

The Single Tax Review

Vol. XXI

JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1921

No. 1

Current Comment

THOSE of us who advocated woman suffrage for many years when that cause was struggling for recognition were under no delusions regarding the consequences of this addition to the electorate. Woman suffrage was woman's right—and no more need be said. That women would do any better than the men with the franchise was not expected. That they would not do as well, owing to their inexperience, was perhaps also to be looked for, though they have done better than we had reason to hope for.

WE confess, however, to a feeling of disappointment at the following from the *Woman Citizen*, an influential and well edited paper of this city, published in the interests of the women voters, and to which Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, who has confessed to Single Tax beliefs, is a contributor:

"Undoubtedly we shall be found now on the side of one party, now on the side of another—not for the party's sake but for some measure's sake. Undoubtedly, when we are on the side of the Republicans our Democratic readers will feel chilly toward us and, undoubtedly, when we are on the side of the Democrats our Republican readers will not care for us. We shall, just the same, try to hold to the middle of the road in our editorial comments and it will be our effort to keep our pages free of any and all *propagandistic excesses*."

WE have italicized the phrase "*propagandistic excesses*." We think this is a peculiarly unexciting phrase. It runs a close second to "normalcy." It will offend nobody, for what offends people is all propaganda with which they do not happen to agree, or which they have financial reasons for opposing. But the *Woman Citizen* cannot be all things to all men, or to all women either. Many of the women voters are beginning to see things. They pay the bills for the household and the dinner table. Most of them are acquainted with the landlord. The rent problem means something to them. In tackling the problem they are bound to commit "*propagandistic excesses*." They may even indulge in impolite reference to certain politicians.

BUT see what it is that the *Woman Citizen* advises the women to do. If they follow the advice given they will vote now under the banner of Penrose, Lodge and Smoot. And then, switching their allegiance, they will vote under the banner of Pomerene, Palmer and Burleson. And avoiding "*propagandistic excesses*," they will of course refrain from indicating what they want, that is if they want anything strongly, for that would land them into those "*excesses*" which are to be avoided.

WE ask the *Woman Citizen* if it really thinks on reflection that what it offers is good advice? Women now have the vote; is this all they purpose to do with it? What is the advantage to the great half of humanity in making this new group of voters superfluous appendages to the two old parties? Shall there be no effort to find out what women want? Are there no great questions on which the two great parties have not yet declared themselves? What about the question of taxation, the rent and housing question, and the greater question underlying all these—that of the land? Are the fiscal laws under which we live of no concern to the women? May they not take an advanced position on these questions even at the expense of committing "*excesses*?"

ARE the women indeed so timid? Do they believe the cause of woman suffrage, now triumphant, could have been won by following the absurdly timid counsel that is given in their chief publication? Did the great leaders like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton consider these niceties, these careful and very lady-like restraints, when they raised their voices for the rights of women so long denied? Now that the women have the vote, the exercise of which is a duty and not a mere privilege, shall they refrain from taking a decided stand on questions in which they as well as men are vitally interested? Is it for this that their own great cause has been fought and won? Are human rights of no further concern now that their political rights have been secured? Is their work over and done? Has it not indeed only just begun? The wrongs that now must be righted are woman's chief concern, for her sake and for the sake of the generations unborn. Those who advise her against taking positive ground on these questions in order to avoid committing "*propagandistic excesses*" are no friends of the new voters. Besides, the advice is incredibly absurd.

THE Committee of 48 is not dead, but stirs again. It is out with a new and revised platform as the foundation of a new party. It may be indicated that the Platform of the Single Tax Party is more explicit and more acceptable to those who want the Single Tax. This Party received a sufficient number of votes in the States where they were on the ballot to form the nucleus of a new party possessing the crusading spirit, and having at the same time a principle that assures its continuance as a modifying and proselyting element in American politics.

The Platform offered by Mr. Hopkins and his associates may be acceptable to many Single Taxers, but we warn the Committee of 48 of the inevitable repetition of what