

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - AUG. 1, 1893.

"WOMAN IN POLITICS."

The *North American Review* for August contains the previously advertised article from the pen of Dr. William A. Hammond, on the subject of "Woman in Politics." From the reputation of the writer in another sphere of usefulness, we were led to expect something uncommon in his promised literary effort. The position which he endeavors to establish, is that woman is unfitted by grave anatomical and physiological peculiarities for taking part in public affairs. That is, in effect, that she is constitutionally unfit to hold office or vote at elections. After a careful examination of his facts and arguments, candor compels us to say that he has completely failed in his purpose.

In opening, Dr. Hammond condescends to an undignified attack on the originators of the movement in favor of woman's rights, which he is compelled to admit has led to beneficial reforms like the following:

"At the present time she can practice medicine almost anywhere in the civilized world; several religious denominations permit her to expound their faith; some of the States of the Union admit her to the bar, and one Territory gives her judicial powers. Her right to work in any field of labor she may select is granted; her person and property are as well protected by the law as those of man; she has all the rights and privileges necessary for her material and mental prosperity, and she is not required to serve in the militia or the *posse comitatus*, to sit on juries or to take her turn at the pumps of a sinking ship."

These being, as admitted, the results of the work of those agitators for the rights of women, we think the Doctor's attack on them as "short-haired women and long-haired men" and "impracticable fanatics," in very bad taste and quite inconsistent with the outcome of their labors. But let us consider the arguments brought forth by the learned Doctor. The first is that the governing power of the world is to be found in the brain of mankind. The average male brain is found to weigh about forty-nine ounces, and the average female brain about forty-four ounces, showing a difference in favor of the male brain of about five ounces. Exceptional brains, male or female, do not of course figure prominently in the argument. But it is shown further that the anterior portion of the brain, comprising the frontal lobes in which the highest intellectual faculties reside, is much more developed in man than in woman; in the average male brain compared with the average female brain the convolutions are more intricate, and "there is some reason for believing" — not enough however to warrant the positive assertion, that the gray cortical matter of the brain of corresponding parts of the two sexes is thicker in man than in woman, and the gray matter is said to be "especially concerned in the evolution of mind." All of this is intended to show that both in quantity and quality the brain of man is superior to the brain of woman. It is next argued that woman is guided more by intuition than reason. That she is emotional and imitative more than reasoning and original. That she "jumps" at conclusions and if asked for her reasons gives such as are irrelevant or insufficient. That she judges as she feels rather than as she thinks, and therefore she is wanting in "judicial mind."

Now admitting all this for argument's sake what does it amount to in establishing the position that woman should take no part in politics? Simply this: As a rule woman is unadapted to positions requiring the exercise of strong reason, sound judgment, purely intellectual process and argumentative force. That she is not fitted for the gubernatorial chair, the judicial bench, the head of an

army or other public office requiring force of intellect, disinterested judgment and enlarged views of public policy. In other words it means nothing more than that women as a class are, in these respects, in the same condition as a large number of men. But would Dr. Hammond attempt to argue that all emotional men, all men with brains below a certain calibre, all men who are unable to give valid reasons for the conclusions at which they arrive, should be denied the suffrage? Singular to say, the only example which he gives of a person who arrived at just conclusions but could only give ridiculous reasons for them is a man, an East Indian Judge whose "decisions on points of law and equity always commanded respect, till he gave his reasons for them and then they appeared to be ridiculous."

This is just the situation with Dr. Hammond himself. Whatever respect might be entertained for his general opinion that woman is unfitted for politics, is dissipated as soon as his reasons are given for such an opinion; they are the poorest we have ever seen advanced among the many untenable and ridiculous things spoken and printed against woman's political rights.

Dr. Hammond considers that the conferring of the franchise upon women ought, in common justice to carry with it the right to hold, any office for which she might have the privilege of voting. That is sound enough. The two rights ought to run together. But when he argues that because she is unadapted for certain offices in the gift of the people, she ought to be ineligible for all and be deprived of the right even to vote for men to fill them, his reasoning is very unsound, for it leads to injustice, and would be quite as applicable to the majority of men as to women. Only a few men are fit to be governors, judges, commanders of men, or to fill any high position in the gift of the people. But this does not argue that they should hold no office whatever, or that they are unfit to vote for men who are fitted and capable. Dr. Hammond admits that,

"There are many offices the functions of which are of a clerical or routine character for which she is admirably qualified, and which therefore, she could fill with advantage to herself and to the public."

And yet with singular inconsistency denoting in Dr. Hammond's brain a small proportion of the gray matter constituting the cortex, or a deficiency in the intricacy of the convolutions, the depth of the sulci or the specific gravity of the organ — he argues that the revolution which has taken place and advanced so far as to give woman a sort of restricted suffrage, "contrary to the ordinary course of procedure ought to go backward;" in other words, she should not be allowed to take any part whatever in politics.

As we have shown, the reason advanced by Dr. Hammond for the exclusion of women from any part in public affairs would shut out the great majority of men. So it is with most of the arguments that are brought forward by those who are opposed to woman suffrage, many of which are far more plausible than those contained in the August number of the *North American Review*. A woman citizen is part of the body politic as much as if she were a man. In a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, she has as clear a right to a voice in public affairs. As far as the law is concerned, she ought to be politically free. An educated white woman should at least be on a political equality before the law as an ignorant black man. If she is unadapted for certain positions in the nation, so are many men, and this should not exclude her from legal eligibility any more than personal unfitness in men. And there is no reason that can be advanced from anatomy, physiology, political economy or common sense to prove that in a government like ours, citizens who are amenable to the laws should be debarred from any voice in the making or execution of the laws, directly or indirectly, solely on account of sex. It never has been brought forward, it never can be, because it would be against truth, justice and consistency, just like the present unsound reasoning of Dr. W. A. Hammond.

A PECULIAR FEATURE OF THE EDMUNDS ACT.

The annexed communication has been received from a country settle-

ment and we notice and answer as requested:

Editor Deseret News:

Will you please answer the following, through the columns of the NEWS?

Under the Edmunds law and the ruling of the Utah Commission, is a man entitled to register, and consequently to vote, who is married to a woman leaving another living husband?

To make the question more clear I shall give an example: Suppose a woman marries in polygamy, and afterwards leaves her husband, before the year 1862, but does not receive a divorce. She marries again. Now, is her second husband a qualified voter?

Yours Truly,
INQUIREE.

We suppose our correspondent wants to know whether a man situated as described is rendered ineligible by reason of his marriage to a woman who has been previously married but has obtained no legal divorce. To a question put in that shape we should answer no. The Edmunds law disqualifies a bigamist, polygamist or person cohabiting with more than one woman. Also a woman cohabiting with any such person, from voting or holding office in this Territory. But in the case supposed or described the man is not in either of these conditions. Under the Edmunds law the woman is a polygamist, unless her former husband has been absent from her for five years and is not known by her to be living. She is therefore ineligible to vote. But the present husband, if he has no other wife and does not cohabit with more than one woman, and has the requisite qualifications of citizenship, residence, registration, etc., is qualified to vote, as there is nothing in the law that touches his case.

The law discriminates harshly against women in this respect. Any woman whose husband cohabits with another besides herself, whether with her consent or not, is disfranchised by the Edmunds law. But a man who lives with a woman who has had other husbands from whom she has not been legally divorced, or who cohabits with a woman that cohabits with other men, is not disfranchised by that singular effort at "moral" legislation known as the Edmunds Act. If the man referred to has all the regular qualifications as a voter, he is not disqualified under the law by his present marital associations.

THE HERRIMAN POLLING PLACE.

At the Delegate election of 1892 the citizens of Fort Herriman were compelled, in consequence of the appointment by the Commissioners of a precinct registration officer who resided five miles distant, to go to a mining camp to cast their votes, and that situated nearly at the top of a mountain unapproachable by vehicles with a load without doubling teams. This was very disagreeable to the citizens, and an appeal was made to the Commission, but as a "Gentile" registrar could not be had in the settlement, no change was made, and those who wished to vote had to travel the five miles and climb the mountain. It was supposed by the "Liberals" that the distance and the locality would deter the quiet citizens of Herriman from casting their ballots, but they did not know the kind of stuff wrapped up in Herriman parcels of humanity. The People's Party held its own at the election and the plot failed.

The Commissioners at that time admitted that the voting place was inconvenient, out of the way of the majority of the citizens, and unsuitable for ladies to cast their ballots, and promised that it should be changed. Either they have forgotten their promise or have been induced to disregard it, for this year the voting place is the same as last year, and the Herriman people will be compelled to trudge as before or not take any part in the election.

We hope that the members of the People's Party in that precinct will not be deterred from discharging their political duty by trouble or distance. And we suggest to them that they keep their eyes wide open for "Liberal" tricks, as we think it will be found that there is a scheme on hand in Butterfield Canyon which the wise will do well to watch and expose if they are not able to circumvent and defeat.

AN INTEMPERATE MILITARY ADDRESS.

THE Grand Army of the Republic has been holding an "encampment" at Denver, and no doubt there has been a time of jollity and enthusiasm. The defenders of their country are entitled to all the pleasure that can be evolved out of their reunion, and the veteran soldiers have the best wishes of all the patriots in the nation. There was but one occurrence at the Denver camp which we consider it necessary specially to notice. Commander Vandervoort delivered an address in which, it is reported, he made allusion to Utah in the following uncalled-for and in some respects untruthful manner:

In company with the Surgeon General I visited the Provisional Department of Utah, on April 21st and 22d. We were cordially received by as gallant a band of comrades as ever wore our badge. The Posts at Ogden and Salt Lake are lively and enthusiastic. I have added Idaho and Montana to the department, which gives them sufficient Posts to form a permanent department. The organization in Utah have had many difficulties to contend with. They are upholding the banner of the grand army in what is practically a foreign and hostile community. They are in front of an enemy, treacherous and defiant, and who are trampling daily under foot the laws of the land with perfect impunity. The grand army in Utah are the natural protectors of the glory and honor of the flag. They herein the presence of a crime as hideous as treason and as damnable as slavery, grandly illustrate the shining glories of our Order. They witness this treasonable organization extending into Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, Wyoming, New Mexico and Colorado, and grasping with greedy hands the balance of power in the very center of the Continent. They are entitled to our sympathy and solid support. It is right we should send greeting to them, for the evil they are massed in solid lines against is one that will cause the next great struggle for Republican government unless it is speedily checked. The question there is not in any sense political; all true men drop party lines there and are simply anti-Mormon. There Jews are Gentiles by name and all stand in solid column though vastly outnumbered by the wicked host. This question is a moral one and we have a right to add our testimony in favor of honor and purity. The slams of Europe with matted hair, blood-shot eyes, unholy thoughts, and beastly, idiotic ignorance and fanaticism impelling them, are being massed behind the solid walls of the gigantic mountains; the flag is hated, the laws which we willingly obey, and the authority of the nation we saved are spurned and spit upon. The school taxes paid by our comrades and those in league with them, are used in sustaining Mormon schools, and in every way the spirit of disloyalty and hate is exhibited. We crushed slavery and purified the flag, we made one country and one flag a living reality, and it is our duty to say to the polygamous wretches who have erected a structure as unholy and damning as slavery, that the men who wore the blue demand that these wicked, unholy efforts to establish on our soil the superstition, crime and hideousness of the dark ages must cease before we are mustered out.

Let us demand through a strong committee that a band of earnest, true men who know and have faced the evil and sin day and night, shall be designated to codify the laws heretofore passed through the dictates of the leaders of this unholy Church. That it shall be written and declared that no Mormon shall vote or hold any office whatever. That all holding Government offices shall be removed, that this commission shall ask Congress to approve the codification of the laws, and that all officers of every grade shall be appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Council, and that the emigration of recruits to build up this damning crime shall be stopped at once and forever.

We emphatically deny the statement that the "Grand Army of the Republic" has had "difficulties to contend" with from a "foreign and hostile community." It has met with no opposition whatever in Utah. Any "sympathy" for the members of the Order on such ground is a waste of sentiment. No one here has offered them any indignity or opposed them as "natural protectors of the glory and honor

of the flag." The stars and stripes need no protection in Utah. That flag was flung to the breeze soon as the Pioneers encamped the spot where this beautiful now stands, and here it has ever since on every public and is honored universally as emblem of a system of which the people venerate and admire. Commander Vandervoort simply giving his hearers almost is popular to say something about the "Mormons" and he talking for applause. Look at a picture he draws of our quiet peace-loving immigrants, "Mormons," hair, bloodshot eyes, unholy thoughts, and beastly idiotic ignorance and fanaticism." His coarse words and unjust epithets are evidence of own unwise heat and lack of leige, and his charges of ignorance and fanaticism back in his own only forms that served as originals for the he has painted, are members of his own Order have rolled in the gutter of Lake City, and with matted bloodshot eyes and idiotic yells uttered in foul language their thoughts and exhibited their ly idiotic ignorance and fanaticism by blasphemous curses against whose shoes they are not black, and principles that they no more soul to approach a mad bull has to sense the spheres.

Such examples of the pretend that "the flag" here, are looked upon our youth, as the most specimens of degraded that have ever staggered streets or attempted to add people from the stump beauties of "liberalism," may vile alcohol. There found in all Utah a "Mormon" will come anything like as the picture drawn by Van as some of his comrades from region.

We do not wish to cast any tion upon the gentlemen who to the "Grand Army." We their bravery in the field and respect their heroism in defend their country; and their from our views, and ours from on important questions, does not our admiration for the qualities. They have a perfect to their opinions and have had freedom in Utah to them. God forbid that they be debarred from the exercise such rights. But Commander Vandervoort has gone off wrong in trying to pandor to the popular notion. They were not "Mormons" he was describing, but some of his comrades of Utah posts at close of a not unfrequent debate.

We have not space to follow speaker through all his founded on the question that he has ore to handle without understanding, and which it appears to quite out of place in a military range, but will just notice the paragraph. What he means part of it is difficult to dim. Probably he could not explain self what he wants to do with ification of "the laws have passed by the dictates of the holy Church." But every understand the desire the Mormon shall vote or hold office whatever." That is not comprehend. That is what his comrades in Utah are for. They want the local treasury, disfranchisement of all "Mormons" would mean full political the small minority, and for the whisky-guzzling, haired, blood-red-eyed, mouthed patriots (?) who to "ban" for much of the and cigars.

We are sorry for Commander Vandervoort. He must in the society of some of the scheming disreputables who assume on their former with the military, and take tage of titles which they won with honor, but which have not made brilliant in life or civil service. He careful of his company and of talking in public on subjects which he is not posted; and will reflect a little we think he agree with us that at a reunion of old soldiers who have fought for the maintenance of republican institutions, something more appropriate could be introduced than endorsement of schemes for the destruction of the political rights of a whole community, because they believe something different from the creeds of their neighbors.