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"Nature has marked the weaker sex for protection, rather than the direction of government."—Thomas Jefferson.

The Case Against Woman Suffrage

The Most Important Question on the Ballot at the Special Election, September 10, 1917

Shall the Constitution be amended as proposed by a resolution of the Legislature granting suffrage to women upon equal terms with men?

"It is by the promulgation of sound morals in the community, and more especially by the training and instruction of the young that woman performs her part toward the preservation of a free government."—Daniel Webster.
TO THE MEN OF MAINE

The question of amending our Constitution to permit women to vote at all elections will be decided by the voters of Maine at the special election September 10 next.

No more important question has ever appeared upon our ballot. It profoundly concerns the future of our State and of every man, woman and child within it.

In this little pamphlet we present as briefly and clearly as possible some of the many reasons for our belief that Woman Suffrage is wrong in theory and bad in practice.

We ask you to read it carefully, then to go to the polls on September 10 and vote as your conscience dictates.

Do not forget that popular indifference is almost wholly responsible for the adoption of Woman Suffrage in certain States of this Union.

Let it not be said that indifference was allowed to decide the question here.

Woman Suffrage, in its final analysis, is a proposal to change what has always been regarded as the natural social order and to establish a new principle as the basis of the State.

No man can afford to be neutral on such a question. It touches every home and every family. It may affect the stability of State and Nation.

We appeal, therefore, to the men of Maine to go to the polls on the tenth day of September next and vote on the Woman Suffrage amendment.

The issue is too big, too vital to the interests of all the people, to be determined by a minority.

MAINE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN.

MRS. CLARENCE HALE, Portland, President
MRS. FRED E. HOLLIS, Portland, Secretary
Press Building, Portland, Maine.
The Case Against Woman Suffrage

1. The vote is not a question of individual "right," or what is best for the individual or for any class, but solely a question of what is best for the State.

2. The net result of Woman Suffrage wherever tried has been a loss to the State and a loss to women.

3. The vote is demanded by only a small minority of women.

4. To force the vote upon the great majority of women to satisfy a small minority would be undemocratic and unjust.

5. Men and women were created different and designed to work in different spheres for the common good—to cooperate with and supplement each other and not to compete.

6. The vote would deprive woman of her non-partisan power which enables her to do for the State what man is unable to do because he is bound by political party obligations.

7. The basis of government is physical force, and the physical power to enforce the law, without which the vote is useless, is neither possible nor desirable for women.

8. Woman Suffrage is demanded by Socialists and Feminists as "a means to an end"—the end being "a complete social revolution."

* * * * *

Such is our indictment of the Woman Suffrage movement. The proof in briefest outline follows:
The Suffrage Solely a Question of What Is Best for the State

The cornerstone of the Woman Suffrage movement is the argument that the vote is a "natural" right from the enjoyment of which women are "tyrannically excluded by men."

Miss Anna Howard Shaw, for years president and now honorary president of the National Woman Suffrage Association, said in the New York Evening Post of Feb. 25, 1915:

"I believe in Woman Suffrage whether all women vote or no women vote; whether all women vote right or all women vote wrong; whether women will love their husbands after they vote or forsake them; whether they will neglect their children or never have any children."

In this statement of the case there is no pretense that the State or anybody in it will benefit by giving the ballot to women. Miss Shaw would have Woman Suffrage though material and moral evil follow in its wake!

The Vote Not a Natural Right

All the legal authorities agree that there is no such thing as a "natural" or "inalienable" right to vote.

"The granting of the franchise," said Chief Justice Marshall, "has always been regarded in the practice of nations as a matter of expediency and not as an inherent right."

"Suffrage," said Judge Cooley, in his work on the Principles of Constitutional Law, "cannot be the right of the individual, because it does not exist for the benefit of the individual, but for the benefit of the State itself."

The Cyclopedia of American Government says: "That the suffrage cannot be a natural right is obvious from the fact that no community can ever enfranchise all its citizens."

And as we shall show in a later chapter of this pamphlet, the suffrage leaders themselves once abandoned the claim that the vote was a right and demanded it only on the ground of expediency.
The franchise is an instrument of government carrying with it a heavy responsibility, and it is given only to those to whom the State, for what it conceives to be its own highest interest, sees fit to give it.

If the franchise were a right, like the right of every one to protection of life and property, the State would not be justified in withholding it from any sane, law-abiding individual.

That it is not such a right common sense alone teaches. The minor, the alien, the soldier or sailor in the service of Uncle Sam, the citizen of the District of Columbia, each has a right to have his person and his property protected. But he has no vote.

From each of these groups the ballot has been withheld on the ground that its "participation in government would be for the disadvantage of the State," the reasons for taking that ground being, of course, different in each case.

In the case of women, it was a question solely of how they could best serve the State, and it was decided that women could best serve the State outside the realm of political contention.

It is clear, therefore, that the case of Miss Shaw and the National Woman Suffrage Association falls of its own weight, since it is based on something which does not exist.

NEITHER MAN NOR WOMAN HAS A NATURAL RIGHT TO VOTE.

The Question for the Voter

Since the question of "natural right" is not involved, the question every man should try to answer to his own satisfaction before he decides on Woman Suffrage is:

Will the public interest be better served, on the whole, by an electorate composed of men and women than it is by an electorate of men alone?

It isn't enough for the Suffragists to attempt to prove
that no harm will come to the State by the doubling of its electorate.

The burden is upon them to prove that "Votes for Women" will raise the standard of government and make it more efficient. They must prove that, on the average, women will be wiser and better electors and legislators than men.

Woman Suffrage means greatly increased outlay of time and money devoted to elections and to government. It means diverting woman from her natural duties. This is a direct loss to the State. The suffragists must prove that women's votes will bring to the State some gain that will more than counterbalance this loss.

WHAT IS THAT GAIN TO BE?

The Net Result of Woman Suffrage a Loss to Women and to the State

It is generally agreed that the greatest menace to government is not the corrupt or ignorant voter, but the voter who fails to do his duty on election day. And this menace is tremendously increased by the addition of women to the electorate.

A small minority of women may be able to induce men to force the ballot on an unwilling majority of women, but no power has yet been devised to make an unwilling majority of women vote.

Certain voters, male or female, can always be depended upon to go to the polls. These are the voters who are led by bosses or by private interests.

The influence of such voters can be offset only when the rest of the electorate likewise goes to the polls. Woman Suffrage will double the number of voters who will vote as they are told. But it will not double the number of independent voters, because the great majority of women whose votes would count against the bosses and the selfish interests will not go to the polls.

Woman Suffrage, therefore, will greatly increase the danger of boss-controlled and interest-controlled legislation.
How Women Have Used the Ballot

Proof of the foregoing is found in all States where women have either full or partial suffrage. In Massachusetts women have had the vote for school committee since 1879. The suffragists asked for that vote as a test of what women would do in politics. Here is the result of that test:

In the last twenty years there has been in Massachusetts an average registration of 4.8 per cent of the legal women voters, and an actual vote of 2.1 per cent, or less than half the registration.

In many Massachusetts towns years have passed without a single female vote!

At the city election in Chicago, April 6, 1915, when an extraordinary effort was made to get out the female vote for its effect upon pending suffrage campaigns, the result was:

Men, 434,277, or 82.7 per cent. of the legal male vote; women, 250,404, or only 49.9 per cent. of the legal female vote.

In other words, 32.8 per cent. more women than men neglected their political duties.

At the last Presidential election, the men of Illinois cast 78.9 per cent. of their legal vote, while the women cast only 53.7 per cent. of the legal female vote.

Illinois is the only state in which the male and female votes are counted separately, but the result there is unquestionably typical of that in other suffrage States.

There is evidence, also, of a lowering of the sense of political responsibility on the part of men in States where women vote. For instance:

The twelve double suffrage States cast in the last Presidential election 58.4 per cent. of their possible vote, while twelve male-suffrage States having an equal population cast 71.3 per cent. of their possible vote.

Another significant fact:

Wyoming, woman suffrage 47 years, with 67,000 male and 35,000 female legal voters, cast 36 fewer votes in the last Presidential election than male-suffrage Delaware, with only 66,000 legal voters!
From the foregoing figures two facts are clear: Women do not vote as generally as men when given the opportunity, and the possession of the ballot by women causes men to lose interest and neglect their political duties.

And in both cases the result is an increase in the stay-at-home percentage and a distinct injury to State and Nation.

**The High Cost of Government**

One of the largest items in the high cost of living is the cost of government. Twenty years ago the annual cost of town, state and federal government for the average family of five was less than $100. Today, according to the United States Census Bureau, it is almost $300.

According to the New York Times, which made an exhaustive investigation, the New York State election of 1914 cost $4,079,171.42, or $2.83 per voter, $2 of which came from the public purse.

The Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a suffragist, estimates that the doubling of an electorate adds at least 50 per cent. to the cost of elections.

On this basis, if the per capita cost in Maine is approximately what it is in New York, Woman Suffrage means an additional expense of at least $1.40 per voter at every election.

Figures filed with the secretary of the United States Senate show that the expenses of candidates for the Senate in 1914 were more than three times as great in Woman Suffrage States as in Male Suffrage States of approximately the same population.

Those who do not count the cost will not consider this an argument against double suffrage. But the poor man is forced to count the cost.

He is counting it now in all Woman Suffrage states, and he is counting it in Australia and New Zealand, double suffrage countries which are known as the champion debt-ridden countries of the world.

Unless the men of Maine wish to pay a higher tax on their property, without any compensating advantage, they must VOTE "NO" ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE SEPTEMBER 10 NEXT.
The Colorado Object Lesson

In its gross mismanagement of the miners' strike of 1913-14, Colorado furnishes one of the best object lessons of the evil results of Woman Suffrage.

As a result of indifference and neglect of duty on the part of the feminized electorate, the liquor and mining laws in the strike region had become inoperative.

In twenty years of Woman Suffrage no attempt had been made to secure a Workmen's Compensation Law, the establishment of an efficient board of arbitration, or any action that might have prevented trouble, while the forces of law and order had been allowed to degenerate into a brutal gang.

Thus the Colorado electorate tolerated conditions that bred violent hatred between capital and labor and found too late that it had neglected to provide adequate means of controlling the situation.

During a period of six months, while men, women and children were being killed and anarchy reigned, the electorate turned a deaf ear to suggestions for a special session of the Legislature; and finally, the State militia having added to the reign of terror instead of suppressing it, the State confessed its incompetence, abdicated its sovereignty and sent for federal troops!

Federal troops have never been called upon to deal with strikes in male suffrage states, except strikes threatening interstate commerce and the safety of the United States mails, and therefore properly subject to federal interference.

Twice in ten years Colorado has been obliged to call upon Uncle Sam to quell riots affecting State issues solely, and it is the only State in the Union having that unenviable record.

The Divorce Evil and Woman Suffrage

The statistics of divorce prove that this great social menace is more prevalent and increasing faster in the Woman Suffrage West than in any other section of the country.
For purposes of comparison, let us take adjoining male and double suffrage States.

Colorado, with Woman Suffrage since 1893, has 409 divorces to every 100,000 of married population, while adjoining Male Suffrage Nebraska has only 226.

The divorce rate per 100,000 of married population is 513 in Washington, 347 in Idaho, 368 in Oregon and 361 in Wyoming, all Woman Suffrage States; while in Male-Suffr- frage Missouri, North and South Dakota the divorce rate per 100,000 of married population is only 281, 268 and 270 respectively.

Although not yet so far advanced along the line of "easy divorce" as the Woman Suffrage countries of Scand- dinavia, where divorce is simply a matter of mutual consent, the divorce mills of some of our suffrage States are sufficiently notorious for all practical purposes.

Rev. Martin Hart, Dean of the Denver Cathedral, in the issue of "The Chronicle" (a religious paper) for Febru- ary, 1915, says:

"Here in Denver we had last year 1265 divorces out of 2500 marriages."

It may be argued that the increasing prevalence of divorce in Woman Suffrage States is due, not to the fact that women are in politics, but to the fact that these States are inhabited by a comparatively unstable people, who hold the marriage bond much more lightly than their more con- servative and perhaps more religious neighbors.

Well, which horn of this dilemma do the suffragists want to take?

Does Woman Suffrage increase divorce? Or

Do none but unstable, radical peoples adopt Woman Suffrage?

The fact is that both these questions should be answered in the affirmative. Woman Suffrage does increase divorce, because divorce has increased faster under Woman Suffrage than it did before; and only radical peoples, with comparatively elastic notions about marriage, adopt Woman Suffrage, because it has yet to be adopted by vote of the people in any State which has not proven an easy prey to Mormonism, Socialism and other radical doctrines.

Vote "NO" on Woman Suffrage in September and PROTECT THE HOME FROM A NEW AND POTENT ELEMENT OF DISCORD.
Social Welfare Laws First Enacted in Male Suffrage States

Every one of the following kinds of legislation was first conceived and advocated by men, and first enacted by male legislators elected by the votes of men alone:

- Limiting the hours of women in industry to 54 a week and to 8 a day.
- Prohibiting night work by women in industry and prohibiting the employment of women too soon before and after childbirth.
- Compensating widows and children of workmen killed in industry.
- Securing the property rights of married women.
- Conferring equal rights of guardianship upon women.
- Red-light abatement laws and laws against white slave traffic.
- Providing for effective birth registration (a law essential to the reduction of infant mortality.)
- Limiting child labor and establishing juvenile courts.

Some of the foregoing kinds of laws—notably the law prohibiting night work—have not yet been passed in Woman Suffrage States.

All the evidence shows that male-suffrage States have led in the initiation and enactment of humane laws.

Why are they asked to double their electorates? Is it that they may cease to be leaders in the march of progress and go back to the position occupied by Woman Suffrage States?

Woman Suffrage and Equal Pay

"Equal pay for equal work" is a very misleading slogan. It implies that women working as many hours and as efficiently as men are discriminated against in the matter of pay on account of sex, and that this would not be so if women had the vote.

In the first place, there is little if any such discrimination.

In the second place, the woman's vote could not do away with it if it existed, because work and wages are regulated by the universal law of supply and demand,
Samuel Gompers says women get less for their work than men because they ask for less. That is true in a sense. But it is far from being the whole story.

The fact is, that unless they put a small price on it themselves, and unless it is of inferior quality, women are not paid less than men when they sell their WORK.

It is when they sell their TIME that the difference between men’s and women’s pay appears.

And this is a matter the ballot cannot change, because it is controlled by the physical facts of nature.

In the general recognition of woman’s need of special protective legislation we have the proof that women are weaker than men physically and cannot compete with men in industry on a footing of absolute equality.

Employers of labor pay for skill and experience, for quantity and quality of output.

They do not pay for sex.

The question of the difference between men’s and women’s pay, therefore, is fundamentally a physical question. It has nothing whatever to do with politics.

How It Works in Practice


Mr. Gompers ought to be a good judge. He is a Suffragist. He has been interested in labor for many years. He has also had the ballot. His word, therefore, ought to be accepted as pretty conclusive evidence of what the ballot can’t do in the field of wages and work.

In Colorado women have voted for years. Has the ballot raised women’s wages in that state? Has it given them “Equal pay for Equal Work?”

In her book entitled “Equal Suffrage,” Dr. Helen Sumner says:

“Taking the public employment as a whole, women in Colorado receive considerably less remuneration than men.”

In the United States as a whole, according to Dr. Sumner, women receive 55.3 per cent. of the average of men’s wages.
But in Colorado, women receive only 47 cents for every 100 cents paid to men in wages.

Clearly, therefore, the ballot has NOT helped the Colorado wage-earner to improve her economic status.

Does any one think it will do for the wage-earning woman of other States what it has failed to do for her Colorado sisters?

A Married Woman's Question

The question of how the Suffrage affects woman is, after all, a question that concerns not a particular class of women, but THE AVERAGE WOMAN.

And the average woman is found in the home with three or four children, doing her own housework and rocking her own cradle.

Business and industry are, as a rule, mere incidents in women's lives.

The instinct of the normal woman is NOT to work for somebody for wages, NOT to compete with men in business or the professions, but to form a life partnership with some man and raise a family.

It is for this reason that women remain in industry but from five to seven years on the average, when they graduate into matrimony.

Fortunately for her the interests of the industrial woman are not selfish interests. It they were she would be helpless, with the vote or without it. Her real interests, on the contrary, are community interests, and the community takes care of them as a matter of self-protection.

The question for the voters, therefore, is NOT how the vote will affect the woman in industry, but HOW WILL IT AFFECT THE AVERAGE WOMAN, WHO IS A MARRIED WOMAN WITH THREE OR FOUR CHILDREN?

Woman Suffrage and Prohibition

Have the liquor interests anything to fear or the temperance interests anything to gain from votes for women?
Suffragists have always varied their answer to this question according to the class of men whose votes they were seeking.

In Massachusetts, during the 1915 campaign, two suffragist speakers were detailed to assure the brewery-workers that women had no designs on the saloon, while other speakers were trying to convince temperance organizations that women would make Massachusetts "dry" if given the ballot.

Vice-President Mary Fleming of the Pennsylvania Suffrage Association expressed in these words the general feeling of the suffragist leaders in the campaign of 1915:

"Activities of W. C. T. U. members of the suffragist movement are detrimental to our cause."

According to the "Woman's Voice," official organ of the Montana W. C. T. U., the suffragists of that State refused the W. C. T. U. a place in their parade during the campaign of 1914.

Mrs. Abigail Scott Duniway, known as "the mother of suffrage" in Oregon, Washington and Idaho, attacked the W. C. T. U. and called the prohibitionists "pirates" in an address before the International Congress of Wine Producers at the Panama Pacific Exposition on July 14, 1915.

A special suffrage edition of the Syracuse Post-Standard, issued March 17, 1917, contained a long feature article from the local branch of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party in which this statement was emphasized:

"The whole (prohibition) question is foremostly a man's question. ... History shows that enfranchising women has not proven the crisis that can be calculated to plunge States of the Union into bone dry prohibition."

It thus appears that we have these two conflicting suffragist attitudes, taken for political purposes, on the question of woman suffrage and temperance.

1. That the suffragists are not concerned about prohibition, and that votes for women will have no other effect upon the liquor traffic than have the votes of men.

2. That all suffragists and the majority of women are prohibitionists, and that women would vote liquor out of existence if given the ballot.

One of these attitudes is obviously false. The other is in accordance with the facts. What are the facts?
Facts Show No Relation Between Suffrage and Temperance

The following twenty-five States have adopted State-wide prohibition:

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Michigan, Montana, Maine, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington and West Virginia.

Eight of these prohibition States have woman suffrage, but one of them (Kansas) adopted prohibition in 1880—thirty-two years before it adopted woman suffrage.

Therefore:

Eighteen States have adopted prohibition with men alone voting while only seven States have adopted prohibition with women voting.

Furthermore, NOT A SINGLE STATE WENT “DRY” WITH WOMEN VOTING BEFORE NOV. 3, 1914, when the prohibition wave now sweeping over the world, as a result of education, first began to rise.

In Utah, which has had woman suffrage since 1896, prohibition has just gone into effect.

Colorado defeated prohibition in 1912, although women had voted in that State for nineteen years. But in 1914, during a Billy Sunday revival, Colorado adopted prohibition, with Denver, the largest city, with the highest percentage of women, voting “wet.”

After forty-seven years of woman suffrage, the State of Wyoming is still “wet.”

On May 4, 1915, the women of Reno, Nevada, exercising the franchise for the first time, voted against the proposal to reduce the number of saloons from 80 to 40, and were publicly thanked by the liquor interests for standing with them.

CALIFORNIA, the largest woman suffrage State, DEFEATED PROHIBITION BY OVERWHELMING MAJORTIES IN 1912 AND AGAIN IN 1916.

On the other hand, male voters have been adopting prohibition for many years.

MAINE HAS HAD PROHIBITION FOR SIXTY-
SEVEN YEARS AND IS NOW BONE DRY WITHOUT WOMEN'S VOTES.

North Dakota which defeated woman suffrage at the polls in 1914, has had prohibition for twenty-eight years.

South Dakota, which defeated woman suffrage in 1916, went for prohibition at the same election. Of the eighteen counties then "dry," only two went for suffrage, while of the six counties carried for suffrage, four were "wet."

Iowa, which adopted prohibition in 1915 by the vote of a male legislature elected by men, defeated woman suffrage at the polls in 1916.

West Virginia, "dry" since 1912, defeated woman suffrage in 1916 by 161,607 to 63,540 votes—about two and a half to one.

In Ohio, where woman suffrage was rejected by a majority of nearly 200,000 in 1914, all but seventy-three of the 1371 townships have banished the saloon.

And here is a most significant fact:

Illinois, where women vote, is "wet," while the adjoining States of Indiana, Iowa and Michigan, where only men vote (Iowa and Michigan having recently rejected woman suffrage) are all now in the prohibition column.

In view of the foregoing facts, how futile to argue that woman suffrage is needed as a temperance weapon! The truth is, as suffragists themselves have admitted, that "the suddenly rapid growth of prohibition has come largely from the modern business view of efficiency and economy."

ALL THE FACTS SHOW THAT WOMAN SUFFRAGE HAS NOT EVEN BEEN A MINOR FACTOR IN THE ADVANCE OF THE TEMPERANCE CAUSE.

The Crowning Proof of Suffrage Failure

If any further evidence is needed of the utter futility of double suffrage, it is found in the almost complete abandonment by suffrage leaders of the "practical results" argument in their demand for the ballot, and their return to the exploded theory of "natural right."

It was upon the theory of "right" that the original demand for the vote for women was based. But when the
Supreme Court had ruled again and again that no such right existed, the suffragists abandoned the theory and rested their "cause" on the alleged wonders the woman's vote had worked in States where it existed.

As late as 1914 the suffrage campaign manual explicitly stated that suffrage was "not a natural right."

The argument for suffrage then, as it had been for years was that it would purify politics, reduce infant mortality, wipe out the social evil and make happier families. "Look at Colorado!" was the suffragist challenge to every doubting Thomas.

The government of Colorado had not yet broken down, and as most people were thinking of other things than votes for women, no serious attempt was made to prove that the rosy pictures of alleged conditions in Colorado were not pictures of actual conditions, but pictures originating in the imagination of their suffrage painters.

But the government of Colorado has since broken down. With the strike of 1913-14 came the nightmare of anarchy, due to the impotence and indifference of the feminized electorate.

THE COLORADO SUFFRAGE ARGUMENT HAD BECOME A SUFFRAGE BOOMERANG!

The House of Cards

When the house of cards built by the Suffragists upon the sands of Colorado fell about their ears, they were forced to seek another foundation for their unstable edifice. And there was only one available—the abandoned delusion of "natural right."

The thing that wasn't so, according to the Suffrage campaign manual of 1914, became the corner-stone of the Suffrage movement before the campaign manual was off the press!

"Back to Susan B. Anthony's 'rights' argument" was the verbal life-line thrown to the drifting and bewildered suffragists. And Miss Anna Howard Shaw, then president of the National Woman Suffrage Association, gave this message to the country:

"I contend that we should not answer our opponents when they argue along these lines, because..."
facts as to the results of Equal Suffrage, or the number of women who want Suffrage, or the reasons they ought to want it, have no bearing on our question.”

Miss Shaw still stands on that ground, and the Suffrage associations, state and national, stand there with her.

FACTS NO LONGER COUNT!

Although female suffrage has been on trial from 5 to 47 years in nine States of the Union, the suffragists refuse to stand on their record, but base their demand for the further extension of the suffrage on grounds abandoned as untenable more than a quarter century ago!

IS IT POSSIBLE TO IMAGINE A MORE CONVINCING CONFESSION OF THE FAILURE OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE?

Only a Small Minority of Women Demand the Ballot

The Woman Suffrage movement is the only movement having for its object the extension of the electorate that has ever met with organized opposition from those it was proposed to enfranchise.

This is a fact of tremendous significance. Indeed, it is a danger signal that must not be ignored by those who wish to do even-handed justice to all concerned in the settlement of this question.

There are in the United States 24,555,754 females of voting age and over. Of these, 2,097,954 live in the eleven double suffrage States, and 1,567,491 live in Illinois, where the Legislature granted women limited suffrage without the consent of the people.

The suffrage associations of the country claim a maximum of approximately 800,000 members. These, with the women of voting age who live in double suffrage States and in Illinois, make a total of 4,465,445 women in the United States who are either suffragists, or women entitled to register and vote, leaving over 20,000,000 women of voting age who are not enfranchised and NOT SUFFRAGISTS.
The Massachusetts Suffragist Association is the oldest suffrage organization in the country, dating back to 1869. It has been well financed and advertised, and its canvassers have gone into the highways and the byways of the State in the effort to gain recruits. Yet the most extravagant claim of its leaders in the heat of the 1915 campaign did not place its membership at over 100,000 females, or less than 10 per cent of the females of voting age in that State.

In other words, after 46 years of organized aggressive suffrage propaganda, at least 90 per cent of the females of voting age in Massachusetts, the State where the suffrage movement was cradled, are still either actively opposed to Woman Suffrage, or so indifferent to or contemptuous of the whole movement that they will have nothing to do with it one way or the other.

It is clear, therefore, taking the suffrage figures at their face value, that LESS THAN ONE WOMAN IN TEN IN THE UNITED STATES DESIRES THE VOTE ENOUGH TO JOIN IN THE DEMAND FOR IT, OR IS SUFFICIENTLY INTERESTED IN IT TO SIGN A CARD SAYING SHE IS NOT OPPOSED.

The Three Tailors of Tooley Street

It should not be forgotten that the Suffragists have bitterly opposed every attempt of the Anti-Suffragists to permit women as well as men to vote on the suffrage question. Bills having this object in view were defeated by the Suffragists twice in Massachusetts. Similar bills were defeated in New York and other States. Why?

Does any one doubt that the suffragists are opposed to this just and easy way of deciding the suffrage question because they know such a test would reveal how pitifully small a fraction of women really want the ballot?

Suffragists are fond of demanding the ballot in the name of "the women of the United States." But in view of their numbers they have no more right to pretend to speak for the women of the United States than the Three Tailors of Tooley Street had to petition Parliament as "We the people of the United Kingdom."
To Enfranchise Women Against The Will of the Majority Would Be Undemocratic and Unjust

While less than 10 per cent. of the women citizens of voting age in any State express a desire for the vote, the most undemocratic act of which the men of that State could be guilty would be to approve a Woman Suffrage amendment.

The fundamental principle of democracy is the consent of the governed.

This implies majority rule.

And as at least 90 per cent. of our women citizens so far as we have any evidence, consent to our form of government, and express no desire for a change, it is clear that the interests of democracy demand that their wishes be considered, rather than the wishes of the 10 per cent. who are in revolt against our government and demand that unwelcome and injurious burdens be placed upon their sisters.

The demand is for "justice for women."

Very well. But for WHICH women? For the 10 per cent. who DEMAND? Or for the 90 per cent. who PROTEST or who SAY NOTHING?

Let us by all means be just to women.

But let us be just by respecting the RIGHTS OF THE MAJORITY WHO CONSENT TO OUR GOVERNMENT, for in this way we shall be just to the State and to ALL WOMEN, even—though they may not know it—TO THE MINORITY WHO ARE IN REBELLION.

Woman Suffrage And Taxation

“But,” we are told, “it is unjust to tax women without giving them the vote.” This is a variation of the old “Taxation-without-representation-is-tyranny” slogan, and no more fallacious argument has ever come from the Suffrage propagandists.
The women of this country are not taxed without representation.

Every woman taxpayer gets for her taxes what every male taxpayer gets—public improvements and protection of life and property.

And she is represented by all the male taxpayers in the community, because they cannot represent themselves without representing her.

Their interests as taxpayers are identical.

Furthermore, as a much smaller percentage of women than of men pay taxes, the enfranchisement of women would greatly increase the percentage of non-taxpaying voters; and thus, assuming for the sake of argument that there is a relation between taxation and the ballot, votes for women would leave the woman taxpayer, as well as the male taxpayer, in a worse position than before.

The fact is, however, that taxation and the vote have no connection whatsoever.

A man may own property in every city and town in the State except the one where he lives, yet he can vote only in the one where he lives.

Minors and aliens are fully taxed on their property, but are excluded from the franchise.

A system of government based on property would give the rich man a power over the poor man that would destroy democratic government and give us in its place a plutarchy.

It was because of its INHERENT INJUSTICE that the property qualification for voters was abolished in most States of this Union years ago, and THE DEMAND THAT IT BE REVIVED NOW IN THE INTEREST OF A FEW WOMEN IS SO EXTRAORDINARY THAT IT IS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND HOW ANY ONE CAN BE DECEIVED BY IT.

The Sexes Were Created Different and Designed to Co-operate, Not to Compete

The demand for “Votes for Women” is based largely upon the extraordinary assumption that “what holds true between man and man must therefore hold true between man and woman.”
But the establishment of this principle would mean "a fair field and favor to none"—the last thing in the world for which women should ask.

The whole trend of modern legislation is toward further special privileges and protection for women. Their nature demands it. The interests of society demand it. Motherhood, potential and actual, must be protected if the race is not to perish from the earth.

There is no question of superiority, inferiority or equality involved in this discussion. Men are not equal to women. Women are not equal to men. They are simply different. And the constant tendency of civilization is toward further differentiation.

To say that men and women are "equal," or that one sex is "superior" to the other, is as senseless as to say that air and water are equal, or that one is superior to the other. Each is superior in its own sphere. Both are essential to life. But they are essentially different and cannot be compared.

To ask woman to assume the burdens of government is to ask her to neglect her natural functions for a wasteful duplication of effort in a field for which nature did not intend her.

THE DUTY OF MEN IS TO PROTECT WOMEN FROM SUCH WASTEFUL AND UNNATURAL BURDENS.

The Ballot Would Rob Woman of Her Non-Partisan Power

How can women best serve the State? Can they serve it best by entering into political contests with men, or by duplicating the efforts of men in politics?

Or can they serve it best by leaving the turmoil of politics to men and directing their energy and their gifts along lines denied to men by partisan political ties?

The ballot is not a panacea. It is not a spiritual influence. It is merely an instrument of convenience in the transaction of the business of government.

True reform begins, not in the ballot box or in the...
halls of legislation, but in the cradle, in the nursery, in the school, in the church, around the family fireside.

And there, without the ballot, woman can do more toward making a better world than anything men or women can possibly accomplish through politics.

Women react upon government just in proportion as they are alert, intelligent, well-informed and public-spirited, through the creation of an intelligent public opinion.

Legislation is merely crystalized public opinion. And in the creation of such public opinion women now have a tremendous influence.

Without the ballot women can approach public questions as women interested solely in the good of the community.

With the ballot, women would deal with such questions as men now deal with them—not with an eye single to the public good, but with one eye on the public good and the other on the political party good.

They would work as members of some political party, and the State would lose this great non-partisan body, which is one of the essential checks and balances of party government.

VOTE "NO" ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND PRESERVE FOR THE PUBLIC WEAL THE NON-PARTISAN POWER OF WOMEN.

The Basis of Government Is Physical Force

Woman Suffrage violates the basic principle of all government—the principle that the electorate must possess the inherent power to execute its sovereign will expressed in legislation.

The gift of the ballot would fail to clothe woman with any real authority, for the obvious reason that there would be nothing back of the ballot.

The ballot is simply a means of ascertaining public opinion. Such public opinion can amount to nothing unless enforced in the form of law, and for such enforcement women must in any case depend upon men.

Law is the expression of sovereignty, and sovereignty rests ultimately upon physical force and upon nothing else.
Not that “might makes right,” but that **might must exist to make right secure.**

The present world war is a demonstration of this fact which surely leaves no room for argument.

And what is true of nations is equally true of small communities.

How long do you think your life or property would be safe in any town or city of this State if it was not known that the law **backed by force** stood behind you?

The law alone would not be enough. A law which is not enforced is obviously of no avail.

Our statute books are filled with laws to protect us; but our real protection is not in the law, but first in the strong right arm and in the gun and club of the officer, and ultimately in the majority of male voters behind him, who would be called upon to back him up with force if necessary.

Take the police off the streets of any large city in this country for twenty-four hours, and we should have a reign of terror and crime that would shock the civilized world.

The fear of men clothed with authority to enforce the law is what keeps the lawless element from lawlessness.

Women are prohibited by nature from being this law-enforcing power, and laws enacted by them against the will of men would be dead letter laws.

To create an electorate lacking in the **one indispensable element of sovereignty** would be to undermine the foundations, not only of government, but of the social order.

**THE WOMAN'S BALLOT WOULD BE A BLANK CARTRIDGE BALLOT.**

---

**Woman Suffrage And War**

In view of the foregoing, what are we to think of the demand of suffragist-feminist-pacifists for votes-for-women as a “war measure?”

If woman suffrage is not justifiable as a peace measure, how can it be justifiable as a war measure?

Women as generally as men, it is true, are doing their duty in the war crisis. But that has nothing to do with the question of suffrage.

The greatest service women can render in time of war
is different from the greatest service rendered by men, just
as their greatest service in time of peace is, in the very
nature of things, different from that of men.

Woman must still be the mother of the race. She can
not be that and be the governor and the fighter, too.

It is not what some women do in emergencies, or what
some women want to do, but what for the common good
all women should do as a general rule, that must concern
us most.

There are women who, in their mistaken zeal, would
shoulder a rifle and attempt to fight with men in the front­
line trenches. But we can imagine nothing but a nation
of feminized, degenerate, traitorous creatures in the form
of men permitting such a criminal sacrifice of womanhood.

The demand for the ballot as a “war measure” is based
on the claim that women have earned it by their service
in the nation’s fight for freedom.

But only the suffragist-feminists, a small minority of
women, are thus putting a price upon their loyalty.

The great mass of our women are intensely and un­
selfishly loyal. And they are not suffragists, but would
regard the imposition of the ballot upon them as a punish­
ment rather than a reward.

We claim that these women, who were doing patriotic
work when leading suffragists were giving aid and com­
fort to the enemy, have earned the right to freedom from
the ballot; and to force them into politics to satisfy the
few members of their sex who put suffrage before loyalty
would, in our opinion, be ONE OF THE GREATEST ACTS
OF FOLLY AND INJUSTICE OF WHICH ANY PEOPLE
COULD BE GUILTY.

**Woman Suffrage, Feminism and Socialism**

All the facts bear out the statement that Woman
Suffrage, Feminism and Socialism are marching hand in
hand toward “a complete social revolution.”

“ONE MILLION SOCIALISTS WORK AND VOTE
FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE!” was the slogan inscribed
on the red banner carried by the socialist contingent in the
big Suffrage parade in Washington, D. C., in March 1913.
Every Socialist and every Feminist is an ardent worker in the cause of Votes for Women.

The editor of the Woman's Journal, the national Suffrage organ is an AVOWED SOCIALIST, having said in an interview in the Boston Post, December 26, 1911:

"I became converted to socialism through reading Socialist newspapers."

"Woman Suffrage," says Daniel De Leon, one of the most prominent American Socialists, "Must take its place as an integral splinter in the torch that lights the path of the social revolution.

Radical Socialists and Feminists, like Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Winnifred Harper Cooley and Max Eastman, are engaged as speakers on Suffrage platforms and their most radical Feministic and Socialistic utterances are published, advertised and sent broadcast by the National Woman Suffrage Association as arguments for Votes for Women.

Mrs. Sanger, radical Feminist, recently convicted by the New York Courts of a serious offence against morals, was defended by leading members of the Suffragist organization, who strongly indorsed her unlawful propaganda.

Van Kleek Allison of Boston, a "birth control" disciple of Mrs. Sanger, was sent to prison in 1916 for circulating among young factory girls literature of an immoral nature. Leading members of the Suffragist-Feminist cult in Massachusetts raised money for his defense and appeared in court in his behalf.

"The Masses," a New York Socialist-Feminist magazine which recently was barred from the United States mails, was saved from bankruptcy less than a year ago by New York Suffragists because of what they declared to be its "great assistance to the cause of suffrage and feminism."

Max Eastman, editor of "The Masses," organized the New York Men's League for Woman Suffrage. A ballad recently published by this "warm friend of the cause," referred to the church as a "dump" and the home as a "hole." This blasphemous ballad, entitled "God's Blunder," was approved by prominent New York suffragists.

So close is the partnership between Woman Suffrage, Feminism and Socialism that in order to dissolve it, this is what the Suffrage associations would have to do:

Drop all their Socialist and Feminist officers, speakers and writers, withdraw from circulation all the Feminist and
Socialist literature published and sent broadcast by the National Woman Suffrage Association in the effort to gain Suffrage converts, and pass resolutions repudiating the doctrines of Socialism and Feminism.

Imagine the violent upheaval in the UPPER CIRCLES OF SUFFRAGISM that would inevitably follow a serious movement on the part of Suffragists to adopt such drastic measures of reform!

Yet they must be adopted before the Woman Suffrage movement can come before the people free from the stains of Socialism and Feminism.

### Woman Suffrage And Feminism

Woman Suffrage, according to Mrs. Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale, noted suffragist, is **an essential branch of the tree of Feminism.**

"Feminism," she says in her book on the subject, "is gradually supplying to women the things they most need." And among these things she mentions **"Easy Divorce"** and **"Economic Independence."**

"Easy divorce," as Feminists explain it, is **"DIVORCE AT WILL."** It would permit a wife to cast off her husband and take another without consulting the courts!

"Economic Independence" is the theory that wives must engage in gainful occupations outside the home in order to be independent. For a wife to be supported by her husband is, according to Feminism, to be a "Parasite."

Feminism, therefore, would compel wives to compete with husbands in business and industry! It would make marriage a farce and the home, as we know it, a thing of the past!

Feminism is a revolt against nature and Christian morals.

Writing in McClure's Magazine for March, 1913, Inez Milholland-Boissevain, who was a prominent Suffragist, foresaw with delight "The beginnings of a breakdown of the artificial barriers in the way of a more natural observance of the mating instinct."

In other words, **"Free Love."**

In the "Forum" for April, 1915, Lottie M. Montgomery says, among other things too indecent to quote:
“In the future, woman will make the sex laws which govern herself and they will not be uniform or written into the statutes as they are now. EVERY WOMAN WILL BE A LAW UNTO HERSELF. . . . To substantiate my statements I refer to the leading spokeswomen of the Feminist movement, i.e., Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Ellen Key, Emma Goldman, Mrs. C. G. Hartley and to Bernard Shaw and Ibsen.”

“The case for Woman Suffrage,” a bibliography of Suffrage literature published by the College Equal Suffrage League and sold by the National Woman Suffrage Association, sneers at the “old-fashioned” Suffrage arguments and gives the highest meed of praise to the radical writings of the most radical Feminists and Socialists.

“Too many advocates of Woman Suffrage,” says “The Case,” (Page 64), “insist that when woman is enfranchised she will be no less ‘womanly’ than before, whereas in point of fact perhaps the chief thing to be said for the Suffrage is precisely that it will make woman less womanly, in the commonly accepted sense of the term. . . . . One cannot argue logically on Woman Suffrage without facing this fact.”

This is the unwholesome and destructive doctrine of the Feminist. It is not the doctrine of the normal man or woman.

If, as Mrs. Hale says, “Woman Suffrage is an essential branch of the tree of Feminism,” then WOMAN SUFFRAGE MUST BE DESTROYED IN ORDER THAT THE TREE OF IMMORAL FEMINISM MAY NOT GROW.

**Woman Suffrage And Socialism**

That Woman Suffrage is **essential to the success of Socialism** is the claim of the most enlightened Socialists. One of the cardinal principles of Socialism is that the interests of husband and wife are different, that the individual and not the family should be the unit of the State, and the enfranchisement of women, as Mrs. A. J. George has so clearly pointed out, is necessary to put this principle into operation.
“There are just two ways,” says Mrs. George, “in which a married woman can vote—either with her husband or against him. If she votes with him she merely doubles the vote without changing the result. If she votes against him, then the family ceases to come in contact with the State as a unit—which is exactly what the Socialists want.”

Socialism is the avowed enemy of modern civilization. It would abolish marriage, break up the family and give the children over to the care of the State.

In all Woman Suffrage countries Socialism is rampant, and in this country it prevails out of all proportion in States where women vote.

Socialists want Woman Suffrage in order to advance Socialism. They believe it is the only weapon with which they can break up the home.

IF YOU DO NOT WANT TO HELP SOCIALISM, VOTE “NO” ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE, SEPTEMBER 10.

“Economic Independence”

What is to become of the home and the children under “economic independence,” the Feminists do not seem to know definitely. Some suggest “communal homes.” Others suggest State institutions.

But all Feminists agree that a wife must be independent of her husband, free to go and come as she pleases, without consulting his desires.

Dora Marsden in “Bondwomen,” a pamphlet attacking marriage and characterizing wifehood as a species of slavery, says:

“The free woman’s concern is to see to it that she shall be in a position to bear children if she wants them without soliciting maintenance from any man, whoever he may be.”

“BONDWOMEN” WAS PRINTED AND CIRCULATED AS A CAMPAIGN DOCUMENT BY THE NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

Charlotte Perkins Gilman, leading Suffrage speaker and writer, in an article in “The Woman’s Journal,” the
Suffrage organ edited by the president of the Massachusetts Suffrage Association, says,

"The woman should have as much to do in the home as the man—no more. . . . . Who, then, will take care of the sick baby? The nurse, of course. . . . . If the child is not seriously ill, the nurse is as good as the mother. If the child is seriously ill, the nurse is better."

It is clear from this that if the Suffragist-Feminists have their way, wives who do not go out into the world to earn their own living WILL NOT BE RESPECTABLE, but will soon be known as "PARASITES" and "BOND-WOMEN!"

"It is UNWHOLESOME," says Mary Ware Dennett, "for ANY WOMAN TO BE SUPPORTED BY ANY MAN."

Mrs. Dennett was formerly an officer of the National Woman Suffrage Association, and is now on the board of directors of the "Birth Control League," a race suicide organization recently formed in New York.

According to this theory, THE HUSBAND MUST CEASE TO BE THE PROVIDER AND THE WIFE THE HOME-MAKER! Otherwise, their relations are UNWHOLESOME!

It is for workingmen to consider how the operation of this abominable doctrine, apart from its destructive effect upon the home, would be likely to affect the labor market.

WHAT DO THEY THINK WOULD HAPPEN IF ALL MARRIED WOMEN, IN ORDER TO BE RESPECTABLE, WERE COMPelled TO GO OUT AND LOOK FOR JOBS?

REMEMBER

If the vote is given to women they will be in duty bound to use it. The vote is a public trust, and those who have it and fail to use it are not good citizens.

Suffragists who say, as most Suffragists do, that "women who do not want to vote can stay at home" are counselling a very grave dereliction of duty, and are giving the most convincing proof of their own unfitness for the
responsibilities they would force upon their unwilling sisters.

The enfranchisement of women means political organizations for women. It means women candidates for any and every office. It means politicians who can strike men in the most unfair way in political contest, but whom men must not strike in return.

The vote for women Means Women on Juries.
Don’t forget that.

They say women jurors will “Purify the atmosphere of the courts.” Perhaps. But they can’t purify the testimony to which they must listen in the jury box and which they must discuss with strange men, often through the long hours of the night, behind the locked doors of the jury room!

When they show you the suffrage map and boast that 49 per cent. of Uncle Sam’s territory is Woman Suffrage territory, just remember:

New York State has approximately one million more inhabitants than all the full double suffrage States combined, yet New York has 20,000 fewer square miles of territory than Washington, the smallest of the suffrage States! Only 8.8 per cent. of the population of the United States is in States that have full suffrage for women.

There are nearly three times as many people in the four great States that rejected Woman Suffrage at the polls in 1915 as there are in the eleven double suffrage States!

It is not the area that counts on election day, but POPULATION.

THE SUFFRAGE MAP IS A FRAUD!

**Woman Suffrage is Going, Not Coming!**

It met its Waterloo in 1915, with overwhelming defeat at the hands of the people of four great Eastern States and rejection by the Legislatures of seventeen others.

Ohio defeated Woman Suffrage in 1912 and again in 1914—the FIRST TIME by a majority of 87,455, but the SECOND TIME, after the voters had awakened to the menace, BY A MAJORITY OF 182,905.
Michigan defeated Woman Suffrage in November, 1912, and again SIX MONTHS LATER— the FIRST TIME by a majority of only 760; the SECOND TIME BY A MAJOR-ITY OF 96,144.

Woman Suffrage was DÉFEATED in Wisconsin in 1912 by a majority of 91,479; in North Dakota, 1914, by a majority of 9,139; in Nebraska, 1914, by 10,104, and in Missouri, 1914, by 140,206.


The vote on the suffrage question in Massachusetts was unprecedented, being 91.2 per cent. of the total vote for Governor, while the vote for Governor was the largest ever cast in any election in that State up to that time.

In 1916 the people rejected Woman Suffrage in Iowa, South Dakota and West Virginia—in South Dakota for the fourth time, and in West Virginia by a vote of more than two to one.

Not a single popular victory for suffrage has been achieved since 1914, when the sparsely settled States of Montana and Nevada were carried because the opponents of suffrage made little organized resistance.

On the other hand, since 1914 seven great States have rejected suffrage by overwhelming majorities at the polls.

The only "victories" won by the suffragists since 1914 have been "victories" for Presidential suffrage—victories achieved in defiance of the people, by means of a well financed and exceedingly attractive female lobby, and therefore a lasting disgrace to the women and the legislators directly concerned.

The facts all show that the great majority of men and women everywhere, when their interest is aroused, are against the double electorate. POPULAR INDIFFERENCE IS THE BEST FRIEND OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

**SUMMARY**

In the foregoing pages we have tried to show that the vote is not a "natural right," but a grave responsibility involving many burdensome and disagreeable duties.
That Woman Suffrage is not only a costly and futile experiment, but a dangerous experiment, since it increases the stay-at-home vote, brings a new element of discord into the home and lessens that respect of men for women which lies at the root of civilized society.

That the demand for the vote is the demand of a small but noisy minority.

That Woman Suffrage is bad economy, being a proposal to compel two sexes, whose interests are identical, to do a job that one can do at least as well.

That men are essential to government and women are not, man alone possessing the physical power to enforce the law, without which the ballot is useless.

That the natural relation of the sexes is one, not of equality, but of difference, and that men and women were designed to work in different spheres for the common good.

That woman can best serve the State outside the realm of political strife.

That the Woman Suffrage movement violates the fundamental principle of democracy in its bold attempt to force the will of a small minority upon the great majority of women.

That it is Socialistic and Feministic in its tendency to make the individual and not the family the unit of the State.

That it is based on a feeling of sex antagonism and is therefore a menace to the home.

That it is an insult to men in its false declaration that they have failed to protect the interests of their wives, sisters and daughters.

That it is unnatural in its dream of a “new freedom” for women, and a distinct injustice to the great mass of women, who do not want new burdens thrust upon them, but wish to be left free for the performance of those duties which are their natural inheritance and which must be performed if the race is not to perish.

Please think this over carefully and then see if you do not agree that THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STATE AND ALL WITHIN IT DEMAND THE DEFEAT OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.
OPINIONS OF EMINENT MEN AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, United States Senator:

I am opposed to granting suffrage to women because I believe it would be a loss to women and an injury to the State. * * *

IT IS A FATAL MISTAKE THAT THESE EXCELLENT WOMEN MAKE WHEN THEY CONCEIVE THAT THE FUNCTIONS OF MEN ARE SUPERIOR TO THEIRS AND SEEK TO USURP THEM.

Rev. LYMAN ABBOTT, D. D., Editor of The Outlook:

If man attempts woman's functions, he will prove himself but an inferior woman. If woman attempts man's functions, she will prove herself but an inferior man. Some masculine women there are; some feminine men there are. THESE ARE THE MONSTROSITIES OF NATURE.

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS:

Woman is queen, indeed, but her empire is the domestic kingdom. The greatest political triumphs she would achieve in public life fade into insignificance compared with the serene glory which radiates from the domestic shrine, and which she illumines and warms by her conjugal and motherly virtues.

Bishop JOHN H. VINCENT, Founder of the Chautauqua:

When about thirty years of age I accepted for a time the doctrine of Woman Suffrage and publicly defended it. YEARS OF WIDE AND CAREFUL OBSERVATION HAVE CONVINCED ME THAT THE DEMAND FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA IS WITHOUT FOUNDATION IN EQUITY, AND, IF SUCCESSFUL, MUST PROVE HARMFUL TO SOCIETY.

RABBI JOSEPH SILVERMAN:

There is no difference between Woman Suffrage, socialism and the present feminist movement. The one means the other and, no matter which cause wins first, disaster to matrimony and the home will follow. At all hazards we must oppose these movements; they are subversive to the best interests of the child and will destroy all that God and man have in the past years built up. I call upon you to rise in your might, to use every means at command to grapple with this, the greatest enemy we have today, and sweep it from the face of the earth.