have the anti-suffrage element as well as the suffrage element, because, when the women do get the vote, they will still be so anxious to keep up their superiority that they will never drop to a lower level, even if they have to drag the whole plane of men and women along with them.

A Seeker After Light.

Greenwood Collection
(Mrs. Chester - Isabel W.)

WOMAN SUFFRAGE NEWSCLIPPINGS: MAINE

Letters to the Editor

SUFFRAGE QUESTION AGAIN IS DISCUSSED

ATTORNEY SWEET REPLIES TO THE LETTER OF MRS. WHITEHOUSE ON FRANCHISE EFFECT

Editor, The Franklin Journal:

I have read with interest an article in your issue of today by Mrs. Florence Brooks Whitehouse, called forth by my letter of a week ago, on the woman suffrage issue.

Her first point is that "the fate of the Republican party hung in the balance, all on account of the 'woman's vote' in California." It is quite true that the issue of the election seemed for a long time to hang on the vote of California. But what evidence is there that it was the woman's vote which introduced the uncertainty? Were the men's votes counted first and found to be overwhelmingly one way, and was it not until the women's votes were reached in the count that the doubt began to appear? The ballots were, of course, promiscuously cast and counted without any indication of sex. How, then, is it to be proved that the women's votes caused the uncertainty? But even if they did, what bearing does the fact have on the particular point at issue? That point is whether the hand-bill circulated at town meeting contained a legitimate argument. The gist of the argument is that Maine is not getting her due share of influence in the Federal government under present conditions. The fact that California's quantum of influence has passed under new control has not the slightest connection with the share of influence which Maine is able to exert. The quantum of Maine's influence remains the same, without regard to who may have control of it.

Mrs. Whitehouse objects to my interpretation of the argument and puts forth her own interpretation. I submit that her interpretation differs from mine in phraseology alone; in meaning and intent they are substantially identical. Just compare the two, as follows: Her premise is that "the women of the West have impressed upon the government, and will increasingly impress upon the government their will and desire in regard to national affairs". My premise is: "The recent presidential election was decided by the states of the great Northwest. In nearly all of these states, women participated in the election." Compare these carefully. Is there an essential dif-

ference? Now compare the conclusions. Her conclusion is "if Mr. Sweet does not want to be governed by Western women, as well as by Western and Eastern men, the only alternative for him is to help enfranchise the Eastern women." Now take my conclusion: "The State of Maine, in order to preserve its relative influence in presidential elections and not be overwhelmed (Mrs. Whitehouse would substitute the word 'governed') by the increased number of voters which suffrage has given to the West (Mrs. Whitehouse uses here the more concise phrase 'western women', thereby improving my diction), must itself give the ballot to women (Mrs. Whitehouse says, 'help enfranchise the Eastern women') as a sort of balance to the women voters of the West." Where is the difference? There is a great difference in the way the thought is expressed, her English being far superior to mine. But when we consider the essence of the thought itself, is there a difference? Our premises are substantially the same, and our conclusions are substantially the same. Therefore our interpretations of the leaflet are substantially the same.

Mrs. Whitehouse says also that "most men would prefer to be governed by their own wives than by other men's wives". But cases have come within my personal observation as a practising attorney which lead me to challenge the universality of this truth. Now let us examine the fallacy of the inference intended to be drawn from this statement. Take any individual voter of Maine, Mr. A. The argument addressed to Mr. A is this: If you do not wish to be governed by other men's wives in national affairs, then give the ballot to your own wife and about 125,000 other wives in both national and state affairs. Your wife will then be able by her one ballot to dominate over you and thus prevent domination by the 125,000 other wives. We must remember that there can be no appeal other than to every voter of the state taken separately and individually. With all deference I say that to consider all the men of the state as an Aggregate Maine Husband and then to ask him to enfranchise his Aggregate Maine Wife, so as not to be governed by other women, involves a fallacy too gross for comment. It is a slip of logic similar to that committed by the weary Irishman who with a companion was walking the railroad ties toward Boston. They were about ready to drop with fatigue when they passed a mile-post, which read, "Boston 10 miles." The first Irishman brightened up when he read it and exclaimed, "Come on, Pat. Sure, it's only foive moiles more apiece!"

It is suggested that we enfranchise Maine women now because at some indefinite time in the future the electoral system may be changed so that the president will be elected by a direct popular vote of the nation, voting as one electorate, and the Eastern states thereby snowed under. When that time comes, if it

ever does, the Eastern states can easily dig themselves out by enfranchising their women then. It should

be remembered that the suffrage can be given at any time, but that, once given, it can never be withdrawn. To grant the suffrage on this ground at this time would be like a guest's jumping from a hotel window on the theory that if the house should happen to get afire at some time in the future and the corridors be filled with smoke and flame, this would be the only escape from burning to death.

In conclusion, let me say that in my former letter I did not say or suggest, as Mrs. Whitehouse assumes, that the votes of women did not affect the choice of 91 electors. I have no way of knowing about that. They may have or they may not have. No one can deny that if women vote in a given state, the fact may affect the identity and the character of that state's electors. What I wished to point out was that it could not possibly affect the quantum of influence which that state will have in the electoral college. And I still maintain that the natural and obvious interpretation of the flyer is that Maine, in self defense against the West, must enfranchise its women in order to preserve its relative influence. I think I have shown that Mrs. Whitehouse's interpretation of it amounts to the same thing.

JOHN ALLEN SWEET, JR.

Greenwood Collection
(Mrs. Chester - Isabel W.)

WOMAN SUFFRAGE NEWS-
CLIPPINGS:
MAINE

Letters to the Editor
(pg. 3 of 3)

SUFFRAGE REPLY TO RECENT EDITORIAL

FOISTING VOTE ON AN UNWILLING CLASS OF WOMEN DEFENDED BY THE SUFFRAGISTS

In a recent issue of The Franklin Journal the following query was made editorially: "The question is, Should the responsibility of suffrage be foisted upon divided womanhood?", and the Farmington Suffrage League sends the following reply, which we are pleased to print, and trust that it will be followed by a communication from the Antis:

Does granting the ballot to women foist upon them the obligation to universally exercise that right? The present voters, by their common practice, have said it does not. In the Presidential election of 1912, in the states where only men voted but 54.5 per cent of them performed that duty. In Maine at the last election 70,000 men did not take the trouble to vote. Self-government has repeatedly been granted to classes of men who did not generally desire it.

The majority of women have not asked for the ballot and the majority have not opposed the granting of it, but of those who take a lively interest in it, either for or against, the great majority are in favor. The only occasion when the government took an official referendum among women on the subject, in Massachusetts, in 1895, women voted 22,204 for and 861 against; less than 1-6 of 1 per cent of the women of the State voted against it. That the sentiment favoring equal suffrage has steadily increased during the two years following is readily shown in the many great suffrage victories and the increasing frequency with which they now occur, in the fact that no state or country that has adopted equal suffrage has ever tried to go back to man suffrage alone, and in the fact that the new states granting suffrage have almost without exception been those adjacent to states in which it has previously been adopted. In the Country at large since 1895 in response to urgent and widely published appeals from the Antis only about 1 per cent have registered an objection to suffrage.

No improvement in the condition of women, either educationally, industrially or in the matter of property rights has ever been secured because all or even a majority have wanted it. Every argument ever advanced against equal suffrage has previously been used against every one of those improvements, but as soon as adopted no one questioned their justice or expediency.

There are among women as among men those who will not assume responsibilities; we have no quarrel with them but should any advantage be denied to those wanting self-government, or who strive to make better conditions in which to live, because the few are not interested?

How much added responsibility would be thrust upon women because of the ballot? Women are continually being urged to inform themselves regarding public interests and moral issues, that they may rightly and effectively use their influence, the influence which they are erroneously but frequently assured is stronger because they have no vote.

One eminent economist has said that "Influence without responsibility is dangerous."

The class of women who admit that the ballot could be had for the asking and used to support the right, yet fail to assume the responsibility, will hardly be more conscientious in its exercise when it is granted than are men who fail to vote. Granting for the sake of argument that women have proved more conscientious than men, then this is a strong argument in favor of granting them the suffrage.

The activity which womanhood in general has shown in every reform and relief movement, and the minor part which they contribute to the criminal records, indicate that women would materially assist the efforts of good and able men in the accomplishment of good government.

The President-elect of Minnesota University says "What I look forward to is the day when no woman shall be at a disadvantage because of her sex and when no woman shall take an unfair advantage because of it. Both these conditions exist today and each is a necessary corollary of the other."

In a national sense the responsibility of Suffrage is held by a divided womanhood. The women in almost every state West of the Mississippi River have the right to vote, while the eastern women do not. Is this right? Do not the women of the East have just as many interests to protect as the women of the West?

Greenwood Collection (Mrs. Chester -
Isabel Whittier)

WOMAN SUFFRAGE NEWSCLIPPINGS: MAINE

Letters to the Editor

SUFFRAGISTS REPLY TO SWEET'S LETTER

FLORENCE BROOKS WHITEHOUSE HOPES FOR MAINE FRANCHISE IN THE NEAR FUTURE

Editor, The Franklin Journal:

An open letter written by John Allen Sweet and published in your issue of March 9 has been sent to me presumably that I may reply to it, since the leaflet referred to was published by the Referendum League of Maine, of which I have the honor to be President, and I ask space in your columns for this letter.

It is refreshing to find that there is one man at least in Maine who does not lay the defeat of the Republican Party to the women of the West. I have heard so much to that effect from the disgruntled Republicans that it is a pleasure to find a man who does not believe it.

The gentleman is quite correct in his statement that the President is elected by 531 electors who compose the Electoral College. He is also correct in saying that the fact that women voted in 12 states did not increase the electoral vote in those states, but he is entirely wrong when he suggests that that fact did not effect the choice of 91 electors for the Electoral College. Until this year the Western States have been pretty correctly pigeonholed weeks before election—this year the prognostications flew wide of the mark, and for a week after election the fate of the Republican party hung in the balance, all on account of "the woman's vote" in California.

I can find nothing in the leaflet referred to by Mr. Sweet to warrant his saying, "In other words, the State of Maine to preserve its relative influence in Presidential elections and not be overwhelmed by the increased number of voters which suffrage has given to the West, must itself give the ballot to women as a sort of balance to the women voters of the West." Instead, the suggestion in the leaflet is a perfectly legitimate one drawn from the lesson of the election, that the women of the West have impressed upon the Government, and will increasingly impress upon the Government their will and desire in regard to National affairs, and as

their power increases, as each new state is won for suffrage, so their influence in National politics will increase. (In the last three weeks we have won four more states with 53 electoral votes making in all 144 electoral votes or more than one-fourth of the Electoral College) and if Mr. Sweet does not want to be governed by western women, as well as by western and eastern men, the only alternative for him is to help enfranchise the eastern women. Most men would prefer to be governed by their own wives than by other men's wives.

We challenge Mr. Sweet's statement that if only the men 35 or over had been allowed to vote Maine's influence would not have been effected in the last election. There certainly would have been no fewer electors but the personnel of the electors might have been changed.

We reiterate, in the words of the flyer referred to, "The spirit of the west has proved a dominant factor in National politics," and we add in the next presidential election it will prove more of a factor because of women's increased representation in the Electoral College, and in case the Nation should consider a popular vote for President, the eastern states would be hopelessly snowed under.

In 1916 the "states where women vote were the decisive factors" and in 1920 the states where women vote may elect the President.

Shall Maine send her six electors to the College in 1920 representing both the will of the men and the women? We hope and believe that she will.

Florence Brooks Whitehouse.

Letters to the
Editor
(pg. 2 of 3)

Greenwood Collection
(Mrs. Chester - Isabel Whittier)

WOMAN SUFFRAGE
NEWSCLIPPINGS!
MAINE

ness men, and possibly the women—supported Mr. Wilson's candidacy. Again I wondered. Did this second man know whereof he spoke? Of course the only conclusion any right, fairminded woman can come to is that they both knew. Of course, the men know about those things.

It seems such a pity that the women of Farmington, as well as the voters, should be so misinformed concerning what is "so elementary and commonplace" as to really think that through his vote a man can in any way help determine who shall be President of these United States; than by his vote he can in any way affect the political color of those same six presidential electors, upon whom Mr. Sweet so confidently relies. How regrettable that they have been taught that if a majority of the voters of the State cast their votes for the Republican electors, all those six electors will be Republican and cast their ballots for the Republican candidate for President. Likewise, if the majority vote for Democratic electors, those electors will all be Democrats and will cast their ballots, willy-nilly, for the Democratic candidate. Or, horror of horrors! those same six electors may be Progressives.

Indeed, the "profound ignorance of the fundamental structure of our government" displayed provokes one even to laughter. How much must be unlearned before we may have the confidence that Maine is all right as she is. It is true that Maine has six electoral votes, and Mr. Sweet assures us that there need be no anxiety as to the women's vote, or any other vote, as to that matter. Maine has six electoral votes and that is all there is to it!

Appreciatively,
S. MAY BAKER.

REPLY ON SUFFRAGE

BY J. A. SWEET, JR.

TAKES ISSUE WITH CORRESPONDENT ON POPULAR DECISION IN THE PRESIDENTIAL VOTE

Editor of The Franklin Journal:

I notice in your issue of Friday an article attempting to unriddle the suffrage argument discussed in my article of March 9. The author of Friday's article presumably has employed those powers of intellectual vision which are so conspicuously lacking in the undersigned; for he tells us that the president really is elected by the popular vote, and dismisses the electoral college as being a mere technicality. It would seem that the "visionary" powers above referred to have failed to perceive that technicalities, like facts, are stubborn things. The validity of arguments is frequently tested by extreme cases, and we will suppose that last Fall Mr. Hughes had obtained a majority of the popular vote, Mr. Wilson getting a majority of the electoral vote. I think that in this situation any admirer of the president familiar with the simplest developments in our political life would feel perfectly safe in paying a fancy price for a reserved seat from which to witness the inauguration of his favorite; and that the audience which would assemble to watch the index finger of Mr. Hughes triumphantly level itself at his popular majority while his rival, a few blocks away, was taking the oath of office, would cut about the same figure at the capital as the electoral college does in the mind of our modern Plato.

JOHN ALLEN SWEET, JR.

Greenwood Collection (Mrs. Chester - Isabel W.)

WOMAN SUFFRAGE NEWSCLIPPINGS: MAINE

Letters to the Editor
(Pg. 1 of 3)