

NEW LIGHT ON ROOSEVELT.

Some Peculiar Reasons Why He Should
Not Be Supported by Women.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

Opinions vary as to the righteousness of Roosevelt's political acts, but as to his attitude toward women there can be no diversity of thought. He has taken it upon himself to dictate concerning her most personal affairs and to map out her life for her in ways that are not only un-American but 100 years beyond the times.

The past forty years have witnessed woman's bitter struggle to obtain an education for herself and the right to labor. Roosevelt would abolish both. He has no use for the higher education for women, nor is he pleased to see her developing her talents and earning her living in the world outside. Though a college man, his daughters are not college bred. In the light of modern methods their educational endowment must be considered most meagre.

On the other hand his sons are receiving every inducement to develop themselves to the utmost. A peculiarity in their training, and one that throws light on Roosevelt's estimate of women, is that as soon as they are well past the kindergarten they are removed from woman's atrocious influence and sent to a boy's boarding school under male teachers and upon graduation are to be sent to a man's college, where again the instructors are men only. Roosevelt's idea of woman's education coincides exactly with the German Emperor's—children, cooking, and church.

The pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church of which Roosevelt is a member preaches openly in the pulpit the subserviency of woman to a husband's rule, and Roosevelt heartily indorses him. His ultimatum on race suicide is well known. American women, to whom motherhood means more than mere numbers, who are progressive in thought and ambitious to secure educational advantages and industrial equipment for their daughters, will do well to ask themselves whether it is wise or right to support by their vote or influence the man who is so strongly opposed to all that intelligent cultured womanhood holds dear.

LULU MACCLURE CLARKE

Edith, Col., Sept. 26, 1904.

The New York Times

Published: October 3, 1904

Copyright © The New York Times