

those who drag heavily laden vehicles through the narrow streets of the other cities; or those who mix mortar and carry bricks in building operations; or those who, their babies toddling about nearby, all day long, to the rhythm of their own cries and songs, sway on ropes of pile-driving machinery.

Then there are the women above these in the hierarchy of employment—those who tend store; those who serve as clerks and can and do keep accounts; those who are in the government departments, especially in the Department of Communications, embracing telegraphs, railroads, and telephones. The telephone girl is an important institution even in Japan.

Moreover, women have made their appearance and are more than holding their own in printing-offices and also on newspapers; while the fame of the Japanese trained female nurse spread over the world during the recent war. Women are even now appearing on the stage, and with distinction. The most notable are Madam Kumehachi and Madam Sada Yakko. The latter made a success in Paris. She is now to be seen by turn in the larger cities of Japan in modern plays, after the European type.

The peculiar significance of this feminine stage appearance is seen in the fact that while the founders of the Japanese theater seem to have been two women, O-Kuni and O-Tsu, practically down to the present generation it was thought immoral for a woman to appear on a stage with a man. The female parts were assumed by males.

The wages paid in these and other lines of women's vocations are not high. To us they would seem very low. But then the Japanese standard of living is also very low. Yet low as these wages are, they are generally higher than women could earn formerly; and they have, as a consequence, made for the dignity and independence of women as a whole.

A silk merchant told me, for instance, that in his native province of Kaga field laborers get twenty sen (ten cents of our money a day, while their wives, in the silk industry, get forty sen; and that, as a consequence, the wives are asserting themselves.

Economic conditions are, therefore, having a material effect in the ascendancy of Japanese women. Another element in this transition is the public school, which is modeled on the American system and is established in every part of the empire. Attendance is made obligatory. Girls have the same studies as boys, at least in the primary and grammar divisions. To a degree at least there is a corresponding higher education, too.

So that at the threshold a strong equalizing impression is being given to the young girls' minds, such as would have scandalized, and, perhaps, frightened their grandmothers. Bevy of these schoolgirls—"students," they are called—may be

seen in certain hours in the streets of Tokyo, without hats, their black hair brushed smoothly and tied with ribbons, wearing dark Japanese waists, dark brown Europeanized skirts, and European stockings and shoes, or here and there the short, native ankle-stockings ("tabi") and straw or wooden sandals. Carrying bundles of books on their arms, they have all the unconscious charm and freedom of American schoolgirls.

\* \* \*

## WHY MANY POLITICAL REFORMERS ARE INDIFFERENT TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

**Outline of an Address Delivered Before the 1907 Convention of the Washington Equal Suffrage Association, Seattle, Sept. 27, 1907, by Joe Smith.**

An observing essayist has said that there are two classes of occasions when one may be called upon to speak in public: when he has something to say, and when he has to say something. Having accepted the kind invitation to address your association I have been placed under the necessity of saying something; but more than this I have been fairly besieged with suggestions of things I desire to say to the progressive women of Washington who are engaged in this effort to win for themselves the privilege (as they already possess the right) of participating in the government which rules over them.

I am frank to confess that I have never devoted much time nor much energy to the advancement of the cause for which your association stands. And without apologizing for that delinquency I desire to explain to you, for myself and for thousands of other men who agree with me that you are being denied a very precious and fundamental right, why it is that we have not made and are not making more of an effort to secure for you the legal recognition of that right.

As a matter of fact our government is not a popular government. It is merely a great battlefield on which tremendous battles are being waged between the champions of popular government on the one hand and its opponents on the other. True it is that in theory at least our government looks back to the governed as the source of all power. But the source of that power is in many instances so far removed, and the stream of that power flows in such devious channels from that source to its outfall in the protection of the rights and interests of the citizen, that the stream is frequently turned from its proper channels, like the waters of an irrigation ditch, to flow over and fertilize with private profit the fields of special interest. From time to time these obstructions in the stream of governmental power are removed or swept away, and from time to time new and different ones are erected, until the stream of government has come to be a very devious and troubled

one, difficult, and at times even impossible, to trace to its theoretical source in the popular will.

First and fundamental among the devices for the prevention of popular government is the device of restricted suffrage. Were the government genuinely representative and readily responsive in all other respects the device of restricted suffrage would still prevent it from being truly a representative one. The question naturally arises, therefore, why is it that all champions of popular government do not devote their first and greatest efforts to procuring a fair and honest extension of the right of suffrage? It is this question which I desire to answer.

The reason is that this is not as yet even a government of those who are permitted to vote. In other words there are so many other devices for the prevention of popular government that even the exercise of the suffrage does not carry with it full actual participation in governmental matters. And until it has been made so the extension to women of the right of suffrage as men possess it would be nothing but a pretty compliment, high sounding but meaningless, granting your demands in form while denying them in fact.

In short, while your demand strikes at the most fundamental device for the prevention of popular government it does not strike at the most vital and immediate ones, the ones interposed to exclude present voters from exercising control of their government. And I speak for many champions of popular government when I assure you that the reason that we do not give our first energies to the championship of your demands is that our first energies are absorbed in the battle for our own rights. It is more vital to our welfare and to yours that we give real significance to the right of suffrage in a limited constituency than it is to extend a restricted and meaningless imitation suffrage to a larger constituency. If the right of suffrage can be made vital and significant in the hands of those who already possess it, our present voters will easily correct many of the gravest abuses of our government. But without restoring to the citizen the power to control his government through the exercise of the suffrage no mere extension of the suffrage can enable us to do so.

We Americans are a resourceful people. And this is as true of those who are opposed to popular government as it is of those who champion it. The opponents of popular government have been intensely resourceful in the erection of devices for preventing it. The champions of popular government are rapidly becoming equally resourceful in the removal of those devices or in the erection of other devices for overcoming or counteracting them. A description of the devices for the prevention of popular government therefore somewhat resembles a description of naval armor. You know as soon as one inventor perfects a projectile which will pierce any known armor another in-

ventor, or the same one perhaps, proceeds to invent an armor which will resist any known projectile. The perpetual warfare, therefore, between special privilege and popular government is a contest of political ingenuity, with a constantly shifting scene of battle, constantly changing weapons, and constantly reorganizing armies, and a contest which in the very nature of things does not depend for its final result upon the outcome of any one skirmish, no matter of how great importance.

The original devices for the prevention of popular government under our federal Constitution were those which were inserted in the Constitution itself by the opponents of popular government. One of these is the delegation of the power of interpreting the Constitution to a body of men who are not chosen by the governed and are only very distantly responsive to their will. This device has given to a power other than the people the privilege of amending that constitution, while denying the exercise of that privilege by the people themselves. Theoretically the people of the United States may amend their constitution through their government machinery, but that machinery is so bunglesome that for forty years the people have not been able to operate it in behalf of any amendment expanding the privileges of popular government.

Another device inserted in the Constitution for the prevention of popular government was that providing for the selection of the president by an electoral college. But the champions of popular government soon found a device for overcoming that device, by the organization of political parties and the nomination of presidential candidates through them. This worked for a while until the special interests invented means for the control of political parties through political machines, thereby defeating the device for overcoming the first device. Champions of popular government thereupon developed the power of the press as a means of checking the iniquity of the political machine, and this proved effective for a while until special interests began to acquire, subsidize and otherwise dominate the press and to corrupt in it that function of representing the general welfare. This device of a muzzled and subsidized press has already been carried by the privileged interests to the extent of causing citizens quite generally to discredit the political integrity of our great newspapers, and it is a humiliating reflection upon the integrity of our newspapers that our great crusades and campaigns for the restoration of popular government are now being conducted through the medium of magazines and periodicals.

Another device written in the federal Constitution for the prevention of popular government is that providing for the indirect election of United States senators. Through the agency of this device the enemies of popular government have been able to dominate the American House of Lords

throughout the history of its existence, and one can count on his fingers, almost, all the conspicuous champions of popular government who ever occupied seats in that body. In the earlier years of the republic this end was accomplished through the simple agency of political persuasion, legislators being prevailed upon in good faith to vote for the candidates put forward by the special interests. Of later years resort has been had to political coercion and to the corrupt use of money, power and influence.

But the champions of popular government have perfected a device to overcome the device of indirect senatorial elections, and in one State at least senators are elected by the people under an efficient direct primary law which transforms the State legislature from a house of thieves into a second electoral college merely recording the will of its constituents.

Devices for the prevention of popular government may be divided into two general classes, those which operate within and under the law, and those which operate in violation of the law but with the consent and connivance of those sworn to enforce the law. Of legal obstructions we have the denial of the right of the people, by extra legal form and extra constitutional machinery, to choose their public servants in the original instance or to remove them during their terms of office by popular vote. Also the people are denied, by constitutional and legal form, the power and privilege of revoking the acts of their legislative officers. But we are rapidly perfecting devices for the overthrow of these devices of our opponents. The direct primary method of nominating candidates for public office promises materially to assist in removing the first of these causes for complaint. The principle of the recall from office, now written in our city charter, will assist in removing the second, and the privilege of direct legislation, adopted in eight States and now being agitated in our own, will remedy the third. These are the battlegrounds of our prevailing contests, and these battles are so absorbing the energies of many champions of popular government that their attention is, for the present at least, distracted from other and perhaps equally fundamental political abuses.

Coming now to the lawless devices for the prevention of popular government we have the political machine, the corporate campaign contribution, the public service political boss, the corrupted public servant, and the ballot-box fraud which prevents an honest election and a fair count.

I submit to you that there is plenty of work for champions of popular government to do besides promoting the campaign for the extension of the suffrage. I submit to you that it is our duty first to correct such of the evils of our government as rob us of the fruits of the suffrage we already pos-

sess before we abandon our own rights to assist you in the enforcement of yours.

It may be argued that were we to give our first efforts to your propaganda for the extension of the suffrage you could and would be of assistance to those of us who are fighting the other battles for the principles of popular government. So far as the members of your association are concerned, so far as all of those women actively engaged in your campaign are concerned, I am convinced that this is true. And yet it is not a part of the history of your movement that the extension of the suffrage to women has contributed in any significant degree to the general effort to overcome the other devices for the prevention of popular government. I do not offer this as a reason for opposing the extension of the suffrage; I hold that we mere men have no right to deny the suffrage in the first place. I merely offer it as the reason why so many champions of popular government devote their first energies to the removal of other devices for its prevention.

Do not understand me as holding up equal suffrage in Colorado as a horrible example of equal suffrage, when I remind you that Colorado is probably the worst governed State in the Union. This is not because of equal suffrage—far from it; but in spite of equal suffrage, and because of the perfection of other devices interposed to prevent the people of the State from dominating their government. I offer that State as an example to illustrate my argument that equal suffrage cannot of itself break down the elaborate machinery erected by selfish special interests to prevent majority rule.

Nor do I have to go so far afield to find a similar example. You have it in the government of the Seattle public schools in which you participate on an equality with us. And yet our city schools are conducted by a self-perpetuating school board, dominated by the attorney for a great public service corporation, and governed as much for the protection of big business as for the promotion of popular education.

Under the big business domination of our city school system the intelligent and energetic women who instruct our children are not permitted to perfect any channel through which they may express their ideas of how our school should be conducted, and the whole system is domineering and autocratic, utterly subversive of the very spirit of democratic government, and a superintendent is employed at a high salary as a means of commanding the services of a man for that position who can procure and retain teachers, at least in the lower grades, at low salaries. I take it that it is a regrettable circumstance that the great wave of prosperity which has swept over the land in the last ten years is not reflected in any adequate increase in the salaries of those whom we employ to educate our children.

I submit that these abuses could be corrected

by the women of the City of Seattle. It is not for me to advise you that you give them your earnest and thoughtful attention. But this much is certain: that when you win your demand for equal suffrage you will win it as the result of the championship of it by other champions of popular government. And you women could tremendously advance the cause for which you are fighting if you would devote more of your attention to the efforts which other champions of popular government are making to remove other devices for the prevention of popular government.

As I have repeatedly declared, I believe that your cause is fundamentally right and just. Permit me to declare that I believe that within the near future this will be universally recognized. I am convinced that whenever you and we can command the attention of all good citizens for the cause which your association represents it will not be difficult to procure a verdict that your rights are fundamental, and that man has no legal or moral right to relegate women to the class with children, soldiers, aliens, idiots and insane persons.

---

## BOOKS

---

### FREE TRADE THAT IS MORE THAN TARIFF REFORM.

**The Whole Hog Book; or, a Dry Subject Made Juicy**—Being George's Thoro'going work, "Protection or Free Trade?" rendered into words of one syllable, and illustrated with pictures. By J. W. Bengough. Published by the American Free Trade League, Boston. Price 25 cents.

Henry George's book on Free Trade was a new departure. While it dealt with the subject of tariffs, it treated them as mere outcroppings of the deeper subject which the question of unrestricted trade calls forth. Not only did it show the importance of free exchanges of products between the people regardless of whether they are of the same or of different nations, but it showed also that trade is a mode of production and that therefore opportunities to dig, and build, and sow, and reap, and manufacture, should be as free as opportunities to trade. In other words free trade was to Henry George synonymous with free industrial activity and association. It was natural socialism as opposed to arbitrary socialism, of which protection is one of the great manifestations.

The significance of George's view is much more marked now than when his book appeared some twenty years ago. There have been great advances in popular thought since that time; and the conflict of interests—labor interests against monopoly interests—which he foresaw, is now upon us. Mr. Bengough's condensation of George's book is therefore not only a desirable but a highly

commendable offering of the American Free Trade League. It at once serves the purposes of agitation for fundamental free trade, and testifies to the recognition by the League of the widening scope of free trade agitation.

Mr. Bengough has done his part with great skill. He has rendered the essentials of George's book into words of one syllable, without straining the English or fracturing the sense. Here is an example on the fallacy that trade follows the flag: "Trade knows nought of what we call states; it has to do with men and men, and makes no note of flags at all." In expressing the difference between protection from good and from bad things, this is a fine example of one-syllable work: "Men speak of trade in the terms they use for war and storm and such dread things," but trade "is not like hail, flood and storm; it is a law of man's life as much as his breath, it is the free act of man; the act that marks him off from the brutes. There can be no such thing as trade if there be not men who want to and who try to trade." And the core of the whole subject comes out in this simple way: "The cause of true free trade is the cause of the rights of man. . . . To pack it all into a few words—we must make the earth as free to all as air and light and the warmth of the sun are now free. . . . If it should rain food and clothes and all the forms of wealth we need from the sky, it would not help the man who has no claim to the land on which they fall."

\* \* \*

### AMERICAN COMMUNISM.

**American Communities and Co-operative Colonies.**  
By William Alfred Hinds, Ph. B. Second revision.  
Chicago, Charles H. Kerr & Company.

The brevity of the articles is compensated for by the completeness of the collection. It begins with the communistic settlement of Jamestown in 1707 and concludes with the Fellowship Farm Association of Massachusetts. Among these experiments are included Robert Owen's communities, the Icarians, Brook Farm, Ruskin, Fairhope, the ill-fated Topolobampo, the Roycrofters, the Straight-Edgers, Spirit Fruit Society, and Helicon Home Colony.

From these histories the author makes the deduction that "agreement is indispensable" to the success of colonies, and that "thus far that has most surely come through the religious life." The conclusion cannot be avoided. Indeed it might be much more strongly stated than the author ventures to state it. Communistic communities not fused with a strong religious devotion do not seem capable of holding together. As this volume shows, we still have the Shakers, The Amana, the Koreshans, all founded upon a religious philosophy, and while some others so founded have gone down, none not so founded have greatly thrived. Of