

There is no argument against equal suffrage, on the ground either of right or of expediency. It takes little or no time. The ordinary man does not give three hours a year to the exercise of suffrage. There is nothing in it to impair the nature of women. It has been tried in the election of school committees and who is conscious of the slightest effect which it has had in absorbing the time of women, or of unsexing them, or of affecting their domestic relations?

* * *

SHALL THE WIVES OF WORKINGMEN GO INTO FACTORIES AND SHOPS?

Editorial in the *American Machinist* of October 11, 1906.

A thing to contrast with the song of praise we are continually hearing about the great benefits conferred upon humanity by labor-saving machinery is the suggestion recently made in *The Independent* by Dr. Simon N. Patten, who is professor of political economy in the University of Pennsylvania and a recognized authority upon economics. In this article he expresses the opinion that wives whose husbands have an income of less than \$20 a week ought to work in the factory, the shop, or the office, to help out with the family expenses. His principal reason for this appears to be that the introduction of labor-saving machinery now used in factories has largely done away with much of the labor which was formerly performed by housewives within their own homes, and yet the necessity for their laboring exists. As Dr. Patten may readily ascertain, comparatively few of the workingmen of this country earn as much as \$20 a week. If, therefore, his advice is sound, the wives of a large majority of such workmen should perform some work outside their own homes in an effort to help support the family. This, of course, would inevitably mean the neglect of the home-making duties, and the practical breaking up of many humble homes.

If the results of all our boasted advances in the sciences and arts and in the construction and use of labor-saving machinery are no better than this; if after all that has been done in that line, wives of men who earn far more than the average, recompense of labor in this country, must leave their homes for outside employment, and we must accept that as a necessary condition, then all our arts and sciences are of little or no real use.

Dr. Patten would, in our opinion, do much better if he devoted his talent to a study of distribution and to an answer to the question of why it is that colossal fortunes are being amassed by means of monopolies and special privileges of various kinds—money accumulated by men to such an extent that they are utterly unable to make proper use of it, while at the same time the problem of support for workingmen has become so insistent and obtrusive as to make it seem to him necessary to propose such a remedy.

And supposing workingmen and their wives generally accepted this suggestion, what effect does Dr. Patten think that would have upon wages and upon the constant tendency to force young children into factories?

Socialists who believe that the use of privately owned labor-saving machinery is one of the chief

causes of our economic and social evils and who seek to "nationalize all means of production" will welcome Dr. Patten's suggestion as an authoritative confession of the failure of the present system. We by no means make any such acknowledgment. We do not believe that machinery oppresses men. Monopolies do that. Unfair advantages; special privilege; failure to secure a "square deal" for every man; these are the things that hurt and when they are done away with we shall then have heard the last of the "crushing effect of machinery" and of the necessity for women with able-bodied husbands going out of their homes to work for daily bread. With all due respect to Dr. Patten, his suggestion is discreditable to the science of political economy as taught in our colleges.

* * *

WOMAN SUFFRAGE MILITANT: THE NEW MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

Edith Abbott, Ph.D., in the *New York Independent* of November 29, 1906. Dr. Abbott Writes from London.

The past year has seen the woman suffrage movement in England enter upon a new and militant phase of its career—and a phase that bids fair to become as triumphant as it has been misrepresented and misunderstood. The temptation of the journalist to furnish sensational and readable stories at the expense of the cause has undoubtedly been extreme; but the truth will out, and the English public has awakened to a consciousness of the fact that a serious campaign is being carried on by serious women—women who are so tremendously in earnest, so full of courage, so full of faith, so ready to sacrifice themselves for their cause that they have changed the amused indignation with which they were first regarded into a hearty, if an unwilling, admiration. After all, one must respect earnestness, more especially earnestness that braves ridicule in support of an idea.

It is now pretty generally understood in London that newspaper stories of shrieking hysteria and behavior too absurd to chronicle were only newspaper stories; that such disorder as occurred a few weeks ago was caused much more by the metropolitan police than by the women; that the leaders of the new movement are not women of the notoriety-seeking sort, but women of cultivation and refinement—university women, philanthropists, women well known and long respected for work in a hundred good causes. Among the women now imprisoned in Holloway Jail, for example, is Mrs. Cobden-Sanderson, one of Richard Cobden's daughters, whom Mr. Bernard Shaw in a pungent letter of protest to the *Times* described as "long known to every one worth knowing in London as among the most charming and interesting women of our day."

It must, of course, be clearly understood that this new movement is disavowed by the old-line suffragists and that the secretary of the national association has publicly disclaimed for her organization any connection with it. But it would be difficult indeed to say now, whatever may have been the case before the last Westminster pilgrimage, whether a majority of the men and women here who believe in the cause are with the old suffragists or the new. ~~As matters~~

diced observer would be inclined to say with the new—certainly not against them.

The new campaign is distinctly an agitation, persistent, aggressive and at times dramatic, even spectacular; a relentless urging of the cause as a question of practical politics, as an immediate reform, instead of a nebulous theory of right and justice. Its keynote is persistence, a compelling of the go-easy public to consider the question even though it would rather not. Four hundred and twenty members of the present House of Commons went in pledged to support "votes for women," the Prime Minister had expressed his sympathy with the demands of the suffragists, and there was every reason to hope that the new Parliament would "do something." But instead of a woman suffrage bill, the women were offered only the "silent sympathy" of the Premier and the pledged members. Now "silent sympathy" is precisely what the cause has been suffering from for a quarter of a century and it is the purpose of the leaders of the new movement to reject it boldly and instead to demand of the four hundred and twenty that they redeem their pledges, and if they refuse, to defeat them, if possible, when they come up for reelection. No doubt this is somewhat uncomfortable for the Government and the recalcitrants. They much prefer women who will accept "silent sympathy" as a crumb to be grateful for. But the question to be asked in all fairness before these women and their methods are condemned is not whether they have made life a little less serene for a group of politicians who have broken their promises, but whether they have injured or promoted their cause. To this last question there can now be but one answer, and that is best given in the words of Mrs. Henry Fawcett, well known as a leader of the old movement and still identified with it. In a recent letter to the Times, with reference to the women now in prison, she wrote: "I hope the more old-fashioned suffragists will stand by them; and I take this opportunity of saying that, in my opinion, far from having injured the movement, they have done more during the last twelve months to bring it within the region of practical politics than we have been able to accomplish in the same number of years."

And how have they done this? They have done this because they have made woman suffrage a subject of discussion everywhere in the kingdom—and among all classes. They have forced men who have votes, in Parliament and out, to commit themselves. They have obtained the united support of the Labor party in the House and with it a promise that a "votes for women" bill shall be one of its foremost demands next session. Moreover, they have, as an important Liberal paper pointed out in an editorial "leader," made it forever impossible for men to say that when women care seriously enough for the suffrage they will get it. Earnestness has conquered ridicule, for it would be a callous public indeed that could refuse a respectful hearing to Mrs. Cobden-Sanderson's quiet and dignified statement before the court which sentenced her. "If any one is guilty," she said calmly, "it is I, but I do not acknowledge my guilt. I do not acknowledge the authority of this court or any other court so long as I have no word nor any power in the making of the laws which I am supposed to

obey. I will only quote the words of the president of the Local Government Board: 'I am a rebel because I am an outlaw.'"

After having seen on one day of the past week a crowd numbering hundreds standing in Hyde Park for more than two hours in a drizzling rain to listen to the "agitators'" presentation of their case, on another day a great demonstration in Trafalgar Square by the women workers from the textile mills of Lancashire and Cheshire and other industrial centers, and after having heard on an evening of the same week the enthusiastic approval which greeted Keir Hardie's statement at his jubilee meeting in Farringdon Hall that the English workingman would not soon forget the spectacle of "Cobden's daughter in prison under a Cobden Government for demanding an extension of the franchise," it is easy enough to understand that there is method in what was at first called "the madness of the agitators."

The attitude of the men of the working classes has been one of the most interesting features of the situation. An eminent Socialist long ago pointed out that woman and the laboring man had alike had from the beginning for their common lot oppression. Perhaps it is the memory of this ancient community of interest that is responsible for the present tie between England's voteless women and England's workmen. Perhaps it is the answer to the appeal sent from Holloway Jail by the daughter of the man who gave them bread. Perhaps it is because of the organized efforts made by the working women, especially the trade union women, in support of the cause and their claim that it is suffrage alone that can rescue them from their present degradation—a degradation of life as well as of work. At any rate, the sympathy has come, first voiced by a man at work in the street, who stopped as the women went by under police guard from Westminster and shouted: "Keep on coming and don't give up the fight. It's the only way we ever got anything, and it's the only way you ever will."

This statement regarding what the women have done does not need to be followed by a statement of what the English Government has done to these women. That is already recorded to England's shame. The public indignation over their treatment in prison has done much to strengthen their cause, for, as Mr. Shaw tersely put it, in an attempt to ridicule the Home Secretary into doing his duty, "nobody in the world really wishes to see one of the nicest women in England suffering from the coarsest indignity and the most injurious form of ill treatment that the law could inflict on a pickpocket."

It may not be out of place to say in conclusion that to one born and bred a believer in woman's suffrage, but long accustomed to regard it apathetically as something which would come only in that long future which holds so much of truth and justice, the past week in London has been one of inspiration and new hope. And in default of the personal possession of the moral courage to serve in a campaign of this sort, it is a pleasure to acknowledge, humbly and gratefully, a deep obligation to those whose service has been great.

* * *

Millinery is admissible when it fits and expounds the soul and the body.—Clarence Lathbury.