

# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VII.—No. 80. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.  
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

OCTOBER 2, 1876.

PRICE ONE PENNY.  
BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

THREE great speeches have been delivered during the past month. They were addressed directly and pointedly to women as well as to men, and will have been read with equal interest and concern by women and men. They deal with questions of deep and terrible import; they are directed to subjects and events which have stirred the heart-strings of the nation, and have aroused in the mind of the people a feeling that has united all sorts and conditions of men and women, whatever be their diversities of social station or of political or religious creed, into one thought and one desire for the repression and prevention of wrong.

It is not the province of this *Journal* to enter on the direct discussion of the atrocities exercised by the Turks, nor of the measures which it is advisable to adopt in order to prevent their recurrence. But if the people of this country are stirred on this question, women are stirred equally with men; if the people exert themselves to relieve the sufferings of the victims, women exert themselves equally with men; if the nation is in any way responsible for the maintenance of the power which has committed the atrocities named, women cannot free themselves from their share in such responsibility; and if the people are now rousing themselves to demand that the influence of England shall no longer be used as a shelter by the Government which has outraged humanity, women have a right to demand their share in directing the counsels of the nation. In one sense women have a greater interest in this question than men. The worst of the atrocities have been perpetrated on women, and women are liable, under such a visitation of rapine as has recently desolated Bulgaria, to horrors and tortures beyond what can be endured by or inflicted on men. Even under the ordinary Government of the Turk women suffer more than men. They are the principal victims of the slave trade, and their slavery is more degrading than that of men. Were the slavery of women abolished, many of the greatest evils and vices of Turkish rule would disappear.

Mr. GLADSTONE, at Greenwich, specially addressed his speech to both halves of the people. He said, "My lords, ladies, and gentlemen, what are the measures we ought to

take in order to prevent the recurrence of these atrocities? . . . He would say to the Turk, Never again, while the years roll their course, shall the hand of violence be raised by you; never again shall the floodgates of lust be opened by you; never again shall the dire refinements of cruelty be devised by you for the sake of making mankind miserable in Bulgaria." If this country has in former days upheld the rule of Turkey over Bulgaria, she has a moral right to use such language now, and if it is right to use such language, women who feel it have a right to respond to Mr. GLADSTONE'S appeal.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in speaking at Edinburgh to a large assembly of men and women, convened under the auspices of the Conservative Working Men's Association, was equally careful with Mr. GLADSTONE to make it clear that he included the latter among the persons to whom his speech was addressed. The speech dealt naturally with more general topics than that of Mr. GLADSTONE. It was, we believe, the first occasion on which Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE had appeared in public since his elevation to the position of leader of the House of Commons—an elevation on which, since there had to be a change, all sections of politicians have cause for congratulation, and none more so than the friends of women's suffrage. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE declared in 1873 that he had long been of opinion that women possessing the necessary qualification as ratepayers ought to be admitted to the franchise, and that he had voted and should continue to vote for such admission. We have therefore every reason to anticipate that when our Bill is again introduced in the House of Commons it may, as heretofore, receive the support of the leader of the Conservative party.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in expounding the principles on which he said the Conservative party was founded, used language which we believe might be adopted with advantage by men of all parties, and which certainly includes women in its scope. He said it was "a principle which connects itself not with one class only, or with another class, but which is founded on the principle of endeavouring to make all classes harmoniously work

together in endeavouring to teach each class that it should respect the rights and privileges of the other, and also that it should devote its energies to the development of that which is good and strong in itself."

The removal from the House of Commons of the Earl of BEACONSFIELD deprives our question of the vote of Mr. DISRAELI, a loss which will be severely felt on the next division, although we trust that his successor in the representation of Buckinghamshire may in this respect follow in the footsteps of his leader, and that the influence of that leader may still be exerted on our behalf. Lord BEACONSFIELD addressed an audience at Aylesbury which appears not to include ladies, the occasion being that of an agricultural dinner. But the speech will be read by women with the deepest interest, and though this is not the place to descant on the main question involved, namely, the policy of HER MAJESTY'S Government, we may agree with Lord BEACONSFIELD in his estimate of the enthusiasm which animates the people of England. In spite of the objection some men have to admitting emotion as an element in politics, we think that Lord BEACONSFIELD is right when he says that when that enthusiasm is excited in a right object, on which the country is clearly informed, it is the finest force that any Ministry can possibly possess. The danger against which he warns us, that designing politicians may take advantage of this sublime sentiment and apply it for the furtherance of their own ends, can be best averted by the spread of political information and intelligence among all sections of the people, and by the discussion and elucidation of political questions in every homestead throughout the land.

MR. FREEMAN, in a letter to the *Daily News*, commenting on Lord BEACONSFIELD'S speech, has some weighty observations as to what constitutes "politics." He gives an instance of two witnesses in a magistrate's court who were examined as to the nature of a certain conversation. One of them said, "They began to talk politics, putting questions to him which he could not answer." The other witness said, "They began to talk about the rise of the world, and ADAM and EVE." Mr. FREEMAN thinks that the man who looked on a discourse about the rise of the world and ADAM and EVE as coming under the head of "politics" showed a keen sense of what politics really are. Such topics would be apt to give rise to theological discussion; and theological is very apt to pass into political discussion when such questions arise as religious toleration, or the connection between Church and State. More than this,

says Mr. FREEMAN, "if we take the word politics in that wide sense in which ARISTOTLE took it, it would be hard to find any subject—the rise of the world or any other—which does not come under the head of politics. Politics, according to ARISTOTLE, is the science of man—of man in his perfect state as a member of a settled community. Every question which touches the action of such a community is a political question. . . . The questions, Have we as a nation done right in the past? How shall we as a nation act in order to do right in the future? are pre-eminently political questions. Doubtless they are moral questions also; but every political question is a moral question." This view of politics, which we hold to be the right definition of the term, not only disposes of the old fallacy that women have no business with politics, but establishes the contrary proposition. If ARISTOTLE is right in defining politics as the science of man in his perfect state as a member of a settled community, there can be nothing rightly called politics which excludes or is excluded from the influence of that half of the community without which the other half would exist in a very imperfect state. "But," continues Mr. FREEMAN, "there are minds which seem unable to take this view of politics. To them 'politics' are simply a matter of little tricks and schemes to get one set of men into power, and to keep another set of men out of power." To such minds, no doubt, the proposition that women should have no part in such politics conveys no reproach to women. But such men have a narrow and perverted view of politics, and it is not to such as these that women or wise men would care to confide the destinies of the nation. "Such tricks and schemes," says Mr. FREEMAN, "are not politics, but the accidents of politics. True politics consist in the endeavour to guide the nation as a nation in a righteous course, and this end can be gained only by putting such men in power as will guide the nation in a righteous course." Women are capable of distinguishing right from wrong—capable of judging what is and what is not a righteous course. Neither men nor women, unless specially informed, can judge accurately what is the wisest course to take in a given emergency; nor are they always competent to decide in far-seeing and permanent questions of policy. But on broad and simple present moral issues, such as that the power of this nation shall not be used to maintain slavery in any part of the globe, or to uphold any Government in committing the atrocities which have horrified the civilised world, women are as capable as men of forming a righteous judgment, while

their less direct connection with the machinery of party conflict, and with those tricks and schemes which Mr. FREEMAN terms the accidents of politics, would tend to leave their insight clearer for simple questions of right and wrong. If women had a share of direct political power, which they must exercise under a sense of responsibility to their conscience and their country, that power would be likely to be used under the influence of high and worthy considerations; and if women had a voice in choosing the champions who are to represent the national conscience in maintaining the claims of humanity and justice and the welfare and honour of our country, those champions would not feel their responsibility lessened, and might possibly find their zeal for righteousness quickened by the consciousness that they must render an account not only to men, but to that keener moral sense which men attribute to women, for the manner in which they have discharged the trust confided to them. Lord BEACONSFIELD spoke gravely on the duty of maintaining the peace of Europe. Women are the peaceful—the non-combatant half of the race. They desire that the peace of Europe should be maintained—that it should be unbroken not merely by war, but by insurrection and rapine. They have a right to require from men the maintenance of peace; they ask for power to instruct their representatives to secure to all to whom their influence extends security from violence and wrong.

THE theory that women are perpetual infants, on which their exclusion from political rights in this country is founded, has been carried out with even more unsparing logic in some other countries. We learn from an account of women's work in Sweden, published by the Hon. Mrs. ROSALIE OLIVECRONA, that up to the year 1858 women were not allowed the right to be considered "of age" under any circumstances. In that year women were enabled to claim, if they wished, the right to be of age when 25 years old, which restriction was removed in 1863, when they were unconditionally declared of age at 25. But it was not till 1872 that there was adjudicated to a woman of age the full right of disposing of herself in marriage, father's, brother's, or kinsman's consent having heretofore been necessary. Other successive amendments in the laws affecting women were—that in 1845 equality of inheritance for son and daughter was established, and the wife received equal right with the husband to their common property; in 1846 woman was granted the right to practice industrial professions, or carry on retail business

in town or country; and in 1874 a Married Woman's Bill was passed by which she was entitled to manage that part of her private property set aside for her personal use in the marriage settlement, and to dispose of her own earnings.

WE have received from a correspondent some papers which seem to afford another instance of contradiction to Mr. JOHN BRIGHT'S indignant asseveration that "women are not a class"—"they are as ourselves." The constitution of the Artists' Annuity Fund provided that although women might become members on the same conditions as to payment and benefits as men, yet they were not allowed to attend the general meetings of the society, nor to vote in the election of the committee or the enactment of the rules.

At the quarterly general meeting of the society, held on June 12th, 1876, the committee stated that they had examined the position of the female members of the society and found that their claims exceeded the amount of their premiums, they therefore strongly recommended that in future female artists should be ineligible as members. The recommendation was adopted by the meeting. One of the lady artists writes to complain of this grievance. She says, "It does not affect me personally, as I have been in it some years, but I think it very hard upon women to exclude them from the working department of the society and then vote for their expulsion. We are not allowed to attend the meetings, and so can make no suggestion, but it seems to me that a fairer way of overcoming the difficulty would be to raise the premium to be paid by women members. But why in this fund more than in ordinary benefit societies, the men's and women's accounts should be kept distinct, I cannot imagine, nor can I see anything in the bye-laws to justify this arrangement; but if it must be so, surely raising the premiums would be the best thing to do. Here is a fund for the relief of painters in want, women are admitted on equal terms as regards payments and benefits, but they are ineligible to attend meetings, consequently when the men members find the women members unprofitable in consequence of their own arrangement as regards separation of funds, they pass a rule excluding women members for the future, without the existing women members having a voice in the matter."

We have always understood that the object of such societies as the Artists' Annuity Fund and kindred institutions was to form a kind of mutual insurance society for

the benefit of all, but more especially of the weaker members. The societies are supposed to consist of members of varying degrees of health, strength, and capacity, and the premiums are or should be calculated on the average proportion between payments and claims of the whole number of members; so long as the total payments by members are sufficient to meet the total claims of members with due provision for a reserve fund, the society is in a sound position. Should the payments fall short, the equitable way of redeeming the balance would seem to be to raise the premiums all round. It appears to be a most ungenerous not to say unjust proceeding for the strong and healthy members to separate their accounts from those of the weaker and more sickly members, and because of their greater need to expel the latter from the benefits of the society. If members are to be turned out of benefit societies when they become "unprofitable," what becomes of the "benevolence" of such institutions? Men would be ashamed to act on such principles in dealing with the weaker members of their own sex, but they have no such scruple in regard to women. The stronger brethren of a society instituted for the common good of the profession, selfishly combine to exclude their weaker sisters from the benefits of co-operation, and these, having no voice in the government of the society, are without redress. If it is "a scandalous and odious libel to speak of women as a class," it must be on the principle of the time honoured legal maxim that "the greater the truth the worse the libel."

WE receive, from far as well as near, proofs that men are not to be trusted with irresponsible power to deal with the interests of women, when those interests appear to conflict with their own. The jealousy of women's labour, which deprives so many Englishwomen of a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, extends to the antipodes. We find in the *Cape Argus* an interesting account of the introduction of women into the printing trade at the Cape, and of the manner in which the innovation was attempted to be put down by the men. In consequence of the difficulty of procuring the necessary labour for carrying on their business, Messrs. SAUL SOLOMON & Co. have employed a number of girls in the composing department of their establishment. The supply of labour thus obtained was not, however, sufficient to meet the demand, and twenty male compositors were imported from Europe, sixteen from England, and four from Holland. But some of the men thus introduced, were neither so steady in their

habits, nor so diligent in their work as was desired. The frequent absence of several men and the dilatory manner in which they performed their work, made it necessary for Messrs. SOLOMON to look about for a means of supplying the labour on the *Argus*, which could not be got from these men. The girls were thought of, and some copy for the *Argus* was given to the female branch of the composing department. When this reached the ears of the men a meeting was called, and the result was that a deputation of four waited on Mr. SAUL SOLOMON, and urged that his firm should cease to employ female labour. He declined to do so, and the deputation then urged that the firm should not employ women on any work connected with the *Argus*, *Mercantile Advertiser*, or *Government Gazette*. This was also declined by Mr. SOLOMON, when the deputation made use of threats to intimidate Messrs. SOLOMON as to the way they should carry on their business. All this was of no avail, and several of the men then absented themselves from work. By this conduct they rendered themselves liable to punishment under the Master and Servants Act. They were summoned before the magistrates, and there received a sufficient warning that they would not be permitted to interfere in future with the manner in which their employers conducted their business.

We trust that the experience thus obtained by the proprietors of the *Argus* of the superior steadiness and trustworthiness of women compositors will induce them to extend their employment, and that if men wish to retain the monopoly of such work in their own hands, they will endeavour to do so by fair competition, and by means of a reformation in their own habits, and not by attempting to keep women out of the trade by intimidation and force, in order that they may work in as idle and irregular a fashion as they choose, to the detriment of those who employ them.

#### MEMORIAL TO THE QUEEN: REPLY OF THE HOME SECRETARY.

The following letter has been received by the Mayor of Cambridge from the Home Secretary:—"Home Office, Balmoral Castle, 20th September, 1876.—Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18th instant, enclosing an address from the ladies of Cambridge to Her Majesty upon the subject of the Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria, and to inform you that I have laid the same before the Queen, who was graciously pleased to receive the same. I confidently trust that the action taken by Her Majesty's Government will, in concert with the action taken by the other Powers, speedily procure peace, with proper terms and securities.—I have the honour to remain, your obedient servant,  
"Mayor of Cambridge." "R. ASSHETON CROSS.

#### PUBLIC MEETINGS.

GLASGOW.  
SPEECH OF DR. CAMERON, M.P.

On September 8th, a meeting in favour of the extension of the franchise to women was held in the Burgh Hall, Hillhead, Glasgow. Notwithstanding the exceedingly unpropitious nature of the weather, there was a large assemblage of ladies, and a goodly attendance of gentlemen. The chair was occupied by Dr. Cameron, M.P., and among those present were Miss Becker, Manchester; Miss Tod, Belfast; Mrs. Scholefield, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Capt. Bedford Pim, M.P.; Mr. Sharman Crawford, M.P.; Professor Lindsay, Rev. David Russell, Dr. Grierson, &c., &c.

The CHAIRMAN, who on rising was cordially received, said that although he did not intend to interpose between the ladies and the meeting for any length of time, he thought it would be well before proceeding to business that they should understand what the object of the meeting really was. The gathering had been spoken of as one in support of women's rights, but this phrase he did not like, on account of its indefiniteness. Some persons stretched it so far as to include under it a number of imaginary claims which they said were asserted by or on behalf of women—namely, the right of wearing men's garments, commanding cavalry regiments, filling pulpits, and sitting in Parliament. He did not know whether these claims were put forward, or whether they could be legitimately embraced in the phrase, but he wished them particularly to understand that they had as little to do with the object of the meeting as the confederation of South Africa. (A laugh.) The object of the meeting was to promote a very sober and simple piece of reform. The law had attached possession of the franchise to the paying of rates and the holding of property, and it seemed to him, and those who thought with him, that there was no reason why, if that basis of representation was accepted in the case of one sex, it should be rejected in the case of the other, or why, if taxation without representation was robbery in the case of a man, it became more justifiable in the case of a woman. (Applause.) Referring to Mr. Bright's argument that women were not a separate section of the community, but were the nearest and dearest relatives of the male electors, and therefore looked sedulously after their interests, he (Dr. Cameron) said that if this argument was worth anything it told quite as much against the lodger franchise as it did against woman suffrage. It had been observed by Artemus Ward that during the civil war in America a vast number of the citizens were ready to sacrifice any number of their relatives for the good of their country. He was not sure that this relationship theory of representation deserved much more consideration in this country than across the Atlantic. Sailors were a section of the community practically disenfranchised. They had their relatives living ashore who had votes in every election. This was especially the case in a city like Glasgow, which was so intimately connected with the sea; and yet notwithstanding this fact, and notwithstanding the attention which Mr. Plimsoll's revelations had attracted towards the interests of the sailors, he remarked that when he contested Glasgow, neither he nor any of the numerous candidates then before the public were, so far as he was aware, asked a single question or requested to make a single pledge on any matter concerning the sailors. With whatever party the newly-enfranchised women might vote, he was certain in the long run they would vote for that party which showed itself most earnest in promoting peace, sobriety, and morality; and in these times, when one party vied with the other in truckling for the votes of the publican, the monopolist,

and the man of pleasure, it would be anything but an evil day when there was introduced among these meaner motives of political action a competition for the purer sympathy and more unselfish votes of the now disenfranchised female rate-payers of Great Britain. (Applause.)

Dr. GRIERSON proposed the first resolution, which was as follows:—"That the exclusion of women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in the election of members of Parliament, is injurious to those excluded, contrary to the principle of just representation, and to that of the laws now in force regulating the election of municipal, parochial, and all other representative governments."

Miss BECKER, who seconded the resolution, began by referring to the fact that in England women had a vote in the election of representatives to the Town Council and the School Board, and remarked that she did not see why they should not also have a vote in the election of members of Parliament. In a parliamentary election interests were involved of greater importance to women than the mere question of what should be the price of gas, and other municipal matters. Yet when the parliamentary election came, she and her fellow-citizens of her own sex were summarily swept out of court as if they were of no consequence at all. Some misconception had arisen as to the scope of their measure, and, therefore, it was perhaps not superfluous to say that it was simply to give to those women who were possessed of the necessary qualifications the privilege of voting. They were not asking that any change should be made in the electoral law in order to admit women to the franchise. Miss Becker then proceeded to refer to the law respecting the property of married women, and also to the speech made by Mr. John Bright, and concluded by expressing the hope that by patiently pressing their claims they might have them granted pleasantly, and willingly, and cheerfully, and when they had a vote she believed they would exercise it in such a manner as to conduce to the well-being of the country. (Applause.)

The resolution was put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

Miss TOD, Belfast, moved the second resolution:—"That a petition to the House of Commons be adopted and signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting." In supporting the motion she pointed out the injustice of debarring women from voting. She praised the conduct of the members of Parliament who had supported their views in the House of Commons. So far as she knew, all ladies who took an active part in this movement had been driven to care a great deal for it by the practical difficulties they found in their path while pursuing philanthropic objects of various kinds. Sometimes they were frustrated in their efforts to promote temperance, or the industrial position of some poor woman, and the parties so frustrated were driven to join those who advocated an extension of the franchise. The reason of this was plain. Legislative interference was met in every attempt at charitable work, and very often in legislative control too. She contended that women should have the right to speak for those of their sex who were either too ignorant or unable to speak for themselves. The present paternal legislators could do good, but their legislation could only be wise and just if framed on extensive information with regard to the persons affected by it. Women, she maintained, had a right to be heard in politics. Would anyone say that women had not also a right to express their indignation at the atrocities in Bulgaria, and to sympathise with the unfortunate sufferers. They claim the power and accepted the responsibility. (Applause.) She concluded by proposing the resolution.

Rev. DAVID RUSSELL seconded. He said that the previous

day Sir Geo. Campbell, as chairman of the Economical Section of Political Science, made some observations of a remarkable character. He (Sir George) dealt with woman simply as a creature, and spoke of her bodily and mental powers, and said these would need to be considered and inquired into, as well as all questions respecting future labour, and the hon. member suggested that a commission should be appointed to inquire into the bodily and mental capacities of the creature woman. (Laughter.) He assumed that the commission would be composed of their fellow creatures—men. (Renewed laughter.) Perhaps, he remarked, it would be advisable that women should be represented on the commission, because the question to be brought forward would be of great interest to the community.—The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. SCHOLEFIELD moved—"That the best thanks of the meeting be given to Dr. Cameron, M.P., for his kindness in presiding on this occasion, and the steady support he has given to the cause in the House of Commons." She thought they should not only thank the hon. member, but feel grateful to him for his support. There was much prejudice on the subject which they were met to discuss, and if this prejudice could once be removed, it would pave the way to intelligent convictions. (Applause.)

Professor LINDSAY seconded. He thought that they should give Dr. Cameron, and the others who represented the wishes of men and women in a great many matters in this country, all honour for supporting their views in the House of Commons. (Applause.) There was no doubt that there was a dead weight in the community against a movement like that which they advocated when men like Dr. Cameron must feel it very difficult to withstand. He explained that one of the chief reasons which had induced him to take his stand in favour of the extension of the franchise, was what had been alluded to by Miss 'Tod—the fact that philanthropic efforts towards improving the social prosperity, more especially of the lower classes, were continually being thwarted by the legislation which pressed so heavily upon those women who toiled for their daily bread. For the consistent vote in Parliament he had always given towards removing the electoral disabilities of women, he considered Dr. Cameron was entitled to their most hearty thanks. (Applause.)

The motion was carried amidst acclamation.

Dr. CAMERON, in acknowledging the vote of thanks, referred to the indomitable energy of the ladies in their endeavour to secure an equality of the franchise.—The meeting then separated.—*Abridged from the Glasgow Daily Mail.*

#### BIRMINGHAM WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of this society was held in the Secretary's Room, at the Midland Institute, on Monday afternoon. Mr. H. Hawkes (borough coroner) presided, and amongst those present were the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, Mr. and Mrs. William Taylor, Mr. and Mrs. W. Rogers, Mrs. J. H. Chamberlain, Miss Sturge, Mrs. and Miss Gore, Mrs. Ashford, Mrs. C. E. Mathews, Mrs. Cattell, Mrs. Archer, Mrs. Frederick Impey, &c.—The annual report, which was read by Miss Sturge, stated that the committee were satisfied with the evident growth and influence of the movement in favour of the removal of the disabilities of women. The committee continued to circulate the *Women's Suffrage Journal*, and believed that did much to dispel the ignorance and prejudice with which the claims of women were still often regarded. They confidently anticipated that the laws which deprived women of civil and political rights would not long find a place in the statute books of a free country. After reviewing the success which the women's suffrage movement

had obtained in distant countries, the report continued that doubtless the liberty which men gained for themselves would enable them to understand that for women also liberty of conscience meant liberty of action, and that civil and religious freedom must rest upon the recognition of the individual rights of every human being. The committee appealed to all who valued liberty to work constantly and earnestly to remove all restrictions which impeded the progress of the human race.—The treasurer's statement, which was read by Mrs. Ashford, showed that the income for the past year had amounted to £68. 9s. 9d., and the expenditure to £49. 16s. 3d., to which, however, had to be added an adverse balance of £18. 13s. 6d. from the previous year. The report was adopted.—[We regret that pressure on our space and an unforeseen accident prevented the appearance of the above notice at the proper date.]

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION.

To the Editor of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*.

Madam,—I have just, for the fifth time, permitted a seizure of goods to be made in my house for the Queen's taxes, because I believe this to be the most direct and practical protest I can make against "taxation without representation." The Americans began their career of independence by the assertion of the right of taxing themselves, and Nonconformists in our own country used the peaceful method of opposition I advocate as a means of freeing themselves from tyrannous exaction. There is nothing in permitting one's goods to be seized and sold on a matter of moral conviction which need prevent any woman from doing it. In my house a man was put in possession each time, but this appears to be at the discretion of the collector, since it has never been done in Miss Hall's case. Some silver forks were this year seized, and they were sold at Mr. Bonham's auction rooms in Tottenham Court Road, last Friday evening. I mention these facts to prove that no difference was made in my case, so far as I know, from that of defaulters from other causes. I believe that, unless we soon obtain the political franchise, we shall lose the advantages we have already gained. It is true that we are agitating for the liberty of half the human race, and that great causes are not quickly won. On the other hand, we may see that the principle on which we rest is scarcely ever seriously objected to; and the chief things we have now to overcome are manly "sentiment" and the peculiar "male sense of justice," which we wish to change from a sense of justice to males into a sense of justice to all human beings, irrespective of sex. Although I urge earnest women to consider the necessity of resisting "taxation without representation," I do not intend thereby to imply that I look upon our representative system as perfect, even for the half of the people at present under it. I hope, if a change in the vote-giving qualification be made, that women will not rest unless their privileges are made equal to those of their male fellow-citizens. We need hardly fear that an intellectual qualification would be instituted far beyond the range of the average woman, since the members of the House of Commons, when the Ballot Bill was passed, were very careful not to require reading and writing on the part of their constituents. At present the property, the liberty, the life, and the honour of women lie at the mercy of ignorant men. The parliamentary vote is the only thing that can give real protection to women.—Yours faithfully,

CHARLOTTE E. BABB.

19, South Villas, Camden Square,  
London, Sept. 19th, 1876.

#### REVIEW.

*Appeal of one half the Human Race, Women, against the pretensions of the other half, Men, to retain them in political and thence in civil and domestic slavery—in reply to a paragraph of Mr. Mill's celebrated "Article on Government."* By William Thompson, author of an inquiry into the distribution of wealth. London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Owen, Brown, and Green, Paternoster Row; and Wheatley and Adlard, 118, Strand; and sold at the London Co-operative Society's Office, 18, Picket Street, Temple Bar. 1875.

"One thing is pretty clear, that all those individuals whose interests are indisputably included in those of other individuals may be struck off from political rights without inconvenience. In this light may be viewed all children up to a certain age, whose interests are involved in those of their parents. In this light also women may be regarded, the interest of almost all of whom is involved either in that of their fathers, or in that of their husbands."—*Encyclopædia Britannica Supplement*, "Article on Government," page 500.

The above extract from Mr. James Mill's "Article on Government," which stands on the title-page of the work before us, conveys one of the chief objections brought against the removal of the electoral disqualification of women by Mr. John Bright in his speech in the House of Commons on Mr. Forsyth's Bill. The brochure of Mr. Thompson contains a searching examination and refutation of the proposition enunciated by Mr. James Mill, and affords an answer in anticipation of the argument relied on by Mr. John Bright to prove that the claim of women to representation is untenable. We therefore make no apology for presenting our readers with some extracts from Mr. Thompson's remarkable book, and we think that it needs but the mental substitution of Mr. John Bright's name for that of Mr. James Mill to render these utterances of half a century ago applicable to the present day. The conjunction of names is also noteworthy. The younger Mill was the leader of the movement to overthrow the proposition maintained by the elder Mill; the younger Bright has been the author of a Bill to remove the political disability so painfully maintained by the elder Bright.

The book opens with an introductory letter to Mrs. Wheeler, to whose inspiration the author acknowledges his indebtedness for the feelings, sentiments, and reasonings, the expression of which he has arranged. He addresses himself to her as having often stated these at various times in conversation and in writing under feigned names "in such of the periodical publications of the day as would tolerate such a theme." Anxious that the hand of a woman should have the honour of raising from the dust that neglected banner which a woman's hand nearly thirty years before unfolded boldly, he hesitated to write. But leisure and opportunity were wanting, he therefore, at last, undertook to become the scribe and interpreter of her sentiments.

The book begins with an examination of the general argument in the "Article on Government" for political rights.

"As far as the simplest political rights of *man* are concerned, Mr. Mill is entitled to the thanks of all men for the plain and unanswerable statements and reasoning in this "Article," by which he has shown what those rights ought to be in order to promote the greatest possible quantity of happiness to all men. But is it not strange that a philosopher—a lover of wisdom—avowedly founding his argument on utility, that is to say, on the tendency of actions or institutions to promote the greatest quantity of human happiness—should deliberately, on the very threshold of his argument, put aside *one half* the human race, of all ages, characters, and conditions, as unentitled to consideration; to any further consideration, at least, than such as may arise from the coincidence of their welfare

with that of the more fortunate half, which he takes under his philosophic protection. The half of the human race whose happiness Mr. Mill takes under his protection is that half—is it necessary to say?—to which he has the good fortune to belong.

"Were Mr. Mill's system of philosophy founded on the assumption that *man* was naturally and necessarily a benevolent being, always inclined to promote the happiness of those within his power, and necessarily acquainted with the means to promote this end in a degree superior to that possessed by those over whom his power extended, however fond and puerile we might conceive the assumption, the *inference* would be at least fairly drawn from the premises. But, strange to say, the assumption on which the whole basis of Mr. Mill's philosophy rests is directly opposed to any such notion of natural beneficence and unerring judgment on the part of men. In proof of this position read the following passage in the *Supplement* to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, page 491:—"That one human being will desire to render the person and property of another subservient to his pleasures, notwithstanding the pain or loss of pleasure which it may occasion to that other individual, is the foundation of government." Still, however, in the face of this grand governing law of human nature, this male philosopher maintains that with respect to one half the human race—women—this universal disposition of man to use power for his own exclusive benefit ceases, and his knowledge with respect to them invariably shows him that their happiness coincides with his, and is included in it! This exception of one half from the influence of the general rule of the disposition to misuse power is certainly a pretty large exception, requiring all the boldness of an English philosopher. In any other hands, so large an exception would go far to destroy the rule. An exception of one half! add one to one half and the rule will be on the other side, on the side of the beneficent exertion of power, and what then would become of the basis of the argument for human rights as founded on the inclination to use power for the exclusive benefit of the possessor? The rule would become the exception, beneficence would become the adjunct of power, and the argument for restraints on the use of power, or against the intrusting of power to one individual over the actions of his fellows, must be abandoned.

"Having laid down such a basis for political rights as the necessary tendency to the use of power for the exclusive benefit of its possessors in favour of all *men* whose happiness may be affected by such power, in what way does the article seek to evade the equal claims of the other half of the human race—women—to similar protection against the abuses of the same power? We may conceive three modes by which it may be sought to evade the application of the general principles of security to women. It may be boldly said that they are incapable of becoming rational and susceptible of happiness like men. Secondly, it may be said that, whether capable or not, men, being equally numerous, are the stronger half of the race, and should therefore render women, like any other objects of desire, tributary to their enjoyment; or, thirdly, by a more refined sophistry it may be allowed that, though women are capable of rationality and enjoyment equally with men, though their happiness should be kept in view as a primary object as much as that of men, yet is all restraint on the power of men quite superfluous as to them, inasmuch as *in their case* men are not influenced by the general tendency of their unenlightened natures to misuse power, but necessarily include the happiness of women in all speculations and regulations as to their own happiness.

"Let us see, then, which of these three evasions of his own principle—his grand, governing, primary law of human nature—Mr. Mill has adopted.

"One half of the human race in almost all countries (in countries very rapidly increasing in population, or where from wretchedness the mean duration of life is very low, much more than one half) are under twenty or twenty-one years of age, their faculties not fully developed, not capable of performing all the duties, or exercising all the rights, of the fully-formed portion of the population. Of the adult half of the human race, one half again consists of men, the other of women. In some countries, as well as in particular districts, it appears that the proportion of the sexes varies; but in general, equality is pretty nearly preserved in the relative numbers. According to Mr. Mill's most enlarged view, therefore, one fourth of the human race, or of any portion thereof, is the greatest number whose interests ought to be directly consulted in the making of laws, the interests of the other three fourths being, somehow or other, benevolently included in those of the stronger ruling quarter; though this same quarter, in the exercise of its powers towards its own members, would, if uncontrolled by restraint, infallibly misuse these powers to the exclusive advantage of whatever number less than the whole might become possessed of them. The ruling quarter is necessarily benevolent towards the three fourths, but as necessarily malevolent towards all the members of the fourth to which it belongs! Or, if benevolence towards the three fourths be discarded, another supposition as strange must be made, to wit, that nature has, to save man the trouble of thought or the need of sympathy towards three fourths of his race, so mysteriously and indissolubly amalgamated their pleasures, pains, and wishes with his, that it is impossible for him to promote the happiness of the one without at the same time promoting that of the others! The grandest moral discovery this that ever has been made! a discovery superseding, with respect to the interests of three fourths of the human race, the necessity of study or of the acquisition of habits of sympathy. The discovery of earlier times—for so many dreary centuries revered—was, that the possession of power by one or by a few, tens, or hundreds, or thousands, necessarily amalgamated their interest with that of all under the influence of their power; caused the one to be included in the other, and necessarily inspired such knowledge and benevolence into the possessors of power as rendered them the fittest instruments for promoting the happiness of all. Mr. Mill has discovered all this to be false philosophy, belied by every page of history, by the occurrences of every day. But, increase the number of the governing party to one fourth, or nearly one fourth, and let that one fourth be the division to which the philosopher himself happens to belong, and he finds the philosophy admirable. The ignorance of men possessing power, is changed into knowledge; their love of exclusive interest, into benevolence. The power that is necessarily mischievous as applied to any of the members of the favoured fourth, becomes as necessarily good when applied to the excluded three fourths. Wonderful alchemy of modern philosophy in the hand of such a magician! If he could but as easily change the dispositions of the possessors of power towards the one fourth, as he takes credit for having done to the hapless three fourths, who so worthy as he of apotheosis!

"But the truth is, that all such quibbling and vain distinctions are unworthy the name of philosophy. Men without knowledge or benevolence, or placed in such circumstances as are ordinarily incompatible with the exercise of such quali-

ties, will necessarily use power for their own apparent exclusive benefit, at the expense of all other sentient beings, children, women, or other men, whose interests may appear to them incompatible with their own. Nor is there any mysterious identification or inclusion of the interests of the weak and ignorant with those of the strong and knowing. On the contrary, the more ignorant and the more weak—whether from nature in the case of children, or from nature as to weakness, and from privation of education and stultifying institutions as to knowledge, in the case of women—the less will there be, or appear to be, of identification or inclusion of interests; because the less of resemblance, of equality, the less there will be of sympathy; the less power to resist and the less of control, the greater will be the temptation to, the more infallible will be the certainty of, abuse of power.

"Had nothing been said, in this celebrated 'Article' on Government, about women, it might have been supposed that in advocating the primary political rights of man, those of women were meant to be included as forming part of the race. Room would have been left for doubt as to the object, in this respect, of this audacious and selfish abuse of the new philosophy. On so presumptuous a hope the *veto* is placed. 'Tis not enough to neglect women in the distribution of rights; they must be put forward, and by name excluded; excluded in a sentence; excluded in the true Eastern style, without condescending to listen to their humble plea for admission, as though all consideration on the subject were superfluous; as though the writer were conscious that those only who have not strength condescend to reason!

"Strength let him, and those who love to tyrannise with him, retain; but the voice of reason they must hear—they who have, in their own case, set the example of so freely using it. There are, even amongst men, those who spurn the selfishness of such exclusive doctrines; who have never felt pleasure in making the will of others bend slavishly, without persuasion, to theirs; who have never felt delight in society, except in that of unconstrained equals. It is for them to protest and clear themselves from liability to the disgraceful imputation of seeking to build their rights and happiness on the prostration of the rights and happiness of one half of their fellow-creatures.

"The claim of children to protection from the laws against those in whose power they are placed, we are not here called upon to discuss. Enough to observe that, the supposition of an identity of interest (in the common acceptance of the term interest) between them and men is a mere fiction, or in other words a falsehood—or why the necessity of regulations, as society advances in improvement, to protect children from the abuse of power on the part of their parents?—therefore this, like all other legal or philosophical fictions, cannot be a just reason for excluding children from political rights. There are reasons, nevertheless, and good ones, for this exclusion; but such as would not apply to the adult portion of the race, to women.

"Dismissing then the case of children, which would form a separate discussion, we shall investigate the philosophical pretext of the 'Article' for the degradation of one half of the adult portion of the human race, in the following order.

- "1. Does this identity of interest between men and women, in point of fact, and of necessity, exist?
- "2. If it do exist, is it a sufficient cause, or any reason at all, why either of the parties, with interests thus identified, should therefore be deprived of political rights?
- "3. Is there in the nature of things any security for equality of enjoyments proportioned to exertion

and capabilities, but by means of equal civil rights? or any for security for equal civil, but by means of equal political rights?

"The first point to be settled with the 'Article' is the matter of fact which it assumes as the basis of the argument: 'Does this identity of interest between men and women, in point of fact, and of necessity, exist?' If not, women ought, according to Mr. Mill's philosophy, to be admitted to an equality of political, as well as of civil and social, rights and enjoyments with men.

"Other grounds for the exclusion of women from political rights have been taken by other men, enjoying the names of moralists, philosophers, statesmen. Of these Mr. Mill has not availed himself: he has passed them by, doubtless because he thought them futile and untenable. Where men have condescended to give any reasons for the exclusion of half their race from civil or political rights, those reasons have been such as the following: general inferiority of muscular powers (strength) and stature on the part of women, general inferiority of the higher intellectual powers, judgment and reasoning, frequent incapacity of exercising even these limited powers from child-bearing and its consequences, consequent inaptitude of women to the performance of many important offices, the supposed necessity of cultivating to the utmost, for mutual happiness, a diversity of character in the two sexes. These, and such reasons, sometimes, and but of late years—since it has become necessary to give or to invent any reasons at all for oppression—have been given: for, until lately, antipathy and ignorance have been in the habit of alleging their feelings, precedent, nature, and such like terms, to justify whatever exclusions or regulations they thought proper to adopt. Some no doubt, anxious to establish political rights for the male part, or even a considerable portion of the male part, of the species, have, merely through prudence, kept back the consideration of the political rights of women, lest so large a demand on political power should lead it to throw discord between the claimants of the political rights of men.

"However this may be, we are not here called upon to examine these or any other reasons against the utility of the equal rights of women, that reason, only excepted, which Mr. Mill has brought forward, and on which he exclusively relies. Such an examination would lead us into an immense general question not now before us. On such an examination our present opponent would probably adopt the same side of the argument with us, as his rule of exclusion depends on the simple fact of identity of interest between men and women, or rather on the inclusion of the happiness of women in that of men. If it should turn out that the interests, or happiness, of women, are no more included in those of men than the happiness of some men, under peculiar circumstances and with favourable dispositions, is identified with that of some others, Mr. Mill will admit that no ground is left for the exclusion of women from political or civil rights; and also, most probably, that all the reasons set up to exclude them will be found to be reasons the most unanswerable for shielding them with every civil and political protection of the law, at least equal to those who have the physical power of oppressing them.

"'Is then,' to use Mr. Mill's words, 'the interest of almost all women involved either in that of their fathers or in that of their husbands?'

"The first obvious defect in Mr. Mill's position, the basis of his system of universal exclusion against women, must strike every eye. 'All,' says Mr. Mill, in the previous part of his 'Article on Government,' 'whose interests are not involved

in those of other individuals having votes in the representation, ought themselves to have votes. But the interest of all children is so involved: therefore all children ought to be without votes.' So far good logic, whatever may be thought of the philosophy or the reason of the position. But he goes on and says, 'Almost all women find their interest involved either in that of their fathers, or in that of their husbands: therefore all women should be excluded from political rights.'

"Let us see now what proportion of women it is, which, on Mr. Mill's principles rightly applied, should enjoy political rights; their interest not being involved in that of any persons possessing political rights. Wives and daughters are the only two classes of women whose interests the 'Article' involves in that of men, namely of their husbands and fathers. All women, having neither husbands nor fathers, and therefore without any one to represent their interests, stand entitled, like men, to political rights. What women stand in this predicament on the statement of the 'Article?' All those not having living fathers, or having left their fathers' establishment, between the age of twenty-one and the time of their marriage; all those who never marry; all widows!

"Why should all these classes of women, who by the showing of the 'Article' itself have not any persons to represent them, be excluded from political rights necessary to their protection, as to that of all other human beings? For the exclusion of these women who have neither fathers nor husbands to embrace their interests, the 'Article' offers no justification.

"To all women, of age and unmarried, the law of most civilised countries awards an equality of civil rights with few exceptions, and those not caused by any notions of identity of interest, with their fathers or other persons; thus negating the strange assumption of an identity of interest with their fathers or any other human beings.

"How large a portion of the adults of the human race do the above three classes form! from one sixth perhaps to one fourth, according to the varying manners of nations leading more or less of women, and at an earlier or later age, to become wives! Yet all these are to share in the general proscription! All these whose interests are admitted not to be involved in those of any other human beings, are to be excluded from the political right of representation, because other women are said to be *virtually* represented by their husbands or fathers!

"If the 'Article' refuse to admit these avowedly unrepresented classes of women, what becomes of the grand argument of the 'Article,' for the political right to representation of all men? of the argument founded on the want of an identity of interest between the possessors of power and those subjected to it, between the makers and administrators of the laws and those who are compelled to obey them? By the statement, the 'Article' admits a portion of women, those not having fathers or husbands—namely, the three classes above mentioned—to have no more identity of interest with others than men have. By the strangest turn that ever logician made in the reasoning of so few lines, these women, not coming under his rule of identity of interest, and allowed by his term *almost* not to come under it, are to be equally excluded from the right of representation with those other women who do come under it. The statement and just reasoning from it, admit them. Palpable and self-evident false reasoning excludes them. Fortunately, however, those non-identified women, the three classes of single women above mentioned, cannot be excluded from political rights, without excluding men—to whom the philosopher has the honour to belong; and thus uprooting the whole basis of his argument on government.

"There are no classes of men who are so much exposed to suffer wrong, who stand so much in need of the protection

of political rights, as these three classes of women. Disadvantages in all shapes, and on every side, surround them in their competition with men. These disadvantages chiefly arise from four sources: from want of strength as compared with men, from want of wealth as compared with men, from want of knowledge and skill in almost every line of advancement as compared with men, and from difference of organisation subjecting them to occasional losses of wealth and time, to which men are not subjected. No classes of men are liable to these tremendous, because mostly combined, evils, in their dealings and competitions with each other. If wealth be wanting to men, they have skill and strength; if strength be wanting, they have wealth and skill; if skill be wanting, they have wealth or strength, or perhaps both; and none of them are liable, as a class, to any inconveniences from organisation, consuming occasionally their time and wealth. If all men therefore, merely because no others can be found possessing political rights in whom their interests are identified, should in their own persons take care of their own interests, by contributing to name those who frame the regulations which dispose of their happiness; how much more unanswerable becomes this argument when applied to a portion, adult, sentient, and rational, of the human race, whom nature, laws, and manners have conspired to render liable to, and defenceless under, the unmitigated wrongs of the male part of their fellow-creatures, and altogether unprepared to enter into an equal competition for the means of happiness with them? If the argument from want of sympathy, where even an equality of natural advantages prevails (as between different portions of men), be incontrovertible; how overpowering must it be, when to a want of sympathy is added a host of natural inequalities, and when again to these are added a still more appalling host of factitious inequalities, which the past brutality of men has heaped on these as well as other classes of women, by withholding from them equal facilities for the acquisition of knowledge and wealth?

“Is it necessary further to prove, what the statement of the ‘Article’ in fact admits, though the inference perversely denies it, that these three classes of women, not having their interests involved in that of husbands or fathers, are equally entitled to nominate representatives with men? On the admission of the ‘Article’ their case rests: identity of interests, its only rule, does not exclude them. These three classes of women, having neither fathers nor husbands, ought, therefore, on the showing of the ‘Article’ itself, to participate in political rights.

“QUESTION II.—If this involving of the interest of women in those of men do exist, is it a sufficient cause, or any reason at all, why either of the parties, men or women, with interests so identified, should therefore be deprived of political rights?

“We maintain, then, that ‘supposing the interests of men and women to be so involved in each other, that the advancement of one is necessarily followed by that of the other, that power given to one, particularly political power, is necessarily used impartially for the advantage of both,—it would no more follow that women should, than that men should, be on that account excluded from the exercise of political rights.’

“For what reasons are political rights claimed by men? For two leading reasons. First, because without them they could never enjoy the civil rights of property and person, or if by chance they obtained possession of any of these civil rights, they could not have a moment's security in the enjoyment of them, without the guarantee of their own power through representatives under their control for the continuance of them. The second reason, though almost entirely overlooked, is scarcely secondary in importance to the first. It is, that the exercise of political rights affords the best opportunity for the exercise of

the intellectual powers and enlargement of the sympathies of human beings, leading their attention out of themselves, to matters in which numbers of their fellow-creatures, to an indefinite extent besides themselves, are interested.

“Now supposing that the interests of men and women were so mysteriously involved in each other, that either party exercising political rights would necessarily promote the civil rights and consequently the happiness of the other equally with their own; as far as civil rights are concerned, this might be a good reason for indifference in the party excluded from political rights as to the possession of them; but it could be no reason at all as to the loss of the second benefit to be derived from the exercise of such political rights. The one party exercising political rights from which the other was excluded, could not by any means impart to that other the exercise of the intellectual powers, and that enlargement of sympathy, that interest in the affairs of numbers mixed with our own, which distinguishes the benevolent from the selfish. This vice of character, want of comprehensive views, want of interest in anything out of themselves or of their own little domestic circle—the necessary result of the state of barbarous exclusion, of domestic imprisonment, in which women have been kept—can never be cured by the enjoyment by any others than themselves of those opportunities for unfolding their powers, which enlarged social, including political, interests, can alone create. Had the party possessing political power used it with ever so much impartiality, had the civil rights and duties, privations and punishments of women for the same offences, been the same as those of men, still would all this—so flagrantly contrary to the actual result of their exclusion—be no justification whatever of the withholding from them political rights. Without them they can never have enlargement of mind, they can never have expansive benevolence; because without them they can never pass through those incidents which are necessary to the unfolding of such qualities. Look to the state of the minds of men in any part of the world excluded from political rights, though enjoying the power of locomotion and equal in point of civil rights (if such state of things anywhere exist) to their neighbours, and you will find either eternal discontent or an abjectness of mind and want of benevolence on the part of the excluded, which denotes the source from which the vice of their characters proceeds. How much more must this be the case with women shut out from those transactions and incidents of busy life which afford exercise, the means of development, to the human powers!

“These opportunities for enlargement of character, can never be afforded but by possessing an influence in public affairs, in matters of public interest; for where influence is excluded, interest cannot be felt, influence, not of mere power or command nor of the corruptive class, but influence arising from the exercise of the understanding. How doubly vain, therefore, is the hollow pretext put forward by the ‘Article,’ of excluding women from political rights on account of the involving of their interests with those of men! Will enlargement of mind and benevolence tend less to their happiness than to that of men? will it tend less to the happiness of those with whom they associate? Can these qualities be unfolded in man or woman if opportunities are not given for their development? How but by discussing and influencing the affairs in which numbers, sometimes to the whole extent of all mankind, are concerned, and in which the individual is connected with and merged in the general interest, can such enlargement and such benevolence be produced? Will the exercise of handicraft trades by men make women expert in such trades? As little can the exercise of the intellectual powers or of the sympathetic affections by men unfold those qualities in women, shut out from a participation in the incidents necessary to unfold them. Will reading,

or hearing read, the description of manual operations, without practice and without benefit to be derived from the practice, ever make any human beings expert in such operations? As little will exhortations to enlargement of mind and to culture of social feelings avail in producing them, where the fields for the exercise, and the motives to the exercise, of them, are withheld. Can we expect grapes from thorns? If we really wish that women should participate in that enlargement of mind and benevolence of which we vainly boast, but do not possess, as our actions demonstrate, wherefore withhold from them the means of cultivating such qualities?

“QUESTION III.—Is there in the nature of things any security for equality of enjoyments proportioned to exertion and capabilities, but by means of equal civil rights? or any security for equal civil rights, but by equal political rights?

“Political rights are necessary to women as a check on the almost inveterate habits of exclusion of men. It is in vain to sanction by law a civil right, or to remove an exclusion, if the law affords no means to those whom it designs to benefit of causing the right or permission to be enforced. Women may be eligible by law to the situation of professors; the law may protect them when married from the personal violence or constraint of any kind of their husbands, as fully as it protects husbands against them; but if none but men are to be the electors, if none but men are to be jurors or judges when women complain against men of partiality and injustice, is it in human nature that a sympathy from old habit, from similarity of organisation and train of thought, from love of domination, should not have a tendency to make men swerve from the line of justice and strict impartiality, should not make them underrate the pretensions of women, and be lenient to the errors of men?

“A second reason why women, in addition to equal laws and an equal system of morals, should also possess equal political rights . . . is, that exclusive legislators, particularly men as exclusive legislators for women, though ever so sincerely inclined to promote the happiness of those whom they exclude equally with their own, must be liable to errors from want of knowledge, from false judgments. How can exclusive legislators know the interests of those who are not their constituents, of those whom they never consult, who have no control over them? Not what they, the legislators, are pleased arbitrarily to call their interests without having any intercourse with them, without any means of discovering them, but what the excluded themselves think to be their interest? or at least what those amongst the excluded who choose to think at all, deem to be their interest? In case of difference of opinion between legislators and those for whose benefit regulations are said to be made (as suppose the insolent and stultifying law or custom of preventing women from addressing numbers of their fellow-creatures in a public room or assembly), how is the legislator to find out this opinion, when none of those affected by the regulation, and who choose to think at all about it, have any means of making their sentiments known to him as their representative? In all cases of difference of opinion between legislators and constituents, it is the duty of legislators to enlighten and convince their constituents before they presume to drag them into pretended interests which they disclaim. But how can legislators enlighten constituents whom they do not know? How can legislators know when those constituents are convinced, if they have no mode by their votes of expressing their opinions? if all those whose opinions are permitted by their votes to be expressed are necessarily either indifferent or hostile to those whose interests are in question? as is the case with respect to men where the interests of women alone are concerned. What is one of the eternal excuses for iniquitous legislation, on the part of

those who affect to take into consideration the influence of their measures, not only on their own interests, but on those also of all others likely to be affected by them? Is it not the pretence that the measures in question do really promote the interest of those whom they affect? What means so simple and effectual, what other practicable means are there of silencing for ever this pretext, or gratifying the allegation if sincere, as affording the means of collecting by personal vote the opinions of those whose interests are at stake? Till this simple expedient is resorted to, any interests at the will of the law-makers may be said to be promoted by any measures. But let those affected by the measures stand in the relation of constituents to its enactors, and let it be imperative under pain of recall, on those enactors, to suspend legislating until they have convinced those of their constituents, or the majority of them, who choose to think at all upon the subject, that the proposed measures really promote their interest, and all difficulties as to errors of judgment in legislators will be removed. Women will no longer be insulted with barbarous laws, and then coolly told by the enactors of them that they are really for their interest, inasmuch as their interests are, by a wise and mysterious dispensation of nature, involved always in the interests of the exclusive male law-makers, or their exclusive male constituents.

“The evil of making laws for the pretended benefit, but in contempt of the will of human beings, being absolutely without measure, while the evil of waiting for the approbation, or at least assent, of the majority of those interested and inclined to judge, being as nothing, but attended with effects in almost every way salutary; it is clear that the latter is the only method of reducing to the lowest the mischiefs of false judgment on the part of well-disposed legislators; and this scheme of persuasion cannot be carried into effect with respect to women but by investing them with equal political rights.

“As society improves, and in proportion to its improvement, the respect paid to brute unconscious force or to muscular strength decreases. There are two causes acting at the same time, and concurring to produce this effect: the one is the comparative inefficiency of mere force to produce useful results, even in the production of articles of wealth, when compared with knowledge and skill applied through machinery; the other is the new class of pleasures, continually increasing and expanding over a larger portion of society, arising from intellectual culture. The employment of brute force in foreign war, and to so great an extent in supporting the machinery of government and enforcing the sanctions of criminal law, tends to keep up this declining respect for force; though even here, as society advances, criminal laws become more mild, and skill is every day superseding, even in war, the efficiency of mere force. For three fourths of the operations, professions, arts, trades, now carried on by men, the muscular strength of women, moderately developed by healthful physical education, would be abundantly sufficient: the fourth, requiring the greatest development of strength, would naturally be conducted by those amongst men who excel in that quality, and who are generally deficient in inclination to intellectual pursuits. Qualities are estimated by their utility: mere force or strength is now, and will be every day, of less and less comparative importance with intellectual qualities, from the decreasing benefits to be derived from it. In point of fact, even now, the most ill-paid offices are those in which mere force is required: force is so common and brutish a quality, that when not joined with skill, or not necessary to self-defence or attack, it is used as a means of support or influence by those only who have not within their command any more influential or better remunerated qualities. While, as society advances in improvement, the beneficially productive power of force decreases, the pleasures

arising from the cultivation of intellect rise into existence, increase in importance, and come to be pursued for their own sake: more delicate pleasures, those of sympathy combined with intelligence, and always spreading over a larger surface, replace the more coarse and boisterous pleasures of mere muscular exertion.

"These favourable tendencies of civilisation, proceeding from the decreased usefulness of mere force and from the new class of pleasures produced by mental culture, have doubtless mitigated the abuses of savage strength despotically used by man over woman. The progression of the same circumstances must doubtless in the end annihilate this abuse. Hitherto, though from these causes, the exercise of the domination has been in some countries becoming more mild, yet are the notions of superiority and the power of oppressing retained with almost as much pertinacity as ever. Superstition and an unequal and hypocritical system of morals, have erected the despotism of the one party into a right, and the submission of the other into a duty. The direct exercise of force is for the most part superseded by the previous drilling of the minds of the oppressors and the oppressed, the one as ready to bear, as the other to inflict, injustice. How long must it necessarily be, before these deep-rooted habitudes are eradicated! how very long before the old and indirect influence of man over woman shall cease to modify and control to his own purposes the exercise of woman's newly-acquired political rights! How much is it to be dreaded that until the education of truth and utility shall have raised the minds of both men and women, the influential party will render to a great extent inoperative the political rights of the other; and thus so far realise the taunts of those who predict the utter inefficiency of any checks, domestic, civil, or political, over the power of diminishing happiness and inflicting misery conferred by nature, in the gift of superior strength, on all those whom she has favoured, or, from its misuse, cursed with it.

"We may rest, then, plainly and fully assured, that so far from the additional check of political rights being superfluous to women, to guarantee to them equal enjoyments proportioned to their faculties, under equal civil and criminal laws, the real cause of apprehension would be, that even the full possession of political rights would for a long time be but partially operative; and that, to attain their full and salutary effects we must look forward to that time when the progress of knowledge and of new institutions shall have obliterated a prejudice coeval with the race of man, and in the early stages of his progress, previous to the development of knowledge, impressed upon him by the very necessities of his existence. Political rights, then, are not only necessary to secure to women the existence of equal civil and criminal laws between them and men; but if it were possible to devise a check still more likely to be efficient to procure for them this demand of equal justice, that additional check ought to be employed."

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED FROM JULY 21st to SEPTEMBER 20th, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Lady Anna Gore-Langton	20	0	0
Mrs. Pidgeon	1	1	0
Mrs. Garth Wilkinson	1	1	0
Mr. Courtauld	1	0	0
Mr. Frederick Hill	1	0	0
Mr. Mariano de Murietta	1	0	0
Mr. Benham	0	10	6
Mrs. Biloart	0	10	6
Mr. H. W. Blair	0	10	0
Mrs. Leach	0	10	0
Mrs. Tennant	0	10	0
Mr. A. P. Graves	0	5	6
Anonymous	0	5	0

Carried forward .. .. . £28 3 6

CONTRIBUTIONS continued.

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	28	3	6
Mr. T. W. Blair	0	5	0
Mr. Golds	0	5	0
Miss W. Taylor	0	5	0
An Irish Friend	0	2	0
Mr. Henry Harris	0	1	0

£29 1 6

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

64, Berners Street, London, W.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, SEPTEMBER, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. J. P. Thomasson (Special Donation)	20	0	0
Miss Edith Brooke (Lecture Fund)	4	0	0
R. L.	1	1	0
Mr. Alfred Tozer	1	1	0
Mr. James Edmondson	1	1	0
Mr. William Whitaker (Broughton)	1	1	0
Mr. W. Melling	1	0	0
Mrs. Whitehead	1	0	0
Dr. Muirhead	1	0	0
Dr. Borchardt	1	0	0
Miss Adamson	1	0	0
Mrs. Chas. Bowman	1	0	0
Mr. Peter Spence	1	0	0
Mr. Thos. Falconer	0	11	0
Mr. George Lee	0	10	6
Dr. Burrows	0	10	6
Mrs. Daniell	0	10	6
Miss H. Mills (Manchester)	0	10	6
Mr. Thomas Peel	0	10	6
Mrs. Walton	0	10	0
Miss Walton	0	10	0
Mrs. Donkin	0	10	0
Mr. Chas. Wilson (two years)	0	10	0
Mr. George White	0	10	0
Miss Stuart	0	10	0
Mrs. Melling	0	5	0
Mr. S. Melling	0	5	0
Miss M. Nichol	0	5	0
Miss Whitelegge	0	5	0
Rev. T. Gasquoine	0	5	0
Mrs. Sinclair	0	5	0
Mr. T. Boddington	0	5	0
Mr. Thos. Wright	0	5	0
Miss A. Bradlaugh	0	5	0
Mrs. Simpson	0	2	6
Mr. F. H. Smith (Sutton)	0	2	6
Miss E. Jones	0	2	0

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer.

£43 19 6

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND SOCIETY.

CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED SINCE JULY 20th, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Miss Lillias S. Ashworth	50	0	0
A Friend	5	0	0
F. S.	2	2	0
Mr. J. A. Baines	1	1	0
Mrs. J. A. Baines	1	1	0
Miss Leonard	1	0	0
Miss Mary Carpenter	0	10	0
Mrs. W. Colfox	0	10	0
Mrs. Suhle	0	7	6
Rev. J. Caldicott, D.D.	0	5	0
Miss Calmady	0	5	0
Mrs. W. L. Carpenter	0	5	0
Rev. W. Hargrave	0	5	0
Mr. Jennings	0	5	0
Mr. Thornton	0	5	0
Mr. Tucker	0	5	0
Miss J. Venning	0	5	0
Mrs. Bond	0	2	6
Mr. Cottrell	0	2	6
Mrs. Henry Fardon	0	2	6
Miss Lutley	0	2	6
Miss L. Geyt	0	2	0
Mrs. Curnoek	0	1	0
Mr. Pakeman	0	1	0

£64 5 6

ALAN GREENWELL, Treasurer,

Office: 53, Park Street, Bristol.