

HERBERT BIGELOW.

Herbert Bigelow has been elected President of the fourth Constitutional Convention of Ohio, now sitting at Columbus.



This election was the more conspicuous because Mr. Bigelow, in the campaign, doubted, and at times said that he doubted, his own election as a delegate, because, as he put it, "I have been so near to this progressive movement for years that many men have come to regard me with foolish fear." His fears in this were not without historic justification, for the fathers of political reform have generally had a Golgotha for their reward.

But this age seems to be rapidly reversing some features of the historic program. We have determined to stop encores. Old things are rapidly passing away; some things, if not all things, are becoming new. And this reversal is seen in Bigelow's election as president of the Ohio Constitutional Convention.

For fifteen years Mr. Bigelow has been the embodiment of the progressive movement in Ohio—this, with all due honor to Tom L. Johnson, whose energies were focused largely on the great

work done in Cleveland. But Bigelow, in that movement, has been the great apostle to the gentiles. He has worked throughout the State, stirring up every corner and cranny. He has made enemies in this work, and he has made warm friends.

Had his campaign occurred four years ago I question whether he could have been elected. Men, just a little while ago, were much prejudiced against him. But a tremendous change has occurred in four years. Men have come to understand him and his cause. Then, the fact that he was a Congregational clergyman, prejudiced many who denied clergymen the right to "mix in politics." But this age has turned the microscope on everything, including its prejudices, and it is looking to substance—not form.

Labels no longer scare. The age is protesting against infallibility masking under ancient form and alleged "guarantees." The Convention came to see nothing dangerous in Mr. Bigelow.

STANLEY E. BOWDLE.



WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Our critical attitude toward the violence-wing of woman suffragists in Great Britain has brought us complaints from American woman suffragists, most of which add nothing to a better understanding of the situation. One critic, however, does, with painstaking care, explain the matter from the viewpoint of the militant side. This is Alice Paul, of Moorestown, New Jersey. She begins with a request for space to explain that an account of the woman suffrage agitation in great Britain "given in *The Public* of December 22, 1911,* contains serious misstatements of the suffragist position." We do not think that the editorial in question contains serious misstatements, nor that it contains any misstatements except the one explained below and to which our critic does not refer. But that the reader may judge we reproduce it here as an appropriate introduction to Miss Paul's criticism:

It may be that the cable reports which attribute last week's assault upon Lloyd George to the violence-wing of British woman suffragists, are in that respect untrue; but the act itself, the hurling of a box into his face with evident intent to do him physical injury, is so manifestly in line with the tory policy of that group as to make their responsibility for it fairly probable.

Whether this inference against them and their leaders be valid or not, there is no obvious escape

*See vol. xiv, p. 1282.