

and trades. A doctor naturally dislikes female physicians. I myself once shared in this prejudice. I now think it right that women should have at least the option of being attended by their own sex. A lawyer objects to female solicitors and barristers: a clergyman, to female preachers. And by some doubtless, such purely personal feelings prompt objections to Woman Suffrage. But my opposition to Woman Suffrage cannot truly be imputed to fears of personal rivalry. It would matter nothing to me if all women were voters. Some would doubtless like to send me to immediate execution, for writing this book. Others more magnanimous, would merely regard me with pity and contempt, as they regard legislators who oppose Woman Suffrage. I am not a party politician. The arts in which I take most interest, Literature and Painting, have long been successfully cultivated by women. And however their rivalry, may apparently, or really injure male authors and painters, it must eventually tend to elevate literary and pictorial art. Where then is the unworthy personal motive for my writing against Woman Suffrage? I am unconscious of any such, but should I deceive myself, my error must be apparent in the following pages; and I shall, to that extent, injure the cause I defend. I believe my motives pure—to publish what I hold to be the truth about Woman Suffrage. If I am right, the publication of my views must prove directly and immediately beneficial. If I am wrong, advantage must indirectly result from the opportunity afforded to Woman Suffrage Advocates, to expose my fallacies.

Some seventeen years ago, under the advocacy of the late J. S. Mill, and Mr. Jacob Bright, Woman Suffrage attracted more attention, and came nearer consummation,